

**Prof. Sergio Cherubini**  
Full professor of Marketing  
University Tor Vergata of Rome  
[cherubini@economia.uniroma2.it](mailto:cherubini@economia.uniroma2.it)

**Prof. Gennaro Iasevoli**  
Associate professor of Marketing  
University LUMSA of Rome  
[iasevoli@lumsa.it](mailto:iasevoli@lumsa.it)

## **STAKEHOLDERS EVENT EVALUATION: NOTTE BIANCA CASE STUDY (\*)**

### ***Abstract***

The purpose of this study is to develop a measurement instrument that can be used to evaluate the special event impacts on local communities and all other stakeholders. To facilitate the discussion on impacts of special events on different stakeholders, an economic, tourism and sociology literatures are reviewed. After reviewing the literature, an instrument to assess the global impact of special events upon their host communities and single (local) stakeholders is proposed; in particular, starting from benefits of scorecard evaluation system, it has been proposed a scorecard for Stakeholders Event Evaluation (SEE) which is able to evaluate the impacts for different topologies of stakeholders in many areas by different ratios and indicators.

The proposed instrument is tested utilizing the Notte Bianca Event, where over 1200 questionnaire were collected.

### ***1. Introduction***

According to "Everyday life aspect" of ISTAT (2004), the 64,4% of the Italian people has enjoyed of at least a show or entertainment out of house among those considered in the event category (theatre, movies, visits to museums and show, concerts, sport matches, discos), value that increase to 69,8% for the men while the women it is 59,5 %.

The trend from the 1993 to the 2003 shows as the people that are dedicated to this activities of the free time is increased (from 57,2% to 64,4%); in particular, the people who practise two or more activities is increased, while the number of people that unwinds only one activity among that previously listed is substantially the same.

In Italy in the 2002, the expense to watch a sport manifestations or other cultural events, or movies was about one thousand millions and 412 Euro millions. In particular, respects the previous year, we can observe that the expense of the public for the theatrical and musical manifestations (+11,9%) and for cinematographic shows (+6,8%) are increased, the expense for the sports manifestations is dropped (-2,1%).

Regarding the supported expense by the spectator: audience is absorbed, for the 44,6%, from the cinematographic shows, for which more than 111 millions tickets were emitted in the 2002, that's to say in average to two for inhabitant. About a third of the total expense (32,5%) is instead flowed towards the theatrical and musical shows and the rest 23,0% to the sports manifestations. To watch

a football match and musical shows, 28 millions tickets were emitted; a few less of the half of the shows effected in the 2002 were constituted from prose shows (47,9%); followed from concerts and music shows thoughtlessly and of art vary (27,1% of the shows) and the dance concerts and of classic music (14,9%).

The data relative to the cultural events and the growth in consumption and production terms points out a phenomenon of big economic and social interest and that is both for the single operative organization (the museum, the cinema, etcetera) than for the territory in which the organization is inserted or works. It is likely that a number of factors have supported this growth over the last decade. Goldblatt (2000) suggested that trends within society have influenced the growth and argued that, with the aging of the population in many western countries, there are now more singular occasions being celebrated. Many of these celebrations involve organised events; he has also suggested that the trend in staging special events has been fuelled by the growth of economies, and in particular, those of western countries.

Moreover, the growth has probably been driven also by the needs of government and tourism agencies to justify the financial support of special events based on their economic contribution to the host economy.

Despite the growth and popularity of cultural and special events, researches regarding "global" event impacts (economic, social, cultural, etc.) and motivations have been very slowly, or have been focused only on some topics versus other research themes or impact.

As observed Hede, Jago and Deery (2003, p. 324) in their research on key trends - during the period 1990-2001 - in terms of methodological issues for special event research, "it appears that there is a need for further research specifically in relation to methodological approaches to special event evaluations. Where once stakeholders, in particular governments, would be concerned only with the economic impacts of special events, they are now concerned with their environmental and social impacts. This will require a more holistic approach to special events evaluation in the future".

## **2. Background in event evaluation**

The necessity of measuring the impact of events for monitoring, control and evaluation purposes is agreed upon by the majority of authors (Getz, 1997; Dwyer et al, 2000a; Gnoth & Anwar, 2000; Jones, 2001; Bowdin, McDonnell, Allen, & O'Toole, 2001; Breen, Bull, & Walo, 2001) but a review of recent literature shows that the methods used and the aspects of the event being measured vary considerably.

In fact, there have been alternative approaches to the evaluation of special events (see, for example, Burgan and Mules, 2000 and Dwyer, Mellor, Mistilis and Mules, 2000). This is emerging in the literature as an area of big interest in event management and some studies have evaluated special events also from the social, cultural or environmental perspectives. These recent studies suggest that the level of interest from these perspectives is burgeoning. This is perhaps a reflection of the increasing use in the corporate world as an auditing and reporting framework (Rogers and Ryan, 2001) 'which requires the measurement of economic, environmental and social performance' (ibid. p.283).

Probably, the main tendency is that to focus on economic impacts also because it appears to be an extension of tourism impact research. Economic benefits have been the subject of much discussion and a variety of measurement frameworks have been devised. A literature search was conducted for material addressing the theoretical basis of economic impact assessment of special events. Useful discussion was found in Burns et al. (1986); Getz (1987); Crompton and McKay (1994); Crompton (1995); Dwyer and Forsyth (1997); Delpy and Li (1998); Mules (1999).

