

Perceptions of mega-event legacy impacts in non-host areas: a reflection on the 2010 FIFA World Cup in Africa

Dr Tembi Maloney Tichaawa
School of Tourism and Hospitality
University of Johannesburg, Bunting Road Campus
Johannesburg, South Africa
Email: tembit@uj.ac.za

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore the perceptions of legacy impacts that are associated with the hosting of a mega-event. Specifically, the study analyses post-event perceptions in non-host areas in Africa. To this end, the study reflects on soccer fans perceptions in Cameroon and Nigeria as case study areas. Based on a survey of 771 respondents (n=390 for Cameroon and n=381 for Nigeria), perceptions were assessed by 20 item variable scale which measured impact attributes linked to mega-events generally and the African legacy objectives linked to the 2010 FIFA World Cup specifically. According to the mean measures, strong favourable perceptions were mainly associated and improved image for Africa internationally, and the fact that the event left a legacy for Africa. Furthermore, while Nigerian respondents displayed a more positive perception than were those from Cameroon, no statistical differences were found between the two case study areas. The study concludes that while such perceptions may be positive, the extent to which the event left a legacy for the continent still warrants a range of research endeavours that focus on key issues linked to the African legacy objectives.

Keywords: Mega-event, leveraging, legacy impacts, soccer fans perceptions, Cameroon, Nigeria

Introduction

According to Bob and Swart (2010), sport events are gaining prominence in the global, regional and local arenas, due to the massive investments that are often associated with their hosting. Cornelissen, Bob and Swart (2011) posit that such investments have resulted in a growing interest in examining their impacts. A vast number of studies agree that mega-events are often justified on the premise of their likely long-term benefits for the destinations that host them (Agha, Fairley & Gibson, 2012; Cashman, 2002; Chalip, 2006; Cornelissen & Swart, 2006; Harris, 2011; Horne, 2007; Malfas, Theodoraki & Houlihan, 2004; Nichols & Ralston, 2011; Preuss, 2011; Ritchie, Shipway & Cleeve, 2009; Swart & Bob, 2012; Tichaawa & Bama, 2012). As countries are increasingly bidding to host mega-events (the Fédération Internationale de Football Association [FIFA] World Cup and the Olympic Games), the main argument presented to justify this desire is the associated legacy benefits that are likely to accrue to the local communities concerned (Dickson, Benson & Blackman, 2011).

Published research investigating the post long-term mega-event legacy impacts in non-host areas is very limited. In the context of South Africa and the 2010 FIFA World Cup, this is particularly glaring given the difference in the way in which the event was leveraged. As Black (2007) observes, what made the 2010 event different from previous World Cups in relation to legacy was the continental orientation adopted that entailed extending the benefits beyond the host country (South Africa). However, few empirically based studies have focused on the post-event effects on the continent (Tichaawa & Bob, 2015). To this end, this article recognises the need to empirically analyse the perceptions from outside South Africa. The study is significant in that it provides insights into further understanding the

extent to which such legacy benefits materialised, and are perceived, outside South Africa. Therefore the study assists in closing the existing gap on current mega-event studies, specifically those that have analysed the legacies associated with the event.

Mega-event legacies

Several studies on mega-events (Black, 2007; Cashman, 2002; 2005; Chappelet & Junod, 2006; Cornelissen, 2007; Cornelissen *et al.*, 2011; Hiller, 1998; Preuss, 2007; 2011; 2013; Smith & Fox, 2007) have reflected on the issue of legacies. Most concur that mega-event legacies represent the outcome of the event which can be interpreted not only as permanent effects, but also as readjustments to normality, or as adaptations to changes brought about by an event. According to Mann (2008: 2) the legacies of mega-events involve “ensuring that as many long-term benefits are generated for the host city, region and nation – well before, during and long after the event”. Preuss (2007: 2) considers legacies of mega-events as “planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures that were/will be created through a sport event and remain after the event”. The basis for the above definition is that it identifies three legacy dimensions: firstly, the degree of planned structure; secondly, the degree of positive structure; and thirdly, the degree of quantifiable structure (Preuss, 2007). Such dimensions imply that a legacy consists of a multi-faceted outcome, consequently the legacy of such an event as the 2010 FIFA World Cup might easily serve to encompass all the different elements of the impact that it creates.

The typologies of sport mega-event legacy impacts

In the available literature, Preuss (2013) asserts that a countless number of legacy effects exists that are associated with the hosting of a mega-event. To boost understanding, Chappelet and Junod (2006: 84 cited by Bob and Swart, 2010: 81-82) identify and differentiate between the following five different types of legacies, based on the nature of each one's effects:

- **Sporting legacy** refers to the facilities that are newly built or renovated for an event, and which will serve some purpose post-event. These sporting infrastructures often become emblematic symbols for the host city, depicting its link with sports. Furthermore, they might also play a role in changing the local culture, by either increasing people's participation in sport, by introducing new and different types of sport to the area, or by fostering the organisation of more mega-events on a regular basis (Bob & Swart, 2010: 81).
- **Urban legacy** focuses on the buildings that were constructed for the event, but which serve no sporting function. Included here are changes made to the urban structure of the host city, as well as the development of new urban districts and specialised areas (Bob & Swart, 2010: 81).
- **Infrastructural legacy** refers to the different types of networks, ranging from transport to telecommunications, that are developed for the purpose of the event, and which are maintained after the event is complete. New access routes by air, water, road, or rail also form part of the infrastructural legacy. Additionally, an event can provide the trigger for promoting the modernisation of such basic services as water, electricity, and waste treatment, among others (Bob & Swart, 2010: 81).
- **Economic legacy**, although difficult to determine, measures the number of tourist visitations over the long-term. Mega-events are often associated with increases in the number of tourists visiting a host city. Although it is difficult to determine the impact of tourism in the long-term, the tourist legacy needs to be evaluated by measuring the number of tourists visiting an area over the long-term. In addition, the economic legacy also includes the setting up of non-tourism-orientated companies that are attracted to the host region by its dynamism, in the form of the possibility of leveraging its investment opportunities. Other good indicators of the economic legacy

of mega-events are the changes that occur in terms of the number of permanent jobs created, and in the reduction of the unemployment rate in the host region or city (Bob & Swart, 2010: 82).

- **Social legacy**, which refers to the residents' memories and experiences of the event, includes the actual skills and experiences that people gain through their direct or indirect involvement in the event. Mega-events are symbolic in nature, and thus often lead to the creation of many stories and myths. These stories and myths form part of what Chappelet and Junod (2006: 85) term the 'collective memory' of an event. This term refers to the local residents' memories and experiences of the mega-event, and can also include the actual skills and experiences that people gain through their direct, or indirect, involvement in the mega-event. An essential part of the social legacy of mega-events is the change in the perceptions of the local residents of the host city or region.
- **Environmental legacy**, according to Cornelissen *et al.* (2011), is concerned with such sustainability imperatives as minimising the negative consequences of the mega-event for the environment, and maximising the positives pertaining to the event.
- **Political legacies** may refer to the improved governance practised at the host destination; the enhancement of nation-building (Lee & Taylor, 2005); growth in political awareness (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2011); increased diplomacy and legitimacy (Ndlovu, 2010); and change in the host destination's political image (Maharaj, 2010). As presented above, legacies can be both positive and negative in nature, and mostly manifest in the cities or region that host mega-events.

