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Due to confirming characteristics, events can be considered to be specification of projects. Large events are particularly described by their complexity and the many stakeholders involved. Because of these characteristics, the achievement as well as the evaluation of project success are extremely difficult. This is aggravated by the diverse perspectives on success by the many different stakeholders involved. A key stakeholders in large events are destination management/ marketing organization (DMO) of the host community. Rationale is the tremendous impact events have on the destination. Particularly, the enhanced tourism development, the increase of tourist arrivals as well as the improvement of the destination’s image and brand awareness can be highlighted. By marketing a destination to potential tourists, establishing a destination’s image and managing an increasing international attention, DMOs play a primary role in handling these major impacts. Nevertheless, managing the major impacts as well as leveraging them into sustainable benefits for the host destination is extremely difficult. Like any other stakeholder, DMOs have certain expectations for large events and may determine success based on whether these expectations were met. Identifying certain success criteria allows the stakeholders involved to evaluate whether a project was successful and whether it met ones expectations. This thesis shall increase the understanding on the evaluation of project success from the DMOs’ perspective as a key stakeholder in large events. In order to identify the role of DMOs in large event as well as their perception of project success and the success criteria used for evaluation, eight semi-structured interviews were conducted. By doing so, managers of particular DMOs were interviewed, while each DMO represents another large event. It was found that DMOs of a host destination are usually neither involved in the organization of large events nor in managerial tasks. In fact, the large event is used for marketing purposes and is further included in marketing activities to promote a destination to the specified target markets. In order to draw the potential benefits from a large event, it needs to be implemented in a DMOs long-term strategy. At the same time, cooperation between a DMO and a large event is crucial. This underlines the important role DMOs have in large events. DMOs perceive large events as successful if the related marketing activities fulfill the previous set expectations for amount and content of media coverage. In addition, success is perceived by the DMOs if a sustainable destination development can be recognized. Within the distinct task areas of a DMO, different perspectives on success become apparent. Multiple different success criteria used by the DMO to evaluate success are identified, which can be allocated to three different success concepts. First, event success is marked by the impact on the tourist and impact on the DMO. Moreover, destination success can be recognized, while organizational success is specified by preparing for the future and for future large events. In addition, the success concepts can be allocated to medium- and long-term dimensions. It becomes apparent that a short-term dimension and a success concept related to project management success can be neglected, as DMOs are less involved in project management tasks related to the event. From the empirical material collected and the existing theoretical matters, a framework is developed accordingly.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>Project Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Success Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMO</td>
<td>Destination Management/Marketing Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Public Relation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Problematization

Nowadays, the business world is marked by a fast changing environment and possible competition around the globe, which requires organizations to respond quicker and adopt faster (Shenhar et al., 2011, p. 703). Therefore, since the 1980s projects have become more popular than ever as a means to generate change and increase the organizational performance as well as to create value and develop a competitive advantage, which makes it important to further examine the area of projects (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 759; Shenhar et al., 2011, p. 699-701). According to the Project Management Institute (PMI), a project is defined as “a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service or result [...] has a definite beginning and end” (2013, p. 3). As underlined by this definition, central characteristics of a project are its uniqueness, temporality and restrictions regarding time and budget as well as its purpose of value creation and the achievement of competitive advantage. These attributes can also be detected in the definition of events. Briefly, events can be described as “spatial–temporal phenomenon, [in which] each is unique [... and] created for a purpose” (Getz, 2008, p. 404). Since events have confirming characteristics with projects, events can be considered to be a specific variation of them. Nevertheless, despite the consistent attributes, literature usually focuses on either projects or events. This implies the necessity to further examine events as a specification of projects in order to provide an additional knowledge to each of the research areas. The size can be considered as another specification of an event, respectively. Large events are occurrences that require major investments and resources and are exposed to both the public and the media. Additionally, large events are described as having a major impact on the host destination, while several stakeholders are involved (Getz, 2008, p. 407; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239).