Where economic evaluation of special events was undertaken, the research context was almost always a sporting special event. In contrast to the economic evaluation of special events, cultural or social evaluations of special events were almost always associated with community/cultural events. This is likely to be based on the perception that sporting events generally provide 'new' income to a region, whereas community/cultural special events are often perceived to "help generate community pride and cohesion, foster the arts, contribute to healthy people, or conserve the natural environment" (Getz, 2000, p. 13).

However, most of the studies that examined festivals and special events have focused on either the economic impact of festivals and special events (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Gartner & Holecek, 1983; Kim et al., 1998; Thrane, 2002; Walo et al., 1996; Uysal & Gitelson, 1994) or the reasons and motivations of people to attend festivals and special events (Backman et al., 1995; Formica & Murrmann, 1998; Formica & Uysal, 1996; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001; Mohr et al., 1993; Scott, 1996; Uysal et al., 1993). These researches focused on the economic impacts of festivals and special events under the assumption that economic benefits of festivals and special events is one of the most important reasons for organizing a festival or a special event in the first place.

As regards the measurement of simple visitor expenditure data has been extended by taking into account 'destination switching' (Jones, 2001), 'net-economic-benefit analysis' (Gnoth & Anwar, 2000), 'inscope' expenditure (Burns & Mules, 1986) and the effects of diary or interview recall on expenditure reporting (Faulkner & Raybould, 1995; Breen et al., 2001).

It has been also recognised that economic measurement is not sufficient to evaluate the intangible benefits or impacts of an event (Dwyer et al., 2000a, Bowdin et al., 2001). Jones (2001) suggests that a focus on direct expenditure benefits will produce an incomplete picture, even if 'switching' and other negative effects are incorporated.

Regarding local residents perceptions of tourism development several studies were carried out and many measurement were proposed (Akis, Peristianis, & Warner, 1996; Getz, 1994; Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002; Hernandez, Cohen, & Garcia, 1996; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; Yoon, Gursoy, & Chen, 2001), while the examination of festival and special event organizers perception of the impacts of festivals and special events on local communities has been limited.

As many studies have demonstrated, events can generate also social impact and in particular they can serve to strengthen social bonds as well as to spread enjoyment. They have an impact on participants, emotional and intellectual outlook, in terms of pleasure, social interaction, stimulation of the mind and the sense and hence stimulating the consumption of food and drink. Events can act as stimulus for other social activities, such as tourism. For a city wishing to become a tourist destination, elements such as attractions, accommodation, transport, infrastructure and facilitate must be present.

Sociologists argue that festivals are generally connected with culturally shared events (Rao, 2001). Festivals demonstrate, in symbolic form, what a society believes to be its essential life and therefore, when a social group celebrates a specific event, it celebrates itself. Thus, festivals and special events reinforce social and cultural identity by building strong ties within a community and in this way it needs to be evaluated. However, as Mason and Cheyne (2000) argued, sociocultural impacts can be less easy to quantify than economic impacts; it is also likely that research concerned this kind of impact may produce results less politically usable. One of the major reason that sociocultural impact have tended not to be a main stream in event management is that it can regard also not positive effects. For example, Bowdin (2001) noted an increase of alcohol consumption during sporting events or that events can became the target of terrorism, as was in Munich Olympic Game; however bad behaviour many spectators are uninterested in events but only in the sharing of an entertainment experience.

Regarding political effects, Hall commented (1997) that today major events tend to attract the attention also of politicians (and media) since events can influence public opinion about a particular politician or ideology. Chwe (1998) suggests that public events provide incentives to generate common knowledge and build trust and sense of obligation. It is also true that corrupt politicians can use events to distract attention from some political problem, or a mechanism to improve their image; it is also likely that a badly managed event can have a significant effect on the social life of community. This may be also for a small scale and short term, as, for example, on the community living near a football stadium or an event place may feel the need that local government protect more their home and buildings.

It would be extremely poor not to consider many events in terms of developmental and environmental impact; in fact, an event can impact on the territory and on the other stakeholders for other areas too, such as:

- employment (Mules and Faulkner 1996);
- business and marketing. Events can have a positive impact on the image of the territory and on sponsor involved. Particularly, events can impact on immaterial resources as knowledge, image, loyalty that can influence buyers behaviour of good and services.
- environmental. Events generate an impact on the environment: for example increasing of traffic, enhancement of public transportation, environmental damages as pollution, litter, noise, etc.

As stated above, sociocultural impacts are often difficult to measure and this can be the case also with environmental impact. In addition, environmental impact such as increased litter and traffic congestion having a negative consequences are often played down by festival organizers. However, events may have an important role to contribute to positively highlighting environmental factors, above of all at the end of event. For example, a festival or a sport event held in an area not developed, may contribute to improve the infrastructures, the awareness and the quality of life.

## **2. 1 Global event evaluation**

Despite the many researches on the different impacts (economic, social, political, marketing, etc.) generated by events on "stakeholder system", very rarely a strategic and global approach has been followed based on stakeholder view; while since 1993 Faulkner (p. 1) had recognised the need to adopt a strategic approach to attracting, hosting and evaluating international events: "just as national and state tourism agencies have been placed under increasing pressure to justify the community's investment by substantiating the effectiveness of their promotional and marketing programs through the conduct of more rigorous evaluations....it is now equally important that the effectiveness of hallmark events and extensions of programs be demonstrated".