Legacy planning

At the centre of the controversy over legacy is the issue of appropriate planning prior to the hosting of mega-events. The importance of legacy planning for the host destinations of mega-events is stressed. For example, Ritchie (1984) cautions that, without careful strategic planning that is focused on destination and community development, it might be difficult to justify making the large investments that are required to host an event. Similarly, Smith and Fox (2007) state that securing regeneration from events requires vigilant planning by event managers who are sensitive to the significance of legacy. Bob and Swart (2010) note that the host country that delivers a successful event, while ensuring a positive legacy, requires effective coordination between a range of such stakeholders as event organisers, regeneration agencies, the government, local businesses and the community. Therefore, comprehensive legacy planning should have helped to ensure that the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup contributed to the development of the communities concerned, as well as benefiting those residents for a long time to come. However, according to Matheson (2010: 12), the "mixed legacy outcomes are indicative of the challenges within the legacy planning and implementation process". For example, "the conceptualisation of legacy lacks a shared understanding and is an emergent area in legacy." Cashman (1998: 111), in the case of the Olympic Games, provides a number of reasons for the difficulty of planning for life post-event:

- During the rush to organise the mega-event, little time exists for considering a plan for the period after the event, despite such being the time when the issue of legacy comes under the spotlight, as LOCs wind up the event. In said case, there exists the peril of pertinent decisions being made 'on the run', and on an ad hoc basis.
- Legacy is usually concealed, since it is usually interpreted to represent a range of additional financial burdens for the host of the mega-event. Regrettably, a vast number of event planners fail to recognise that, while creating a legacy requires some additional expenditure, it represents a way of recouping some of the mega-

event costs through the development of related tourism, and of further recouping the costs related to the construction of event facilities.

- Legacy is more often than not looked upon as a side issue that can be tackled post-event. Due to it not being seen as a central issue, few destinations that host mega-events have comprehensive post-event plans.
- In addition to the above, legacy also consists of information about how best to stage mega-events. It has been customary for the organisers of upcoming mega-events to 'look over the shoulder' of those staging a current event. However, the bulk of mega-event 'knowledge' is not passed on in any systematic way to the next destination hosting the future event.

According to Agha *et al.* (2012) and Pellegrino and Hancock (2010), to create a positive legacy for an event, the host destinations of mega-events must focus on the post-event legacies, and not just on the event itself. Authorities must plan for legacies, and not anticipate, and assume, that the legacy concerned will simply materialise. The construction of a legacy requires that deliberate effort, strong leadership and sustained commitment be exerted. Furthermore, a realistic legacy vision must be crafted and promoted to include a broad economic footprint, while stakeholder collaboration, especially within the ambit of the public and private sectors, is important.

Legacy has the potential to arouse community support for mega-events, especially if there are tangible outcomes and return on investments concerned (Matheson, 2010). Preuss (2007) outlines that a positive legacy helps to overcome complaints about such an organisation as FIFA, and that it provides evidence of why the World Cup has been good for the host country involved. Said legacy further provides justification for the use of scarce public resources in constructing stadiums and general infrastructure to ensure that all necessary event structures for the event are ready in time. A positive legacy also motivates other nations to bid to host future World Cups. Such reasons were important in the case of South Africa's hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup.

Bob and Kassens-Noor (2012) and Preuss (2013) argue strongly that there is a need to sustain post-mega-event legacies for a significantly long period of time, urging that such legacy effects should be evaluated for at least a period of over 20 years. Matheson (2010: 12) cautions that "it is insufficient for policy makers to focus on short-term impacts; instead, sustainable legacies are emphasised to justify public expenditure". The sport event tourism research conducted by Weed (2007), Smith (2012) and Miah and Garcia (2012) underscore that events should be used by the destinations that host them to drive long-term developmental plans, and that, therefore, their planning should incorporate urban regeneration strategies.

The monitoring of legacy effects entails considering both the intangible and the tangible effects of the event (Dickson *et al.*, 2011; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Preuss, 2013; Ritchie *et al.*, 2009). According to Cornelissen *et al.* (2011: 309), "intangible effects – which often relate to the subjective experiences – can generally only be felt, such as the change in resident and visitor perceptions of the host city or region". Preuss (2013) argues that the legacy effects of such mega-events could be either direct or indirect. Preuss (2007) and Harris (2011) assert that the direct effects represent those tangible sport facilities and related infrastructure that are built for the main purpose of hosting the mega-event. According to Swart and Bob (2010; 2012) and Bob and Kassens-Noor (2012), the indirect effects of mega-events legacies for host destinations could include the intangible effects of image enhancement, and of the feel-good factor (Allmers & Maennig, 2008; Maennig & du Plessis, 2007; Maennig & Zimbalist, 2012) that is experienced by the host population and by visitors during the event. However, as Cornelissen *et al.* (2011: 309) infer, "indirect effects are

facilities and infrastructure that would have been built even if the event had not taken place, but the mega-event served to speed up these developments”.

The legacy framework discussed above illustrates the key impacts that are linked to the 2010 FIFA World Cup that have been examined in relation to non-host African countries. As the discussion above illustrates, the focus on legacy impacts tends to be on the host(s) involved. This study focuses on the non-host impacts, which has, up until now, been a neglected focus area in terms of mega-event research.

The African World Cup legacy

To achieve positive legacy results, Preuss (2013) and Dickson *et al.* (2011) caution on the need for careful planning and execution at all phases of the mega-event cycle (prior to, during and post-event). According to the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2010: 16), “a legacy programme should include both short-term and longer-term initiatives, and should focus on both the direct and indirect impacts of the event, and also address wider institutional co-ordination benefits”. This was the intention of the organisers of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, and the associated planned legacies through the designing of the African Legacy Programme. According to the South African government, the event was expected to contribute effectively to the awakening of Africa’s potential as a prosperous, united and influential global colossus (Department of Sport and Recreation, 2008). Projects embarked upon under the African Legacy Programme fell mainly within the domains of peace and nation building, football development, tourism and the environment, culture and heritage, security cooperation (Tichaawa & Bob, 2015; Tichaawa & Swart, 2010).

Smith and Fox (2007) contend that a clearly designed and implemented legacy programme is likely to generate a number of positive benefits for the host destination community and for stakeholder groups. Although several legacy programmes had been designed and implemented for previous mega-events, the African Legacy Programme was rather unusual, simply because it aimed to achieve a continent-wide legacy as opposed to a legacy that was confined to the host country, South Africa. Elsewhere, however, the design of the African Legacy Programme has been criticised either for being rather overly confident, or for South Africa having advanced and strengthened its own position thereby. Tawfik-Amer (2011) argues that by using the African narratives, South Africa’s aim was designed to gain African support for its bid. Whatever the case might be, what is lacking in the analysis of the legacy impacts of the 2010 event in Africa according to the aforementioned objectives, is the extent to which the leveraging of the objectives was achieved. Thus, this research endeavour focused on soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria.