Stakeholders are commonly referred to as parties that have an interest, share or claim from a legitimate or moral viewpoint in a project (Clarkson, 1995, p. 106; Cleland, 1998, p. 55 cited in Winch, 2007, p. 272; PMI, 2013, p. 30), whereupon parties with the same expectations for a project form a group of stakeholders (Wagner-Mainardes et al., 2012, p. 1863). As the description indicates, stakeholders involved in a large event have certain expectations for it. Thus, by using distinct success criteria for evaluation these stakeholders evaluate a project according to whether their expectations were met (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; McLeod et al., 2012, p. 82; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 212; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; PMI, 2013, p. 30; Shenhar et al., 2001, p.699; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 91; Winch, 2007, p. 288). However, despite numerous studies on projects and project management in general, many projects do not meet the stakeholders’ expectations and hence, seem to fail (Cooke-Davies, 2001, p. 185). Literature agrees that the evaluation of a project’s success or failure strongly depends on the examining perspective of a stakeholder (McLeod et al, 2012, p. 70, 81; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 768; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 88, 90). Thus, what is considered as a failure by one stakeholder might be a success for the other one. Additionally, what seems like a failure in the beginning might turn into a success later on and vice versa (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 714). Both, the achievement as well as the evaluation of project success are extremely difficult, because of the many stakeholders involved in an event, their diverse expectations and hence, their diverging perspectives on success. This is aggravated by the facts that a common agreed definition of project success is missing, the topic expanded further and more aspects are taken into consideration (McLeod et al, 2012, p. 70, 81; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 768; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 88, 90).
Nevertheless, determining project success is of great relevance, as it enables the organization to adjust project efforts and organizational aims (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699) and allows to implement beneficial changes improving the organizational performance. (Cooke-Davies, 2001, p. 189). Project evaluation is therefore crucial and needs to be examined closely. In order to increase the likelihood of achieving overall project success, it is indispensable to determine the key stakeholders involved in a project. Additionally, it is of tremendous importance to inspect their particular expectations and specific perspectives on project success (PMI, 2013, p. 31; Wateridge, 1998, p. 63; Wagner-Mainardes et al., 2012, p. 1875). This underlines the necessity to carefully examine the stakeholders involved in a project and their particular and yet individual perception of success.

Although little is known about the stakeholders involved in large events, the destination management/ marketing organization (DMO) of the host community can be considered to have an interest in large events. DMOs are commonly referred to as permanent tourism organizations that “promote tourism to a destination” (Getz, 2008, p. 406; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 937), wherein upon a destination can be a city, a region or a country and tourism includes both business and leisure travel (Getz, 2008, p. 406). Rationale behind DMOs being a key stakeholder is the tremendous impact events have on a destination. Particularly the enhancement of tourism development, the increase of tourist arrivals as well as the improvement of the destination’s image and brand awareness can be highlighted (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011, p. 1369; Getz, 2008, p. 405-406, 414). According to the definition, DMOs play a primary role not only in handling these major impacts by marketing a destination to potential tourists, but also in establishing a destination’s image and managing an increasing international attention, especially while hosting a large event (Getz, 2004, p. 405; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 929-930). Nevertheless, managing the major impacts as well as leveraging them into sustainable benefits for the host destination proves to be an extremely difficult task. In order to do so, a careful consideration is required, particular strategies need to be aligned and a close cooperation with DMOs is needed. (Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 83; Jago et al., 2010, p. 233; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936). To increase the understanding of these essential interest groups, DMOs as a key stakeholders of large events have to be examined. Therefore, the DMOs’ specific role and their affiliated responsibilities in large events need to be further inspected to achieve and to leverage the potential benefits of large events.

Like other stakeholder, DMOs have certain expectations in large events and may determine success by considering whether these expectations were met. In fact, an insufficient amount of knowledge is reported about the precise role, certain expectations and the particular success perspective of DMOs in large events. Therefore, these aspects have to be examined properly in order to achieve overall project success and to maximize the potential benefits large events serve to a host destination. To evaluate whether a project was successful and whether it met the stakeholders’ expectations, success criteria are determined by those involved. However, little is known about the success criteria considered by the DMOs of destinations hosting a large event. It is therefore tremendously important to identify the relevant success criteria implied by DMOs.

As aforementioned, not much is reported about a stakeholder’s evaluation of project success of large events in general and a DMO in particular. Moreover, the area of research on DMOs as key stakeholders in large projects is hardly examined. The DMOs perspective on evaluating large events and their perception of project success is unclear and barely studied. Nevertheless, in order to meet stakeholder expectations and hence, to
achieve overall project success of a large event, it is indispensable to identify the DMOs’ evaluation of project success in this respect.