In order to fill this gap, Carlsen, Getz and Soutar (2000), using the Delphi technique (the panel Delphi was consisted of academics and consultants and editorial board of the *Event Management* journal) and involving a target group of approximately 55 events management industry experts, identified an evaluation criteria list of some main indicators as quoted in table 1.

Burgan, instead, provided different methods to evaluate event impact and population attending, but without specifying the different area of impact (economic, political, etc.); some of this methods are:

- Proportional occupancy – this process involves knowing the seating capacity of a venue and estimating the proportion of seats filled at various performances. It relies on judgment and observation and can be a relatively arbitrary approach.
- Hotel occupancy – hotel occupancy figures will give an underlying feel for the numbers of visitors using formal accommodation. This can be combined with additional information from a survey (eg. what proportion of individuals used hotel or motel

accommodation during their visit/attendance). This approach offers some degree of formal estimation, but requires careful interpretation of the survey data.

- Access to additional revenue information – many retail and food service providers can provide expert opinion as to average consumption/sales levels per person – from extensive commercial experience. Therefore trading information of concessions associated with the event may be used to get a feel for attendance. Of course such a process can be affected by the number of concessions in place and the weather during the course of the event. This procedure tends to be drawn upon by event organisers, but can not be considered to be sufficient for evaluation work.
- Aerial survey can be used to produce aggregate attendance estimates (ie. aerial photographs and counts). This approach would again need to be supplemented by survey information (such as average length of time spent at the site) and is only suitable for a single outdoor site.

**Table 1: Pre and post-event evaluation criteria to be used**

PRE-EVENT EVALUATION CRITERIA	POST-EVENT EVALUATION CRITERIA
Potential Risk exposure for the Tourism Destination Authorities	Economic impact at the state level
Probability of success	Economic impact at the city/community level
Compatibility with existing venues	Number of international visitors
Event Manager's capability	Direct visitor expenditure
Potential community benefits	Value media coverage
Potential environmental impacts	Positive community attitudes
Forecast number of tourists	Financial results (profit/loss)
Fit with destination image/brand.	Problem-free operations
	Sponsor satisfaction
	Cost benefit analysis
	Environmental impacts
	Community (socio/cultural) impacts
	Yield per visitor
	Future use of purpose built facilities (legacy).

Carlsen, Getz and Soutar (2000)

Since traditional metrics were not offering a full understanding of the situation, being outcome focused instead of being process oriented, both academics and practitioners were urged to develop better metrics that ease the process of strategic planning and control.

The major inadequacies of traditional metrics mentioned in the literature are as follows:

- traditional accounting measures of performance are inadequate for strategic decisions (e.g. Kaplan and Norton, 1992);
- they are backward looking (e.g. Ittner and Larcker, 1998a);
- they provide little information on root causes (e.g. Ittner and Larcker, 1998a);
- they do not link the non financial metrics to financial numbers (e.g. Kaplan and Norton, 1992);
- they report functional not cross functional processes (e.g. Ittner and Larcker, 1998a);
- they rarely consider intangible assets (e.g. Bukowitz and Petrash, 1997; Ittner and Larcker, 1998a, b);
- they rarely estimate the value created.

Since measurement plays a crucial role in new financial support, new measurement systems should be able to correctly performance the event strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, new performance measurement systems are required; a broader set of measures, including measures of quality,

customer satisfaction and process management in contrast with the classical approach, which is based on economic performance measures.

The literature of new measurement methods evolved in two main streams. One of these streams is focused on developing better financial tools that overcome the limitations of traditional financial performance measures. In this research stream the most popular method is the economic value added and input-output system. The second research stream stresses the importance of non financial performance measures. The methods developed in this stream integrate non financial and financial performance measures with a process approach, giving greater importance to forward-looking measures such as customer satisfaction, volunteers satisfaction and defect rates. One of the most popular methods developed under this stream is the balanced scorecard.

Balanced scorecard is a method proposed by Kaplan and Norton (1992) that considers both financial and non financial performance measures in a holistic approach. Their first article was followed by a series of others related to the use and implementation of this method in strategic management (Kaplan and Norton, 1993, 1996a, b, 2001) and in leading the change process in an organization (Kaplan and Norton, 2001).

The balanced scorecard was designed to overcome the information overload of traditional metrics and give the top management a fast and comprehensive view of the entire business. It integrates four different perspectives: financial, customer, internal business and learning&growth (Kaplan and Norton, 1992).

In this way, the cross-functionality constraint of traditional metrics is solved. In each perspective, the goals and related key measures are chosen according to the strategy (in this case regarding event) and targets.

### **3. Methodology**

The basic rationale of a balance scorecard is that to create a comprehensive framework that can translate a company's vision into a coherent and linked set of financial and non financial measures. In its traditional form, the measures should include both outcome measures and the drivers of those outcomes.

As regards the use of a balance scorecard in evaluating event impacts, first of all it is necessary to ask for if the four traditional areas are correct or if necessary to adapt and customize the metrics.

Probably, the best path to afford this problem is that to consider the event system and the stakeholders of event itself; in fact, by articulating the areas and measures, event managers or Institutions can start from their objectives and from the different impacts that an event can generate. Many studies suggest that events can be evaluated from the economic, social, cultural, political and environmental perspectives.