Methodology

The population of this research were the soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria. The two countries formed the case study areas that were used by the researcher in soliciting for data to test perceptions of the post 2010 FIFA World Cup African legacy impacts that were associated with the leveraging of event beyond the geographical confines of South Africa. Both countries were considered ideal for such a research endeavour on the basis of their prominence as “African giants” when it comes to success linked to football achievements. Besides sharing a geographic border, Cameroon has participated at a record seven FIFA World Cup events compared to five for Nigeria, making them the two most successful teams in terms of appearances in the African context (Tichaawa & Bob, 2015). The passionate views of their fans in terms of football (see Pannenburg, 2010; Darby, 2000), makes such a region ideal locations to test the post-event perceptions of leveraging the 2010 event continentally.

A sampling size of 758 respondents were chosen in order to achieve a 95% confidence level and a 5% sampling error based on Isaac and Micheal (1981). In both countries, a typical match can attract an average of 30 000 repeat fans. Based on the sample calculator, a total of 758 questionnaires was equally split (379 each) and administered to fans in both case study areas. Such fans were chosen at the Unification Stadium in Limbe, Cameroon, and the U.J. Esuene Stadium in Calabar, Nigeria. On each game day, trained fieldworkers were located throughout the stadium's entry points in order to be able to apply the systematic stratified sampling method, according to which every 79th fan was chosen in order to ensure a more representative sample of the population surveyed. At the end of the data collection period, 771 soccer fans were successfully surveyed (n=390 for Cameroon and n=381 for Nigeria).

Twenty variable items that measured fans perceptions were developed based on an extensive literature review on the hosting of the 2010 event. However, such variables were informed largely by the predefined African legacy objectives that were expected to drive socio-economic development within the continent. The variables also considered in part the legacy dimensions associated with mega-event legacies as postulated by Cornelissen *et al.* (2011). A five point Likert scale was then used to measure perceptions. The response scale used for the survey is ordinal. The categories used were strongly agree (1), agree (2), neutral (3), disagree (4) and strongly disagree (5). The survey instrument was tested by means of a pilot study. Such a pilot study was particularly helpful as it highlighted grey areas that were ratified prior to the main data collection exercise.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 19 was used to analyse the quantitative data. The software generated frequencies in terms of percentages that allowed for a clear representation of the results. Additionally, it allowed for the use of independent sample t-test to compare perceptions across geographic regions. The qualitative data was analysed into conceptual categories in terms of the constant comparative method. The analysis was conducted thematically in relation to key issues and debates emanating from the literature review on mega-events generally and the primary data.

Results and discussion

In the discussion, the results have been grouped (strongly agree and agree, and strongly disagree and disagree) to make for a better understanding.

Socio-economic and environmental issues

Table 1 below presents the results in terms of perceptions linked to the socio-economic and environmental impacts associated with the post 2010 FIFA World Cup in non-host areas. In terms of economic impact, Table 1 shows that the respondents (83.7% from Nigeria and 79% from Cameroon) generally agreed that the 2010 FIFA World Cup resulted in programmes that improve the economic development of Africa (V1). du Plessis and Venter (2010) opine that the benefits that are associated with the preparatory activity of a mega-event (including stadium development, the event in itself attracting a multitude of tourists and the long-term impact of the tournament) due to the change in the perception of the host economy and the potential for trade, investments and tourism which are dimensions of economic contributions to the host regions.

According to the data in Table 1, respondents (75.1% from Nigeria and 72.3% from Cameroon) also agreed that Africa's citizens have benefited from jobs created by the 2010 FIFA World Cup (V2). This underscore the believe that one of the known economic benefits of hosting a mega-event is that such events stimulate significant short-term or temporary

employment and long-term or permanent employment for the local citizens of the host region (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Miah & Garcia, 2012), and in this case non-host regions as well, especially when leveraged. A vast majority of the respondents (92.1% from Nigeria, and 91.6% from Cameroon) expressed a belief that the successful hosting of the event has boosted levels of pride in, and the image of, Africa internationally (V3). The findings support those of Lee and Taylor (2005) who found that sport tourism events tend to have a strong symbolic function, in respect of evoking a sense of community, excitement and emotion. Furthermore, they reinforce the findings of du Plessis and Maennig (2011) who reported an increase in international awareness for the host nation South Africa and Namibia (a non-host area) post the 2010 event. Overall, the findings indicate that the respondents were enthusiastic about a positive change in Africa's image, as a result of the hosting of the 2010 event. The event could, therefore, have helped to instil an enthusiastic belief that the African continent has established a higher international prominence for itself and that mega-events are a potent tool for enhancing place image. Whatever the case might be, it is of vital importance that the good impression made by hosting the 2010 FIFA World Cup in Africa is sustained and used to advance its position in relation to tourism and other economic development imperatives in the long-term.

Table 1: Socio-economic and environmental issues (in %, n=390 for Cameroon and n=381 for Nigeria)

| Type of impact | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | |
|---|----------------|------|-------|------|---------|------|----------|------|-------------------|-----|
| | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N |
| V1 Programmes that improve the economic development of Africa | 19.5 | 26.0 | 59.5 | 57.7 | 12.3 | 10.5 | 5.1 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| V2 Employment | 23.6 | 16.8 | 48.7 | 58.3 | 17.9 | 13.6 | 5.2 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 5.0 |
| V3 International image enhancement | 50.8 | 54.3 | 40.8 | 37.8 | 5.6 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.1 |
| V4 Promoting peace on the African continent | 26.2 | 20.2 | 32.3 | 45.7 | 16.7 | 17.1 | 11.7 | 9.7 | 13.1 | 7.3 |
| V5 Improved skills development in Africa | 15.6 | 18.9 | 53.1 | 55.6 | 24.4 | 17.1 | 4.8 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 5.2 |
| V6 Increased tourism investment opportunities in Africa | 17.9 | 24.4 | 56.7 | 58.5 | 14.9 | 10.5 | 6.7 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 2.6 |
| V7 Increased tourism arrivals | 10.8 | 23.1 | 27.2 | 38.6 | 31.3 | 17.8 | 22.8 | 11.8 | 7.9 | 8.7 |
| V8 Improve tourism awareness continentally | 10.3 | 14.7 | 39.5 | 47.0 | 21.2 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 9.7 | 8.5 | 8.1 |
| V9 Improved environmental awareness in Africa | 11.5 | 18.4 | 39.0 | 41.7 | 26.2 | 22.8 | 6.9 | 9.4 | 16.4 | 7.7 |

C - Cameroon N - Nigeria

In terms of the events having helped in promoting peace on the African continent (V4), many of the respondents agreed with the statement, with slightly more respondents from Nigeria agreeing (65.9%), compared to the number from Cameroon (58.5%). Some respondents disagreed with the statement (24.8% being the slightly greater percentage from Cameroon, compared to 17% from Nigeria), while 17.1% of the respondents from Nigeria and 16.7% of those from Cameroon were neutral. According to Walker, Kaplanidou, Gibson, Thapa, Geldenhuys and Coetzee (2013), the 2010 event created programmes that used football for human development by promoting peace on the African continent, with the help of several organisations, including the Football For Hope Movement. However, the data also displays a degree of scepticism with regards to the idea when those who disagreed or remain neutral are contextualised.