1.2 Research Question
Considering the aforesaid problematization, the following research question is addressed in this paper:

How do destination management organizations evaluate project success of large events?

1.3 Research Objectives
The purpose of this study is to increase the understanding of how DMOs as a key stakeholder evaluate project success of large events. In order to address this purpose, three sub-purposes are considered within this research. Identifying the role DMOs have in large events and their resulting tasks and responsibilities is the first sub-purpose. The second sub-purpose is a means to enhance the knowledge of the DMOs’ perception of project success of large events. Additionally, the specification of success criteria that are considered by DMOs for diverse large events is the third sub-purpose. In this respect, several cases of DMOs involved in certain large events are examined.

1.4 Contribution
By examining the success evaluation of DMOs, this study contributes to the current knowledge of project success for large events and increases the understanding of success criteria used by DMOs to evaluate them. Furthermore, by looking at events as a specification of projects the current understanding is extended. In this respect, this thesis contributes to the literature on project success by supplementing it with specific findings regarding large events. Moreover, a contemporary perspective to the present literature on events is provided by including the project based viewpoint. The identification of the perspective on project success by DMOs and the success criteria used are transferable to other DMOs and other large events in the future. The findings and conclusions drawn on in this thesis can be implemented by future host destinations when evaluating the project success of a large event and hence, alleviates the evaluation. Eventually, naming the DMOs’ perspective on project success allows project managers to take the success criteria of these stakeholders into consideration when planning and executing a large event. This in turn increases the likelihood of achieving an overall project success by satisfying the stakeholders’ expectations (McLeod et al., 2012; Voss & Kock, 2013, p. 94).

1.5 Limitations
This study is limited to the success criteria used by DMOs to evaluate project success. Even though these success criteria might be relevant for other (key) stakeholders as well, this research focuses on the DMOs’ perspective. Additionally, this study discusses the topic of project success, rather than project failure. Rationale behind this is the assumption in this research that both elements are contrary related to each other; ergo, the presence of the one (success) leads to the absence of the other (failure) and vice versa. Further on, due to temporal constraints, the final step of project success evaluation and consequently, the DMOs’ perception of success is considered, rather than the complete evaluation process of large events.
1.6 Research Disposition
In order to answer the research question mentioned above, this thesis is organized in the following disposition.

**Chapter One: Introduction** – This chapter is aimed at the familiarization of the reader with the topic by briefly describing the problematization and introducing the research question. The difficulty to determine project success is recalled. Moreover, the rationale behind DMOs being key stakeholders for large projects is given and the importance to identify success criteria used by DMOs to evaluate success is stated.

**Chapter Two: Theoretical framework** - In this chapter, the reader is provided with the theoretical understanding of both events being projects and the specification of large events. Project success and its development over the last decades, the different concepts of project success and the dimension of time are discussed. Eventually, stakeholders involved in large events are introduced, focusing on DMOs as key stakeholders of large events and providing rationale for this consideration.

**Chapter Three: Research Methodology** – The theoretical as well as the practical methodology of the research are introduced in this chapter. The researcher’s preconception and philosophy are illustrated. Moreover, the particular selection criteria for cases and respondents, the way of conducting the research, and the realization of interviews are presented in detail. Truth criteria and method ethics are briefly discussed.

**Chapter Four: Empirical Findings** – This chapter is aimed to briefly introduce the interview partners, the examined DMOs and the conjunct large events. Subsequently, the particular empirical material gained from the interviews is presented.

**Chapter Five: Analysis** – In this chapter, the findings are analyzed by their meaning and denotation to the area of research. By doing so, a framework for evaluating project success of large events is developed.

**Chapter Six: Discussion** – The conclusions drawn from the analyzed findings are discussed in this final chapter. Eventually, their contribution to both theory and practice are introduced.
2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Projects