If an organizer needs to design a scorecard event evaluation, it is opportune to remember that it is very difficult to plan an universal instrument of evaluation, useful for all event typologies and stakeholders; anyway, we can imagine a personalization process based on the characteristics and dimensions of the event to be evaluated. Yet, it is true the personalization generally regards the indicators to be used for objective evaluation, while we can accept a greater generalization for the macro design of scorecard and for the stakeholders typologies to keep inside.

The first step in building a scorecard stakeholders driven regards just the identification of the different stakeholder typologies of the event, eventually defining a ranking of them.

We just suggested (Cherubini and Iasevoli, 2004) that an event is a multiple aims system and that it is possible to be many stakeholders, who can also condition the management of the event supporting the creation of positive or negative report to the activity of the event same. As Reid and

Arcodia suggested (2002, p.492) the definition of stakeholders applicable to event management research is not unlike the existing definitions of stakeholders. In fact, the focus of the event stakeholders definition has a necessity to relate to events, as unlike corporations, that are devised and conducted in limited time spans: “Groups or individuals who are affected or could be affected by an event’s existence. Primary stakeholders are those individuals or groups without whose support the event would cease to exist. Secondary stakeholders are those groups or individuals who although are not directly involved in the event can seriously impede the event’s success”.

The following step is to identify - for each stakeholder - the different “critical factor of success”, that is to say that kind of factors on which stakeholder evaluates if the event can (is) or cannot (not) be successful and, in the same time, in which area of impact the factor is inside. We can image four different areas of impact: Economic, Socio-cultural, Environmental, Service/Holistic.

Every area has specific characteristics and need of different instruments and indicators to evaluate the event impact, as decryped following:

- *the economic area.* Event is much often directed towards to the creation and to the marketing of an experience; in this term it is possible to exist an interest of the stakeholders involved in monitoring the resulted obtained. This category include both a cost estimations and the revenue generated by the event but also as these results are reflected on the equity same of the event and the marketing of the following edition of the event same. In order to evaluate the economic impact, it is necessary to define many indicators e different techniques for obtain them. O’Neill, Getz, and Carlsen (1999) suggest a combination of methods to understand the economic impact, among which also marketing researches;
- *the socio-cultural area.* In this area we find cognitive indicators directed to estimate the attitude, the behaviour and the satisfaction of participants. There are a variety of methods available which need to be selected and combined to produce a complete picture. These range from surveys, focus groups and observation (Getz, 1997; Watt, 1998; Bowdin et al, 2001) to aerial photography to gain attendance figures (Raybould, Mules, Fredline & Tomljenovic, 2000). They also involve a number of stakeholder groups including nonattendees (Getz, 1997). In order to gain robust reliable data a sampling method, which ensures representation of all sub-groups and minimum bias, is required (Bearden, Netermeyer, & Mobley , 1993);
- *the environmental area.* Since the most of all events are organized in a real place or in a territory (we could have concerts and on line shows too) could be useful to evaluate how it could impact on environmental. Generally, the first information to check is the amount of garbage generated from visitors and participants. Other useful information in this area regard the consumption of electric light, the physical damage generated to monumental or other public or private infrastructures, the acoustic level or quality air after the event, and so on;
- *the service indicator.* The logic that takes to the determination of the indicators of service is that to allow an evaluation both of processes of the single activity and to the relative performances generated during the cycle of the event. Generally, the first and more used information is the respect for the pre-established program; other indicators that generally are classified in this group regard the presence of possible disorganizations, disaster, etcetera. Moreover, it includes the estimate of participants to each events, tickets sold, and so on.

At the end of process, it will be possible to edit a framework as quoted in table II.

**Table II: Example of Matrix for Stakeholders Event Evaluation (SEE)**

STAKEHOLDER	AREA OF IMPACT	CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR	METRIC INDEX	OBJECTIVE	RESULTS	IMPORTANCE
PRINCIPAL (City, Region, Company, ...)	Social-Economic	Participants	Number	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Service	Attractions	Number	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Visibility	Number of participants	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Media Visibility	TV Minutes, Magazine references Radio minutes	X X X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Social	Reputation	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Economics	Revenue/Costs	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Social	Cohesiveness	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	Litter	Tons litter	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	Crisis	Nr accidents	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	...	...	...	...	...	...
ORGANIZER	Economic	Profitability	Total amount % of revenue	X X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Participants	Number	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Target mix	% of target	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Customer satisfaction	% of positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Reputation	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	Litter	Tons litter	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	Crisis	Nr accidents	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	...	...	...	...	...	...
SPONSOR (technical and economic)	Socio-Economic	Participants	Number	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Awareness	% of Participants	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Sponsor visibility	TV Minutes, Magazine references Radio minutes	X X X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Sponsor's target	% of coherence	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Reputation	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Merchandising Selling	Number Revenue	X X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Event values	% coherence with sponsor's value	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	...	...	...	...	...	...