When analysing the event and skills development (V5), many respondents in Nigeria (74.5%) and in Cameroon (68.7%) agreed that the event improved skills development on the continent. Some respondents assumed a neutral stance (24.4% from Cameroon and 17.1% from Nigeria), while very few respondents disagreed with the statement (8.4% from Nigeria and 6.9% from Cameroon). According to Bull and Lovell (2007), the hosting of global events attracts flows of skilled labour mainly for the development of event- related infrastructure. Although the findings in this study show some degree of uncertainty among the fans in both case study areas, many fans expressed a belief that skills had been enhanced and improved as a result of the 2010 event. The fact that volunteers for the 2010 event were largely selected from across the African continent might have influenced the response. However,

Jago, Dwyer, Lipman, van Lill, and Voster (2010) assert that the skills legacy of mega-events in developing countries is often not great, as the specialist or skilled staff tend to leave the region after their task has been completed. They advocate that it is useful that skills training or apprenticeship programmes be adopted so that there is considerable transfer of skills from the external experts to the local workers, more especially due to the development of those workers who are in management positions.

With regard to tourism legacy impacts associated with the 2010 event, Table 1 shows that the majority of respondents, slightly more in Nigeria (82.9%) than in Cameroon (74.6%), were of the view that the event has increased tourism and investment opportunities in Africa (V6). Such a finding mirrors those of Gold and Gold (2012) who indicate that the 2010 FIFA World Cup witnessed growth in the tourism markets of African countries and contributed to the growth of African states. Hinch and Higham (2011) assert that the tourism sector is a major benefactor from mega-event hosting, and that such benefits can spill over to non-host regions. In sum, the findings imply that most of the fans in Nigeria and Cameroon were of the opinion that tourism on the African continent has improved and that investment opportunities have been enhanced post the hosting of the 2010 event. However, the long-term effects of such improvements have yet to be determined. As du Plessis and Maennig (2011) observe, the economic benefits of this nature that are linked to mega-events are often exaggerated and tend to arouse problematic expectations in terms of the growth multipliers that are adopted, as well as the irony of leakages of revenue.

In a correlated statement to the above, which was presented to the respondents regarding the notion of increased tourist arrivals, an interesting shift in response was noted in the two case study areas. Many respondents in Nigeria (61.7%) compared to Cameroon (38%) felt that the number of tourist arrivals in their country had increased because of the hosting of the 2010 event (V7). Furthermore, more respondents in Cameroon (31.3%) than in Nigeria (17.8%) were neutral about the statement. Many respondents in Cameroon (30.7%) and 20.5% in Nigeria disagreed with it. The results present somewhat distorted picture in this regard. For Africa and the 2010 FIFA World Cup tourism legacy, the number of tourist arrivals over a period of time, and the number of jobs created by the sector, will be important in determining the ability of the 2010 event to have created international awareness of the continent, and to have promoted tourism.

Furthermore, some of the respondents (61.7% of the respondents from Nigeria compared to 49.8% from Cameroon) felt that they were more aware of Africa as a tourism destination because of the event exposure (V8). Conversely, more respondents from Cameroon (29%) compared to those from Nigeria (17.8%) rejected it. More so, 21.2% of the respondents from Cameroon and 20.5% of those from Nigeria were neutral. Although the majority of soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria expressed a belief that the 2010 event enhanced their level of awareness of the continent as a tourism destination, a degree of scepticism was noted when those who disagreed with or who remained neutral were brought into the equation. Theoretically, mega-events not only affect the destinations that host them, but they might have a significant impact on the surrounding regions (Bijkerk, de Ridder & Donaldson, 2012). Given the extent of the international media exposure that a FIFA World Cup attracts, showcasing the tourism products that the continent has was one way of enhancing awareness of Africa as a tourism destination.

The last impact type on Table 1 (V9) showed a rather nuanced response with regards to the 2010 event having improved environmental awareness in Africa. Although the majority of the respondents (60.1% from Nigeria and 50.5% from Cameroon) agreed with the notion, other respondents in Cameroon (26.2%) and Nigeria (22.8%) were neutral, while the remaining proportion of respondents (23.3% from Cameroon and 17.1% from Nigeria) disagreed with it. This finding implies that most of the soccer fans in Nigeria and Cameroon were confident

that hosting the 2010 FIFA World Cup in Africa had improved their level of awareness of the need for environmental sustainability in Africa. It also reinforces Deccio and Baloglu's (2002) persuasive argument that mega-events are capable of acting as a conduit that leads to greater environmental awareness. Conversely the results show a level of concern because those who disagreed with the statement and those who remained neutral cannot be ignored. Kasper (1998) asserts that one of the major trepidations that emanate from mega-event hosting is centred on the damage to the environment. More so, the lack of African legacy initiatives that focused on the sustainability of the environment in Cameroon and Nigeria could have been blamed for the response.

Political issues

Table 2 below reveals the results that were received from the respondents in this study in relation to the political issues concerned with the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in Africa.

Table 2: Political issues in %, n=390 for Cameroon and n=381 for Nigeria)

| Type of impact | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | |
|--|----------------|------|-------|------|---------|------|----------|------|-------------------|------|
| | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N |
| V10 Enhance African cooperation | 14.6 | 12.9 | 34.1 | 39.4 | 25.6 | 25.2 | 17.2 | 14.9 | 8.5 | 7.6 |
| V11 Improve joint partnership agreements and strengthen regional cooperation | 9.5 | 14.7 | 42.1 | 36.2 | 25.9 | 29.7 | 14.8 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 13.1 |
| V12 Improve the chances of hosting future mega-events | 19.0 | 22.3 | 35.4 | 44.1 | 25.1 | 15.5 | 18.1 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 8.9 |

In this research, when the respondents were asked whether or not they agreed that African countries can now cooperate more efficiently because of the 2010 FIFA World Cup hosting (V10), a split between those who agreed, those who disagreed with it or who were neutral on it was noted. The majority of the respondents (52.3% from Nigeria and 48.7% from Cameroon) agreed with the statement. Some of the respondents were neutral on the statement (25.6% from Cameroon, and 25.2% from Nigeria), whereas others disagreed with it (25.7% from Cameroon and 22.5% in Nigeria). The results show that some fans in Cameroon and Nigeria believed that the 2010 World Cup created an opportunity for cooperation between African nations. However, the results also portray doubt that the successful hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa has increased confidence in the capacity of African countries to cooperate more efficiently as a whole, given the scepticism noted from those soccer fans who remained neutral or who disagreed with the statement, perhaps given the huge gap between African states in terms of several critical economic determinants such as available finance for strategic investments (Tawfik-Amer, 2011).