Since the 1980s projects gained a continuously increasing popularity. Among others, reasons can be found not only in the ambition to generate change and increase the organizational performance, but also as a means to create value and develop competitive advantage (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 759; Shenhar et al., 2011, p. 699-701; Pinto, 2013, p. 644). Additional reasons are to enable organizations to respond quicker and to adapt faster to certain environmental changes (Shenhar et al., 2011, p. 703). An elaborate study from Fortune et al. (2011) shows not only a general increase of projects as such, but also an enhanced use of project management tools, techniques and methods in organizations. Moreover, Pinto (2013, p. 644) notes that organizations consider projects to be a solution to increase the operations’ efficiency as well as their effectiveness. This underlines the fact that the importance and the popularity of projects are increasing. To define projects, literature focuses on different aspects. Westerveld (2003, p. 411) specifies projects to be “unique and novel” and underlines their “clear finishing date”. In turn, Shenhar (2001, p. 394) takes the aspect of the project’s purpose to accomplish a precisely defined goal into his central consideration, while other authors concentrate on a projects’ contingency on the environment (Poli & Shenhar, 2003, p. 231) or projects being “unique, one-time initiatives” (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 3). Nevertheless, a project’s uniqueness, its specifications regarding time restrictions as well as the predefinition of budget and scope play a central role. In this respect, this paper follows the definition provided by the Project Management Institute (PMI), as it broadly summarizes the central characteristics of a project, which in turn can be found among the definitions provided by other authors as well. A project, as defined by the PMI, is therefore “a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service or result [...which] has a definite beginning and end” (PMI, 2013, p. 3).

Keeping this definition in mind, several specifications and variations of projects can be recognized. To answer the identified research question of how DMOs evaluate project success of large events, two major specifications are considered as most relevant. First, the fact that events can be seen as projects is specified in the following. Second, the possibility to distinguish projects by size is further examined in order to define large events.

2.1.1 Specification: Projects as Events

In order to provide a definition for events, the terminology has to be considered from several perspectives. Events are commonly referred to as temporal occurrences that take place at a specified location, while their uniqueness is highlighted (Getz, 2008, p. 404; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239). The requirement of resources and investments, especially financial ones, are involved in events as well (Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239). Further characteristics are the engagement of multiple stakeholders in an event as well as the involvement of risks (Getz, 2008, p. 404, 419). Additionally, events are undertaken for a precise purpose, which might be the implementation of strategic goals, the achievement of economic benefits or value creation in general (Getz, 2008, p. 404, 419). Successful events enable host destinations to achieve recognition and awareness, to promote an economic growth and to increase incoming tourism as well as to make a destination accessible to influences from all over the world (Getz, 2008, p. 414). This also led to the fact that hosting an event became increasingly attractive in the last couple of years (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011, p. 1369; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Getz, 2008, p. 403; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 211; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 238). Therefore, the impact
events have on the host destination can be recognized as an additional characteristic when describing events. Moreover, “events are universally important for many cultural, strategic and political reasons” (Getz, 2008, p. 411), as they can support host destinations to further develop and build an identity along with gaining competitive advantage. In summary, events are characterized by their nature of being temporary, unique occurrences that have an impact on the host destination. Risks and stakeholders are involved in events and resources and investments are required for events. Considering the definition of projects provided earlier, several overlapping elements among projects and events become visible - the uniqueness, specified purposes, and constraints regarding time, the impact and the influence of the environment. Moreover, projects and events both aim to create value and to develop a competitive advantage. This leads to the evaluation that events can be considered to be a specific variation of projects. However, until now this approach was not specifically followed and literature usually focuses on either projects or events. By looking at events as a specification of projects, the understanding in the research area of projects is enhanced by the knowledge of events and vice versa. Consequently, both research areas may learn from each other.

While events are a specification of projects, events can be categorized individually as well. In order to do so, Getz (2008, p. 404) identified eight types of events, which are (1) cultural celebrations, (2) political, (3) arts and entertainment and (4) business and trade events, (5) educational & scientific, (6) recreational as well as (7) private events and (8) sport competitions. In turn, other authors narrow these classifications down to three types. These are cultural events as well as such of a sports and business/commercial kind (Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210). As it can be seen from above, the narrow classification can be recognized in the elaborate one. The basic characteristics of each type of event are the same, while the difference can be found in their individual purpose and program settings (Getz, 2008, p. 404; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222). Nevertheless, descriptions and arguments stated can be applied to all types of projects.

The type of event is a possible categorization, while events or projects can also be distinguished by size. Therefore, the specification of large projects is discussed in the following.