**Table II (continue) : Example of Matrix for Stakeholders Event Evaluation (SEE)**

PARTICIPANTS	Socio-Economic	Program	Program respected	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	No risk	Number of accidents	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Experience	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Social	People homogeneity	% of homogeneity	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Value for money	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Information	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Customer care	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SUPPLIERS (museums, shops, theatres, cinemas, transportations, restaurants, etc.)	Economic	Selling	Amount	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Profitability	Amount % of revenue	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Brand image	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Event reputation	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Customer satisfaction	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	No risks	Number of accidents	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Information	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
...	...	...	...	...	...	...
COMMUNITY (local population and economy)	Economic	Impact	Amount	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-Economic	Image destination	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Event reputation	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Economic	Customer satisfaction	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Environmental	Impact Crisis	Tons litter Nr. of accid.	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Socio-economic	Event reputation	% positive	X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
	Service	New service and infrastructures	Amount Quality	X X	% of X	Low/Medium/High
...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Once the Critical Success Factors for each Stakeholder to be measured have been identified a research methodology is required, which will be able to gather the information. There are a variety of methods available which need to be selected and combined to produce a complete picture; these methods range from surveys, focus groups, observation (Getz, 1997; Watt, 1998; Bowdin et al, 2001) to aerial photography (Raybould, Mules, Fredline & Tomljenovic, 2000).

O'Neill, Getz, and Carlsen (1999) suggest that marketing research techniques can be effectively used to understand spectator perceptions of event quality and success and they suggest a combination of skilled participant observers using a systematic framework and more quantitative visitor surveys.

## 4. *Notte Bianca Case Study*

The *Notte Bianca* event was born in the ambit of the twinning between Rome and Paris, where the *Nuit Blanche* is now an important rendezvous in the cultural offer of the French capital, awaited from many Parisian and tourists.

The *Notte Bianca* is a great meeting of experiences and cultures crossing borders, overcoming barriers and uniting people and nations. This year, just two weeks after the Roman event (it was on September 17<sup>th</sup>), Paris and Brussels celebrate their *Nuit Blanche* (on October 1<sup>st</sup>). Paris in particular confirms it is on the same wavelength as Rome in strengthening a twinning that over the years has resulted in a fruitful cultural exchange and for the 2005 edition of the *Notte Bianca* also provides reciprocal hospitality.

In addition to Rome, Paris and Brussels, the spirit of the *Nuit Blanche* has also infected Montreal, where February 26<sup>th</sup> 2004, for the second year in a row, the Quebecois discovered new aspects of their city, visiting art galleries, museums and locations used for many different performances. In 2006 the *Nuit Blanche* will become even more popular and international, also involving Madrid, Riga and Helsinki.

The Roman *Notte Bianca* event is a successful initiative jointly by the Municipality of Rome and by the city's Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture: a big collective experience in an open-end town from 20 pm to 8 am of the following day, from the centre to the periphery, in a context of hard impact on the citizens and of big tourism booster.

The event involves the place principals of the town, from the more traditional to the more unusual: common museums, public and deprived, historical places, villa and gardens, cultural institute, institutions, theatre, libraries, shopping centre, sport centre, church and cult places, cinema, art tunnel, nightclubs.

The first Roman edition from the *Notte Bianca* event was September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2003 and, on the wake of the obtained success, the September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004 was repeated with resulted still improve. After the extraordinary success with the 2.000.000 visitors who in 2004 invaded the streets and squares of Rome, the city once again prepares to relive this magical festive atmosphere for a whole night.

In the 2003 the total number of the proposed events during the night were about 100; in the 2004 edition the produced initiative on purpose, united to the spontaneous adhesions, were more than of 500.

In the edition of 2005 there had been 600 events planned all over the city involving 800 artists and with the participation of:

- the city's most important public and private bodies and cultural institutions
- foreign academies and cultural institutes
- municipal, state and private museums remaining open for this special occasion
- cinemas and theatres
- shops, boutiques, arts and crafts shops and food and tasting kiosks
- art galleries
- bookshops
- rarely accessible art centres.

### 4. 1 Data collection

To understand the profile of participants and the motivations to participate to *Notte Bianca* and to estimate which event typology was the most appreciated, we developed a twelve questions questionnaire. Respondents were asked first of all to specify where they knew the *Notte Bianca* programme, which transport they used during the night, how they organize the participation to the event, which kind of event they prefer, the *Notte Bianca* perception. In addition, the survey instrument contained demographic questions to allow the assessment differences across demographics groups and a question regarding the satisfaction both on organization than on events.

The questionnaire was distributed in twelve different place of the city in order to cover every kind of events and also in different time of the night (starting from 20 pm to 6 am); resulting in collection of 1239 surveys over all period of the event.

#### 4.2 Results

As displayed in **Table III**, the sample (n= 1239), contained a nearly equal number of male and female respondents and more than 90% were Italians. More than two-thirds navigate on Internet; the age of respondents ranged from 15 to over 65.

**Table III: Sample profile**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	626	50.5
Female	613	49.5
<i>Age</i>		
Median	26-39 years old	
Mode	19-25 years old	
Range	14-over 65	
<i>Education</i>		
Basic School	73	5.9
High School	588	47.5
Graduate	493	39.8
Post –graduate	85	6.9
<i>Citizenship</i>		
Italian	1164	93.9
Other	75	6.1
<i>Internet from home</i>		
Every day	615	49.6
More time in a week	293	23.6
Some time in a month	89	7.2
Some time in last six months	48	3.9
Never	168	13.6
Not respond	26	2.1

#### 4.3 Participants behaviour and event perception

Data analysis showed the underlying principles of participants' behaviour during the event. First of all data demonstrate that almost 60 percent of participants just knew the event, since they participated at the previous editions; in particular, more than one-fifth (21.2%) of the respondents attended both 2003 and 2004 edition.

As regards the main factor for participating to Notte Bianca event, the analysis suggests that the respondents take part to event because they can “live the city in a new way” (27.8%) and “to attend at many events in the same night” (23.5%).