With regards to the statement that the number of joint partnership agreements and programmes to strengthen regional cooperation has improved because of the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup (V11), over half of the respondents (51.6% from Cameroon and 50.9% from Nigeria) agreed with the statement. Many respondents were neutral (29.7% from Nigeria, and 25.9% from Cameroon), as were those who disagreed with the statement (22.5% from Cameroon and 19.4% from Nigeria). The soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria somewhat agreed that the 2010 event provided an opportunity for promoting regional integration, albeit in the domain of sport and tourism. However, as was the case with the statement analysed above, the percentages that were received in terms of those who disagreed with the statement, and in terms of those who remained neutral, were significant and cannot be overlooked as they raise concern with regards to the extent to which such joint regional cooperation has occurred in other parts of Africa.

When the respondents were asked to react to the statement that Africa now stands a better chance of hosting more conferences and large-scale sporting events by virtue of South Africa having hosted the 2010 FIFA World Cup (V12), the majority of the respondents agreed with it (66.4% from Nigeria compared to 54.4% from Cameroon). This result is consistent with post-event studies that suggest that the successful hosting of the event by South Africa has changed stereotypical views of the African continent's ability to organise world-class events (du Plessis & Maennig, 2011). However, many of the respondents in Cameroon (25.5%), in contrast to a lesser number in Nigeria (18.1%), disagreed with the statement. Furthermore, 25.1% of the respondents in Cameroon and 15.5% of those in Nigeria were not sure about the statement and were neutral. In entirety, the findings in this regard are not straightforward, as was the case with the previous two statements linked to the political legacy of the World Cup in Africa. It is well documented in the relevant literature that Africa and the developing world have largely been excluded from the hosting of large-scale sporting events compared to the extent to which such events have been held in the developed world, owing to several contentious issues (Darby, 2005; Alegi, 2008).

Football issues

In this research, Table 3 below shows that an almost equal proportion of the respondents (68.8% from Nigeria and 68.7% from Cameroon) agreed with the statement that the 2010 FIFA World Cup has accelerated the development of African football (V13). This finding might have been influenced by the fact that the African Union (AU), in an attempt to use the 2010 tournament to boost the importance of sport on the entire continent, declared 2007 the 'International Year of African Football', with the aim of promoting the contribution of sport to peace and reconciliation on the continent. Such an initiative was supported and well received by member states of the AU (Department of Sports & Recreation, 2008). Besides this, the respondents might have also been aware that several African countries had benefited from such legacy projects as the 'Win in Africa with Africa' project. The said project was initiated by FIFA and included a number of complementary and specific measures that were aimed at contributing towards improving the quality of football in Africa in the long-term. According to FIFA (2011), under this programme, 54 football pitches were being constructed and football teams in 52 (at the time) African countries had already received equipment support (in the form of boots, balls and training kits), player registration, and competition management systems. The programme was envisaged as boosting African football by addressing the critical areas of limited infrastructure and the management of the game, with a view to improving its quality. However, one key concern of note is the sustainability of such initiatives across Africa. Since legacy impacts are to be measured in the long-term, the sustainability of such projects is important for determining the extent to which the 2010 FIFA World Cup advanced the game of football on the African continent. To date, the extent of the effects of such a legacy initiative remains unknown.

Table 3: Football issues in %, n=390 for Cameroon and n=381 for Nigeria)

| Type of impact | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | |
|---|----------------|------|-------|------|---------|------|----------|------|-------------------|------|
| | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N |
| V13 Accelerated the development of African football | 20.5 | 20.0 | 48.2 | 48.8 | 16.7 | 14.2 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 6.4 | 8.1 |
| V14 Benefited disadvantaged football groups | 13.8 | 12.6 | 35.1 | 49.3 | 23.3 | 20.7 | 20.4 | 12.7 | 7.4 | 4.7 |
| V15 Improve local football leagues | 10.5 | 17.6 | 31.8 | 39.4 | 22.1 | 19.9 | 13.6 | 22.5 | 13.1 | 13.6 |
| V16 Improve football infrastructure | 19.7 | 23.4 | 52.3 | 47.5 | 14.6 | 10.8 | 3.3 | 10.1 | 3.3 | 7.9 |

When the respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on whether or not they thought that relatively disadvantaged football groups have benefited from the 2010 FIFA World Cup hosting (V14), the majority of respondents in Nigeria (61.9%) compared to the smaller number from Cameroon (48.9%) agreed with the statement. Many of the respondents (27.8% from Cameroon and 17.4% from Nigeria) remained neutral about the statement, while some of the respondents (23.3% from Cameroon and 20.7% from Nigeria)

disagreed with the statement. The findings suggest that there was general agreement among soccer fans in both case study areas that disadvantaged groups had benefited from the 2010 event. Swart, Bob, Knott, and Salie (2011) showed how the Football Foundation for South Africa (FFSA) used the event to accelerate social change and integration in a racially divided community in Gansbaai, South Africa. Besides the building of new sport facilities in the community that created a 'space for sport', the community also experienced youth development, social integration, community pride and environmental education.

When confronted with the statement that the local football league in my country has benefited from South Africa's hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup (V15), the respondents in Cameroon and Nigeria reacted differently. Most of the respondents (57% from Nigeria and 42.3% from Cameroon) agreed with the statement. This could be explained by the fact that in the run-up to the 2010 event, several football capacity-building initiatives were orchestrated in Africa. For example, Cameroon has since benefited from such an initiative, as it has had its national league (the MTN Elite One) evaluated and assessed. Furthermore, national technical directors, club coaches, referees, coaching instructors, and association and club presidents, as well as others, have received various forms of specific training. In this sense, it is envisaged that those who have benefited from specialised training directly would be able to transfer the knowledge and skills gained to others who are involved in football at regional and community levels. In a recent study conducted on football development in Nigeria, Adetunji (2011) expresses the significance of the advancement made in terms of the Nigerian Premier League, which has significantly influenced the development of such related facilities as equipment and the quality of human capital. Asked to rate their level of agreement on whether or not they thought that football infrastructure in Africa has improved because of the 2010 FIFA World Cup (V16), the majority (72% from Cameroon and 70.9% from Nigeria) agreed with the statement, compared to those who disagreed (18.3% from Nigeria, and 13.4% from Cameroon) with it. The findings reflect the confidence from soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria that the football infrastructure has improved since the 2010 FIFA World Cup was held.

An "African World Cup"?

What made the 2010 FIFA World Cup different from previous World Cups in relation to legacy was the continental orientation adopted that entailed extending the benefits beyond the host country (Black, 2007). Identifying the perceptions with regards to South Africa's positioning of the 2010 FIFA World Cup as an 'African World Cup' is essential in that it provides insights into further understanding the extent to which such legacy benefits materialised, and are perceived, outside South Africa.