We investigated also the sample behaviour and its way to organize the night. In particular, the sample could be divided in two main groups: the first one plans before what events to attend during the night while the second one has not plan nothing (people will choose what events to attend walking on the streets or people who will live the night above of all as an big party). We investigated the participants attitude and behaviour by comparing the responses across the two different groups. In particular, Table IVa shows the difference between the group means refer to interest on events typologies; while Table IVb shows whether the ratings of Art, Theatre, Sport and Books & Reading are statistically different for two categories.

**Table IVa: Two groups means refer to event typologies grade of interest**

	FIRST GROUP			SECOND GROUP			TOTAL		
	Mean	N	Std. Dev.	Mean	N	Std. Dev.	Mean	N	Std. Dev.
Art	5,62	706	1,579	4,95	516	1,768	5,33	1222	1,694
Music	6	707	1,195	6,05	519	1,169	6,02	1226	1,184
Theater	5,18	699	1,657	4,6	511	1,799	4,93	1210	1,741
Shopping	3,35	698	2,135	3,73	512	2,129	3,51	1210	2,14
Movies	4,75	692	1,871	4,71	511	1,834	4,73	1203	1,855
Solidarity	4,67	695	1,641	4,5	508	1,796	4,6	1203	1,71
Sports	3,76	694	2,141	4,16	510	2,141	3,93	1204	2,149
Books & Readings	4,52	700	1,93	4,15	509	1,926	4,36	1209	1,937
Activities for children	2,76	700	2,084	2,73	513	2,063	2,75	1213	2,074

Note: All items were measured on a seven-point scale with the words “extremely interested” at the high end and “not interested at all” at the low end.

The means difference between respondents who plan before what event to attend or who do not plan in terms of “Art” is .67, for “Theatre is .57, for “Sport” is -.41 and for “Books & Readings” is .37. As Table IVb shows the value of “2-Tail Sig.” for Art, Theatre, Sport and Books & Reading is .00 so we can conclude that “analyst participants” are more interested in Art, Theatre, Sport and Books & Reading than “cherry picker participants”; while this second group is more interested in Sport events.

**Table V: T-Test for means difference in event typologies grade of interest**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
ART	Equal	8,20	0,00	7,00	1220,00	0,00	0,67	0,10	0,48	0,86
	Unequal			6,87	1033,83	0,00	0,67	0,10	0,48	0,87
MUSIC	Equal	0,66	0,42	-0,77	1224,00	0,44	-0,05	0,07	-0,19	0,08
	Unequal			-0,77	1130,03	0,44	-0,05	0,07	-0,19	0,08
THEATER	Equal	8,58	0,00	5,75	1208,00	0,00	0,57	0,10	0,38	0,77
	Unequal			5,67	1045,02	0,00	0,57	0,10	0,38	0,77
SPORT	Equal	0,22	0,64	-3,26	1202,00	0,00	-0,41	0,12	-0,65	-0,16
	Unequal			-3,26	1096,90	0,00	-0,41	0,12	-0,65	-0,16
BOOK & READINGS	Equal	0,00	0,97	3,28	1207,00	0,00	0,37	0,11	0,15	0,59
	Unequal			3,28	1095,99	0,00	0,37	0,11	0,15	0,59

#### 4.4 Event global impact

As regards the global impact of the event on different area, many data were collected and many other information are still to be collected at the moment of writing this paper.

In particular, following the theoretical model proposed previously, in order to obtain the data for evaluating the impact of each area, we used different research instruments, such as: survey, statistics report, observation, qualitative interviews, etc.

Table VI shows many information regarding some stakeholders are decrypted, and many others are being collected at the moment of writing the paper.

**Table VI: Notte Bianca Event Evaluation**

STAKEHOLDER	AREA OF IMPACT	CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR	METRIC INDEX	RESULTS
PRINCIPAL (Local Government)	Social-Economic	Participants	Number	Over 2.500.000
	Service	Attractions	Number	Over 500 events
	Socio-Economic	Media Visibility	Number of participants	Over 1.500.000 folder Over 1.000 articles Over 40 Radio Over 25 TV programs
	Economic	Economics	% positive	Rate 3 on a 1-4 scale
	Environmental	Litter	Tons of garbage	200 tons
	Environmental	Crisis	Number of accidents	120 medical assistance
	Environmental	Electric light consumption	Number of Kilowatt	3.5% more than a normal Saturday night
ORGANIZER	Economic	Economics	Revenue/Costs	30 millions/3 millions euros
	Social-Economic	Participants events	Number	Over 2.500.000
	Social-Economic	Participants at art events	Number	Over 75.000
	Social-Economic	Participants at music events	Number	Over 500.000
	Economic	Target mix	Profile of target	Two main segments
	Socio-Economic	Customer satisfaction	% of positive	Rate 3 in a 1-4 scale
	Socio-economic	Reputation	% positive	Rate 2,98 in a 1-4 scale
	Environmental	Litter	Tons of garbage	200 tons
	Environmental	Crisis	Number of accidents	120 medical assistance
	Service	Transportation	Number	700 metro trains 111 bus more than normal Saturday night
Socio-Economic	Loyalty	% of loyal customer	More over one fifth	
PARTICIPANTS	Socio-Economic	Program	Program respected	Not completely caused by rain
	Environmental	No risk	Number of accidents	None of big entity
	Socio-Economic	Experience	% positive	Rate 3 in 1-4 scale
	Socio-economic	Information	Number & quality	Over 300.000 web visitor Over 1.500.000 folder

## **5. Conclusion and discussion**

The purpose of this study was to develop an evaluation instrument that can be used to measure the special event impacts. Despite the growth and popularity of cultural and special events, researches regarding “global” event impacts and motivations have been very slowly, or have been focused only on some topics versus other research themes or impact. On the contrary, it seems to be emerging in the literature as an area of big interest in event management studies.

From the literature, many methods to evaluate the event impact are proposed but very often they focused only some impact typology at same time had recognised the need to adopt a strategic approach to evaluating events.

One literature streams on measurement methods had stressed the need to integrate non financial and financial performance measures with a process approach, giving greater importance to forward-looking measures such as customer satisfaction, volunteers satisfaction and defect rates; one of the most popular methods developed under this stream is the balanced scorecard.

Applying the balance scorecard to event evaluation (SEE) based on a stakeholders driven approach, we can image for each stakeholder different areas representative for main impacts typologies (Economic, Socio-cultural, Environmental, Service/Holistic) and many items for evaluating the impact.

The “SEE” methodology can be used before or after the event in order to develop a real knowledge event management able to assist the decision maker in his evaluations process.

The framework proposed was used for the Notte Bianca event, an international event organized in Rome since 2001. Many data were collected, thanks to a research on 1239 participants, and they were classified following the framework; the study results reported here have limitations because other data should be collected but the time was too short.

However, the results of this study still provide a basis for further development and refinement of an instrument to evaluate the impact of an event on different stakeholder typologies.

*(\*) Sergio Cherubini wrote §1 and §3, while Gennaro Iasevoli wrote §2 and §4.*

**References**

- Akis S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 17(7), 481–494.
- Backman K. F., Backman, S. J., Uysal, M., & Sunshine, K. M. (1995). Event tourism: An examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3(1), 15–24.
- Bearden, W.O., Netemeyer, R.G. and Mobley, M.F. (1993), *Handbook of Marketing Scales*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bowdin, G., & Church, I. (2000). *Customer satisfaction and quality costs: towards a pragmatic approach for event management*. Paper presented at the Events beyond 2000: setting the agenda, Sydney.
- Breen, H., Bull, A., & Walo, M. (2001). A comparison of survey methods to estimate visitor expenditure at a local event. *Tourism Management*, 22, 473 - 479.
- Bukowitz, W.R. and Petrash, G.P. (1997), "Visualizing, measuring and managing knowledge", *Research and Technology Management*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 24-31.
- Burgan, B., & Mules. (2000). *Event analysis - understanding the divide between cost benefit and economic impact assessment*. Paper presented at the Events beyond 2000: setting the agenda, Sydney. 330
- Burns J.P.A, Hatch J.H. & Mules T.J (1986). "An Economic Evaluation of the Adelaide Grand Prix" in Syme G.J., Shaw, B.J., Fenton, P.M. and Mueller, W.S. (eds) *The Planning and Evaluation of Hallmark Events* (pp 172-185). Aldershot: Avebury.
- Carlsen J., Getz D., Soutar G. (2000), "Pre-event and post-event criteria research", in Allen J, Harris R., Jago L. and Veal A., *Event beyond 2000: setting the agenda*.
- Cherubini S. (1997), *Marketing dei servizi*, Franco Angeli
- Cherubini S. (1998), *Il Co-Marketing sportivo*, Franco Angeli
- Cherubini S. and Iasevoli G., (2004) "Il marketing per generare valore nel sistema evento", in Andreani J. and Collesei U., *Le tendenze del marketing in Europa*, EAP Parigi
- Cherubini S. and Iasevoli G. (2000), *Co-Marketing. Tipologie, potenzialità e applicazioni*, in Andreani J. and Collesei U., *Le tendenze del marketing in Europa*, University Ca' Foscari of Venice.
- Cherubini S., Canigiani M., and Santini A. (2005), *Marketing, Comunicazione, Eventi: l'esperienza dello Sport*, Franco Angeli.
- Chwe, M. S. Y. (1998). Culture, circles and commercials: Publicity, common knowledge and social coordination. *Rationality and Society*, 10, 47–75.
- Crompton J.L & McKay S.L. (1994). "Measuring the Economic Impact of Festivals and Events: some myths, misapplications and ethical dilemmas". *Festival Management and Event Tourism* 2 (1) 33-43.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425–439.
- Crompton, K., & McKay, S. (1994). "Measuring the economic impact of festivals and events: Some myths, misapplications and ethical dilemmas". *Festival Management and Event Tourism: An*
- Delpy L. & Li, M (1998). "The Art and Science of Conducting Economic Impact Studies". *Journal of Vacation Marketing* Vol. 4 (3) pp 230-254.
- Dwyer L. and Forsyth P. (1997). "Impacts and Benefits of MICE Tourism: a framework for analysis". *Tourism Economics* 3(1) 21-38.
- Dwyer L., Forsyth P., Madden J. & Spurr R. (2000). "Economic Impacts of Inbound Tourism Under Different Assumptions about 1994 Australian FAI Indycar Grand Prix: Final report. Ernst and Young, Brisbane.