The World Cup was envisaged as benefiting the entire African continent in a number of ways. Table 4 below shows that most of the respondents (55.9% from Nigeria and 44.6% from Cameroon) agreed with the statement that the whole continent has benefited from the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup by South Africa (V17). Based on the results presented in relation to the socio-economic statements (as discussed above), such a result was to be expected as it mirrors the general trend in responses. In terms of the African Legacy Programme, positive spill-over effects to non-host countries, especially in terms of socio-economic and environmental benefits were anticipated (Department of Sports & Recreation, 2008). The findings here reflect the fact that leveraging the first ever mega-event hosted in Africa were perceived to by some of the respondents to provide legacy benefits beyond the boundaries of the host country, South Africa. Although the extent of such legacy benefits was not substantial in this study, the finding challenges the conventional thinking that South Africa's positioning of the World Cup in this manner was merely yet another way of appropriating Africa to its own advantage, using it to gain leverage in the bidding process, as the country could then focus on continental, rather than on domestic, paybacks (Tawfik-

Amer, 2011). Much debate has arisen surrounding the extent of benefits that have filtered through to other African countries, as a result of hosting the World Cup in South Africa. Ostensibly, the results show that soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria generally held different views in relation to the continental benefits accumulated by the 2010 event.

To further probe the positioning of the 2010 FIFA World Cup as an 'African World Cup', respondents were asked to state whether or not they agreed or disagreed with the statement that only those countries close to South Africa benefited from the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup by South Africa (V18). An almost split response was noted among the respondents. A significant proportion of the respondents (47.5% from Nigeria and 39.5% from Cameroon) agreed with the statement, whereas many of the respondents (40% from Cameroon and 34.1% from Nigeria) disagreed with it. Few of the respondents (20.5% from Cameroon and 18.4% from Nigeria) were neutral. A split in response in terms of the key informants was noted across both case study areas. The findings reveal some degree of tension in relation to which parts of Africa might have benefited from the 2010 event. Some soccer fans in Cameroon and Nigeria felt that only those countries that were close to South Africa benefited from the event. The findings in this regard were consistent with those of Achu and Swart (2012) who found that 88% of African immigrants interviewed in their study in South Africa shared the same sentiments regarding the statement. The findings further strengthened the idea that the event might have benefited the entire continent, although the extent of such benefits has not yet been determined.

With regards to the statement that overall, the 2010 FIFA World Cup was truly an African event (V19). An interesting twist in the result obtained is evident when it is read together with the previous two related statements because the majority of the respondents (69.3% from Nigeria, and 65.1% from Cameroon) agreed with the statement. The findings in this regard somewhat refute those of Tawfik-Amer (2011) who seems inclined towards the idea that publicising and popularising the event as an 'African World Cup' rather reflected a South African appropriation of Africa to its own advantage, specifically to gain leverage during the bidding process as indicated earlier. The results further raise questions with regards to Maharaj's (2011) assertion that punting the event as one that would benefit the entire African continent was a mere magniloquence. Besides, V20 suggest that over 90% of the respondents in both case study areas accept that the 2010 event left a legacy for the continent.

Table 4: Positioning of the event as an 'African World Cup' in %, n=390 for Cameroon and n=381 for Nigeria)

| Type of impact | | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | |
|----------------|---|----------------|------|-------|------|---------|------|----------|------|-------------------|------|
| | | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N | C | N |
| V17 | Event benefitted the whole continent | 10.0 | 19.9 | 34.6 | 36.0 | 18.5 | 19.2 | 23.1 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 11.5 |
| V18 | Event benefitted only countries close to South Africa | 6.7 | 13.9 | 32.8 | 33.6 | 20.5 | 18.4 | 22.1 | 22.0 | 17.9 | 12.1 |
| V19 | Overall, the event was truly an African event | 37.2 | 28.9 | 27.9 | 40.4 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 9.8 | 8.2 | 13.6 | 11.0 |
| V20 | Event left a positive lasting legacy for Africa | 62.8 | 69.8 | 31.8 | 27.8 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 |

Table 5 below indicates that respondents from Cameroon were generally in agreement with most of the statements about the 2010 FIFA World Cup and the African legacy, with mean scores between 1.46 and 2.96. Two impact statements stand out as the ones the respondents agreed with the strongest, 'South Africa hosted a successful 2010 FIFA World Cup and achieved a legacy for Africa' and 'the successful hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup has boosted the pride and image of Africa internationally' with mean scores of 1.46 and 1.62, respectively. The Table also reveal that fans in Cameroon were leaning toward being neutral in their responses, with mean scores between 2.55 and 2.96.

Table 5: Mean and standard deviation of fans perceptions in Cameroon

| Type of Impact | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|------|----------------|
| Programmes that improve economic development in Africa | 2.14 | 0.911 |
| Improve skills development in Africa | 2.25 | 0.849 |
| Employment | 2.18 | 1.002 |
| Improve football infrastructure | 2.25 | 0.992 |
| International image enhancement | 1.62 | 0.763 |
| Increased tourism investment opportunities in Africa | 2.22 | 0.946 |
| Increase tourism arrivals | 2.9 | 1.114 |
| Improve tourism awareness continentally | 2.77 | 1.141 |
| Improved environmental awareness in Africa | 2.68 | 1.093 |
| Enhance African cooperation | 2.71 | 1.164 |
| Improve joint partnership agreements and strengthen regional cooperation | 2.69 | 1.079 |
| Promote peace on the African continent | 2.53 | 1.341 |
| Accelerated the development of African football | 2.32 | 1.086 |
| Benefitted disadvantaged football groups | 2.72 | 1.154 |
| Improve local football leagues | 2.96 | 1.22 |
| Improve the chances of hosting future mega-events | 2.55 | 1.157 |
| Event benefitted the whole continent | 2.96 | 1.238 |
| Event benefitted only countries close to South Africa | 2.88 | 1.234 |
| Even left a positive lasting legacy for Africa | 1.46 | 0.708 |
| Overall the event was truly and African event | 2.35 | 1.409 |

Table 6 indicates that respondents from Nigeria (n=381) were generally in agreement with most of the statements about the 2010 event, with mean scores between 1.36 and 2.67. Two statements stand out as the ones the respondents agreed with the strongest, 'South Africa hosted a successful 2010 FIFA World Cup and achieved a legacy for Africa' and 'The successful hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup has boosted the pride and image of Africa internationally' with mean scores of 1.36 and 1.59, respectively.

Table 6: Mean and standard deviation of fans perceptions in Nigeria

| Type of impact | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|------|----------------|
| Programmes that improve economic development in Africa | 1.99 | 0.877 |
| Improve skills development in Africa | 2.2 | 0.959 |
| Employment | 2.24 | 0.974 |
| Improve football infrastructure | 2.32 | 1.171 |
| International image enhancement | 1.59 | 0.808 |
| Increased tourism investment opportunities in Africa | 2.02 | 0.863 |
| Increase tourism arrivals | 2.44 | 1.212 |
| Improve tourism awareness continentally | 2.5 | 1.109 |
| Improved environmental awareness in Africa | 2.48 | 1.157 |
| Enhance African cooperation | 2.65 | 1.115 |
| Improve joint partnership agreements and strengthen regional cooperation | 2.67 | 1.197 |
| Promote peace on the African continent | 2.38 | 1.131 |
| Accelerated the development of African football | 2.33 | 1.136 |
| Benefitted disadvantaged football groups | 2.48 | 1.02 |
| Improve local football leagues | 2.62 | 1.264 |
| Improve the chances of hosting future mega-events | 2.38 | 1.185 |
| Event benefitted the whole continent | 2.61 | 1.266 |
| Event benefitted only countries close to South Africa | 3.15 | 1.256 |
| Even left a positive lasting legacy for Africa | 1.36 | 0.66 |
| Overall the event was truly and African event | 2.32 | 1.274 |

When comparing the mean scores of the respondents from Cameroon (n=390) and those from Nigeria (n=381) (see Tables 5 and 6), it is observed that the Nigerian respondents were generally more positive towards the legacy statements. To further examine the results, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare difference in opinions on the 2010 FIFA World Cup legacy impacts.