- Faulkner, B. 1993. *Evaluating the Tourism Impact of Hallmark Events*. Occasional Paper No. 16. Canberra: Bureau of Tourism Research.
- Faulkner, B., & Raybould, R. (1995). Monitoring visitor expenditure associated with attendance at sporting events: an experimental assessment of the diary and recall methods. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(2), 73 - 82. 332
- Ferrari S. (2002), *Event Marketing: I grandi eventi e gli eventi speciali come strumento di marketing*, Cedam
- Formica, S., & Murrmann, S. (1998). The effects of group membership and motivation on attendance: An international festival case. *Tourism Analysis*, 3(3-4), 197-207.
- Formica, S., & Uysal, M. (1996). A market segmentation of festival visitors: Umbria Jazz Festival in Italy. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3(4), 175-182.
- Gartner, W. C., & Holecek, D. F. (1983). Economic impact of an annual tourism industry exposition. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10(2), 199-212.
- Getz D. (1987). "Events Tourism: Evaluating the Impacts" in Ritchie J.R.B. and Goeldner C.R. (eds) *Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Research- a Handbook for Managers and Researchers*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Getz, D. (1994). Residents' attitudes toward tourism: A longitudinal study in SpeyValley , Scotland. *Tourism Management*, 15(4), 247-258.
- Getz, D. (1997). *Event management and event tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communication.
- Getz, D., Carlsen, J. and Soutar, G. 2000. *Towards standardized event impact evaluations*. Conference paper presented to the Convention and Expo Summit VIII, Las Vegas: unpublished.
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Residents attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79-105.
- Hede A., Jago L. & Deery M., (2002), *Special Event Research 1990-2001: Key Trends and Issues*, in Jago L., Deery R., Allen J. Hede A., *Events and Place Making*, UTS.
- Hernandez, S. A., Cohen, J., & Garcia, H. J. (1996). Residents attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 754-779.
- Iasevoli G. (2000), *Il valore del cliente*, Franco Angeli
- Iasevoli G. (2004), *Le alleanze di marketing*, Franco Angeli.
- Ittner, C.D. and Larcker, D.F. (1998a), "Innovations in performance measurement: trends and research implications", *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 10, pp. 205-38.
- Ittner, C.D. and Larcker, D.F. (1998b), "Are nonfinancial measures leading indicators of financial performance? An analysis of customer satisfaction", *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, vol. 36, pp. 1-35.
- ISTAT (2004), *Annuario Statistico Italiano*, ISTAT, Roma.
- Jones, C., (2001). Mega-events and host-region impacts: determining the true worth of the 1999 world cup. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3, 241-251.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, R. D. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(2), 3-11.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1992), "The balanced scorecard ± measures that drive performance", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 70 No. 1, pp. 71-9.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1993) "Putting the balanced scorecard to work", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 71 No. 5, pp. 134-42.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1996a), "Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 75-85.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1996b) "Linking the balanced scorecard to strategy", *California Management Review*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 53-79.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (2001), "Transforming the balanced scorecard from performance measurement to strategic management: part I", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 87-104

- Kim, C., Scott, D., Thigpen, J. F., & Kim, S. S. (1998). Economic impacts of a birding festival. *Journal of Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 5(1/2), 51–58.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121–139.
- Mohr, K., Backman, K. F., Gahan, L. W., & Backman, S. J. (1993). An investigation of festival motivations and events satisfaction by visitor type. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 1(3), 89–97.
- Mules T. (1999). "Estimating the Economic Impact of an Event on a Local Government Area, Region, State or Territory", in *Valuing Tourism: Methods and Techniques*, Bureau of Tourism research Occasional Paper Number 28, Canberra.
- Mules, T., and Faulkner, B., 1996. "An economic perspective on special events". *Tourism Economics*, 2 (2): 107-117.
- Nicholson, R. E., & Pearce, D. G. (2001). Why do people attend events: A comparative analysis of visitor motivations at four south island events. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39, 449–460.
- O'Neill, M., Getz, D. & Carlsen, J. (1999). Evaluation of service quality at events: the 1998 Coca-Cola Masters Surfing event at Margaret River, Western Australia. *Managing Service Quality*, 9(3), 158-166
- Rao, V. (2001). Celebrations as social investments: Festival expenditures, unit price variation and social status in rural India. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 38(1), 71–97.
- Raybould, M., Mules, T., Fredline, E., & Tomljenovic, R. (2000). Counting the herd using aerial photography to estimate attendance at open events. *Event Management*, 6, 25-32.
- Rogers, M., & Ryan, R. (2001). The triple bottom line for sustainable community development. *Local Environment*, 6(3), 279 - 289.
- Scott, D. (1996). A comparison of visitors' motivation to attend three urban festivals. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3(3), 121–128.
- Thrane, C. (2002). Jazz festival visitors and their expenditures: Linking spending patterns to musical interest. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 281–286.
- Uysal, M., & Gitelson, R. (1994). Assessment of economic impacts: Festivals and special events. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 2(1), 3–10.
- Walo, M., Bull, A., & Green, H. (1996). Achieving economic benefits at local events: A case study of a local sport event. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3(3/4), 96–106.
- Watt, D. (1998). *Event Management in Leisure and Tourism*. (1st ed.) Harlow: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Weikert, B., & Kertstetter, D. (1996). Resident's attitudes toward tourism: An applied study in a historic community. Proceedings of the 1995 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. Radnor, PA: USFS Gen. Technical Report, NE-218.
- Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modelling. *Tourism Management*, 22(4), 363–372.