Table 7 indicates that there was no significant differences between Cameroonian and Nigerian respondents on all the statements, the p-values are more than the significant level of 0.05. The respondents from both countries were therefore consistent in their responses/opinions. This is also supported by the small mean differences observed.

Table 7: Independent sample t-test on Cameroon versus Nigeria

| Type of impact | Cameroon vs Nigeria | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|---------|----|---------|
| | Mean difference | t-value | df | p-value |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-----|--------|
| Even left a positive lasting legacy for Africa | 0.10 | 0.146 | 769 | 0.5580 |
| Programmes that improve economic development in Africa | 0.15 | 0.168 | 769 | 0.5666 |
| Improve skills development in Africa | 0.05 | 0.055 | 769 | 0.5220 |
| Employment | -0.06 | -0.061 | 769 | 0.4758 |
| Improve football infrastructure | -0.07 | -0.065 | 769 | 0.4743 |
| International image enhancement | 0.03 | 0.038 | 769 | 0.5152 |
| Increased tourism investment opportunities in Africa | 0.20 | 0.221 | 769 | 0.5873 |
| Increase tourism arrivals | 0.46 | 0.395 | 769 | 0.6537 |
| Improve tourism awareness | 0.27 | 0.240 | 769 | 0.5948 |
| Improved environmental awareness in Africa | 0.20 | 0.178 | 769 | 0.5705 |
| Enhance African cooperation | 0.06 | 0.053 | 769 | 0.5210 |
| Improve joint partnership agreements and strengthen regional cooperation | 0.02 | 0.018 | 769 | 0.5070 |
| Promote peace on the African continent | 0.15 | 0.121 | 769 | 0.5481 |
| Accelerated the development of African football | -0.01 | -0.009 | 769 | 0.4964 |
| Benefitted disadvantaged football groups | 0.24 | 0.220 | 769 | 0.5871 |
| Improve local football leagues | 0.34 | 0.274 | 769 | 0.6078 |
| Improve the chances of hosting future mega-events | 0.17 | 0.145 | 769 | 0.5577 |
| Event benefitted the whole continent | 0.35 | 0.280 | 769 | 0.6101 |
| Event benefitted only countries close to South Africa | -0.27 | -0.217 | 769 | 0.4142 |
| Overall the event was truly and African event | 0.03 | 0.022 | 769 | 0.5089 |

Conclusion

Post longitudinal studies that focus on perceptions of mega-event legacy impacts are important, especially where such events are hosted in developing contexts. This study appraises the post-perceptions of soccer fans perceptions of the legacies associated with leveraging the 2010 FIFA World Cup as a continental event in Cameroon and Nigeria. While Nigerian fans were generally more positive in their response than were Cameroonian fans, overall, the study found no statistical differences in relation to fans perceptions in Cameroon and Nigeria. This case study has highlighted the fact that the positioning and leveraging of the 2010 FIFA World Cup by the host nation South Africa as a continental event, and the subsequent designing and adaptation of an African legacy program did result in a number of socio-economic, sport and political effects in other African countries. What this study did not do was to determine specifically, the typologies and extent of legacy benefits and which stakeholder groups have benefitted accordingly. Therefore future legacy related research should consider such issues when analysing the long-term legacy effects of a mega-event with the view to inform the planning and management of future events of this nature that are hosted on the African continent and leveraged in the same manner. Such studies, if undertaken, could illuminate how key African legacy objectives have been achieved and how sustainable such legacies are in present day.

References

- Achu, F. & Swart, K. (2012). African immigrants' perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World Cup and its 'African legacy'. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 1: 33-41.
- Adetunji. A. (2013). A discursive construction of teasing in football fandom: the context of the South-Western Nigeria viewing center. *Discourse & Society*, 24(2): 147-162.
- Agha, N., Fairley, S. & Gibson, H. (2012). Considering legacy as a multi-dimensional construct: the legacy of the Olympic Games. *Sport Management Review*, 15: 125-139.
- Alegi, P. (2008). 'A nations to be reckoned with': the politics of World Cup Stadium construction in Cape Town and Durban, South Africa. *African Studies*, 67(3): 397-422.
- Allmers, S. & Maennig, W. (2008). *South Africa 2010: economic scope and limits. Hamburg Contemporary Economic Discussions*. Issue 21. Hamburg: University of Hamburg.

- Bijkerk, C., de Ridder, R. & Donaldson, R. (2012). An assessment of a non-host city on the fringe of the FIFA 2010 World Cup: the planning, benefits and failure of the Drakenstein Municipality. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 1:81-92.
- Black, D. (2007). The symbolic politics of sport mega-events: 2010 in comparative perspective. *Politikon*, 34(3): 261-276.
- Bob, U. & Kassens-Noor, E. (2012). An indicator framework to assess the legacy impacts of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 1: 12-21.
- Bob, U. & Swart, K. (2010). Sport events and social legacies. *Alternation*, 17(2): 72-95.
- Bull, C. & Lovell, J. (2007). The impact of hosting major sporting events on local residents: an analysis of the view and perceptions of Canterbury residents in relation to Tour de France 2007. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4): 229-248.
- Cashman, R. (2002). *Impact of the Games on Olympic host cities*. Center for Olympic Studies. Barcelona. Retrieved 10 October, 2015, from <http://olympicstudies.uab.es/lec/pdf/cashman.pdf>.
- Cashman, R. (2005). *The bitter-sweet awakening. The Legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney, Walla Walla Press.
- Cashman, R. (1998). *Olympic legacy in an Olympic city: monuments, museums and memory*. Fourth International Symposium for Olympic Research. Retrieved 10 October, 2013, from <http://library.la84.org/SportsLibrary/ISOR/ISOR1998m.pdf>.
- Chalip, L. (2002). *Using the Olympic to optimise tourism benefits: University lecture on the Olympics*. Centre for Olympic Studies. Barcelona. Retrieved 14 November, 2013, from <http://olympicstudies.uab.es/lectures/web/pdf/chalip.pdf>.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 11(2): 109-127.
- Chappelet, J. & Junod, T. (2006). *A Tale of 3 Olympic Cities: What can Turin learn from the Olympic legacy of other Alpine Cities?* In D. Torres, Major Sport Events as Opportunity for Development (pp. 83-90). Valencia.
- Cornelissen, S. & Swart, K. (2006). The 2010 FIFA World Cup as a political construct: the challenge of making good on an African promise. *Sociological Review*, 54: 108-123.
- Cornelissen, S. (2007). Crafting legacies: the changing political economy of global sport and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Politikon*, 34(3): 241-259.
- Cornelissen, S., Bob, U. & Swart, K. (2011). Towards redefining the concept of legacy in relation to sport mega-events: Insights from the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3): 307-318.
- Darby, P. (2000). Football colonial doctrine and indigenous resistance: mapping the political persona of FIFA's African constituency. *Culture, Sport and Society*, 3(1): 31-87.
- Deccio, C. & Baloglu, S. (2002). Non-host community resident reactions to the 2002 Winter Olympics: the spillover impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1): 46-56.

Dickson, T.J., Benson, A.M. & Blackman, D.A. (2011). Developing a framework for evaluating Olympic and Paralympic legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16(4): 285-302.

du Plessis, S. & Maennig, W. (2011). The 2010 FIFA World Cup high-frequency data economics: effects on international tourism and awareness for South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3): 349-365.

du Plessis, S. & Venter, C. (2010). *The home team scores ! a first assessment of the economic impact of World Cup 2010*. Bureau for Economic Research. University of Stellenbosch. Cape Town.

Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M. (Eds.). (2011). *Olympic cities: City agendas, planning and the World's Games, 1896-2016*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Gratton, C. & Preuss, H. (2008). Maximising Olympic impacts by building legacies. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14): 1922-1938.

Harris, L. (2011). Mega-events and the developing world: a look at the legacy of the 2010 Soccer World Cup. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 18(3): 407-427.

Hiller, H. & Wanner, R. (2011). Public opinion in host Olympic cities: the case of the 2010 Vancouver Winter Games. *Sociology*, 45(5): 883-899.

Hiller, H. (1998). Assessing the impact of mega-events: a linkage model. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1(1): 47-57.

Horne, J. (2007). The four 'knowns' of sports mega-events. *Leisure Studies*. 26(1): 81-96.

Horne, J., & Manzenreiter, W. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *Sociological Review*, 54(2): 1-24.

Isaac, S. & Michael, W.B. (1981). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego: Edits Publishers.

Jago, L., Dwyer, L., Lipman, G., van Lill, D. & Voster, S. (2010). Optimising the potential of mega-events: an overview. *International Journal of Events and Festival Management*, 1(3): 220-237.

Kasper, R. (1998). Sport, environment and culture. *Olympic Review*, 26(20): 67-70.

Lee, C.K. & Taylor, T. (2005). Critical reflection on the economic impact assessment of a mega-event: the case of 2002 FIFA World Cup. *Tourism Management*, 26(4): 595-603.

Maennig, W. & du Plessis, S. (2007). World Cup 2010: South African economic perspectives and policy challenges informed by the experience of Germany 2006. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 25(4): 578-590.

Maennig, W. & Zimbalist, A. (2012). *Introduction: the economics of mega sporting events*. In Maennig, W & Zimbalist, A. (eds). *International Handbook on the Economics of Mega Sporting Events*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing: 3-8.

Maharaj, B. (2011). 2010 FIFA World Cup: (South) 'Africa's time has come'? *South African Geographical Journal*, 93(1): 49-62.

Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E. & Houlihan, B. (2004). Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-event. *Municipal Engineer*, 157: 209-220.

Mann, P. (2008). *Legacy best practice. An introduction and global review*. Legacy Lives 2008 Conference Report, 28 –30 January 2008. Pmp Legacy: UK.

Matheson, C. M. (2010). Legacy planning, regeneration and events: the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games. *Local Economy*, 25(1): 10-23.

Miah, A. & Garcia, B. (2012). *The Olympics, the basics*. London: Routledge.

Ndlovu, M.S. 2010. Sports as cultural diplomacy: the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa's foreign policy. *Soccer & Society*, 11(1-2): 144-153.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. (2011). Pan-Africanism and the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 29(3): 401-413.

Nichols, G. & Ralston, R. (2011). Social inclusion through volunteering: the legacy potential of the 2012 Olympic legacies. *Sociology*, 45(5): 900-914.

Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2010). *Local development benefits from staging global events: achieving the local development legacy from 2012*. A peer review of the Olympic and Paralympic legacy for East London proposed by the Department of Community and Local Government. United Kingdom. Retrieved 23 November, 2013, from <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/46207013.pdf>.

Pannenberg, A. (2010). *Football in Africa: Observations about political, financial, cultural and religious influences*. NCDO Publication Series, Sport & Development.

Pellegrino, G. & Hancock, H. (2010). *A lasting legacy. How major sporting events can drive positive change for host communities and economies*. Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu.

Preuss, H. (2007). *FIFA World Cup 2006 and its legacy on tourism*. Trends and issues in global tourism. Berlin: Springer.

Preuss, H. (2011). A method for calculating the crowding-out effect in sport mega-event impact studies: the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3): 367-385.

Preuss, H. (2013). The Contribution of the FIFA World Cup and the Olympic Games to green economy. *Sustainability*, 5(8): 3581-3600.

Ritchie, B. W., Shipway, R. & Cleeve, B. (2009). Residents' perceptions of mega-sporting events: anon-host city perspective of the 2012 London Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14(2/3): 143-167.

Ritchie, J.R.B. (1984). Assessing the impacts of hallmark events: conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1): 2-11.

Smith, A. & Fox, T. (2007). From 'event-led' to 'event-themed' regeneration: the 2002 Commonwealth Games legacy programme. *Urban Studies*, 44(6): 1125-1143.

Smith, A. (2012). *Events and urban regeneration: the strategic use of events to revitalise cities*. London: Routledge.

South Africa. Department of Sports and Recreation. (2008). *2010 FIFA World Cup South Africa, Government Mid-Term Report*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

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

Swart, K., Bob, U., Knott, B. & Salie, M. (2011). Leaving a sport and socio-cultural legacy beyond 2010: A case of the Football Foundation of South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3): 415-428.

Tawfik-Amer, R.M. (2011). *Africa and sport mega-events: the experience of the 2010 FIFA World Cup*. Paper presented at the 4th European Conference on African Studies, 15-18th June, Uppsala-Sweden.

Tichaawa, T.M. & Bama, H.K. (2012). Green Point residents' perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World Cup: a post event analysis. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 1: 22-32.

Tichaawa, T.M. & Bob, U. (2015). Leveraging mega-events beyond the host nation: a case study of the 2010 FIFA World Cup African Legacy Programme in Cameroon and Nigeria. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 742-757.

Tichaawa, T.M. & Swart, K. (2010). Cameroonian fans' perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World Cup: a case study of Buea and Limbe. *Alternation*, 17(2): 173-199.

Walker, M., Kaplanidou, K., Gibson, H., Thapa, B., Geldenhuys, S. & Coetzee, W. (2013). "Win in Africa, with Africa": Social responsibility, event image, and destination benefits. The case of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa. *Tourism Management*, 34: 80-90.

Weed, M. (2007). Stakeholder relationships in sport and tourism. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4): 149-153.