2.1.2 Specification: Large Events

Projects can be categorized in regard of multiple different aspects, such as the project application area, the project goals and contract types (Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 301; Westerveld, 2003, p. 417). Another central aspect to distinguish projects is their size (Westerveld, 2003, p. 417). Size is an important aspect for categorization, as it combines several factors, which in turn could be used individually for categorization as well. By considering multiple factors, a detailed description of a project is provided that eventually leads to an overall specification into large, medium-size or small. A research carried out by Malfas et al. (2005, p. 217) concludes that the duration, the complexity in its organization, the number of stakeholders involved and the grade of impact are the essential factors to differentiate projects by size (Malfas et al., 2005 p. 217). Size is an important aspect for categorization, as it combines several factors, which in turn could be used individually for categorization as well. By considering multiple factors, a detailed description of a project is provided that eventually leads to an overall specification into large, medium-size or small. A research carried out by Malfas et al. (2005, p. 217) concludes that the duration, the complexity in its organization, the number of stakeholders involved and the grade of impact are the essential factors to differentiate projects by size (Malfas et al., 2005 p. 217). In this connection, the grade of complexity is continuously repeated in literature and can be identified as the key factor of distinction in size (Jaafari, 2007, p. 145; Malfas et al., 2005 p. 217; Miller & Hobbs, 2005, p. 42). Thus, large projects are especially marked by a high grade of complexity as well as multiple risks and uncertainties involved (Miller & Hobbs, 2005, p. 42). Westerveld (2003) illustrates five types of projects according to their size and describes the largest project type as “a complex network of closely related stakeholders trying to fulfil the need of a client and user” (Westerveld, 2003, p. 416).
Moreover, large projects are characterized by a turbulent environment, the existence of clear restrictions and a precise project purpose to fulfil an existing need (Westerveld, 2003, p. 416). Further on, Jaafari (2007, p. 174) identifies complexity as the major characteristic of large projects, whereupon the external environment and a multifaceted structure of a project itself are considered to be the two major sources for complexity. A complex structure of a project is therefore marked by high risks, an involvement of the latest technologies and solutions, long development phases and an enhancing influence through stakeholders (Jaafari, 2007, p. 145). Large projects are further described as projects that influence a community, require major investments and numerous resources. Additionally, they are exposed to politics, regulations and various stakeholders (Jaafari, 2007, p. 174). Furthermore, the levels of scrutiny and ambiguity are strongly dependent on project size. Hence, large projects come along with an intensive scrutiny by different stakeholders involved and a respectively long phase of high ambiguity before project execution is put into action (Miller & Hobbs, 2005, p. 43-44). Both aspects can be recognized in the previously mentioned characteristic of high risks involved.

Additional attributes become visible by leaving the project specific point of view and by considering size from the event perspective instead. Mills & Rosentraub (2013, p. 239) focus on large sports events and consider them to be “national or global competitions that produce extensive levels of participation and media coverage and that often require large public investments into both event infrastructure [...] and general infrastructure”. Here the aspects of major investments and resources needed as well as the exposure to stakeholders, especially the public, are recalled. This is repeated by Getz (2008, p. 407), who claims that large events are traditionally defined by considering the amount of tourists they attract, the image they compose and their influence on the development of the host destination. Getz (2008, p. 408) further distinguishes between two types of large events, namely large events that are “global in their orientation and require a competitive bid to ‘win’ them as a one-time event for a particular place” or hallmark events that depend on the host community and are typically hosted in merely one particular destination. In respect to large events, Malfas et al. (2005, p. 210) take external and internal aspects into account. By doing so, external characteristics are mainly described by media attention, tourism attractiveness and an event’s impact on the host destination. In turn, the number of event participants and viewers as well as the grade of organizational complexity are evaluated as internal characteristics to define large events. The determining factors for project categorization by size in tourism literature are extent, consequences and meaning of an impact on a host destination. This impact is further described by an improved infrastructure and developments as well as enhanced awareness, attractiveness and image (Sola, 1988, cited in Malfas et al., 2005, p. 211). This is repeated by Jago et al. (2010, p. 222) who divides the impact into economic, social and environmental effects on the host destination. In turn, Getz (2008, p. 407) uses the terminology of ‘high value’ instead of ‘impact’, which is marked by aspects such as an increased market share, a potential growth and sustainability. Furthermore, a further descriptions of large events that may go along with the objectives are publicity all over the world as well as the attraction of additional tourists, which becomes visible by a high tourist demand (Getz, 2008, p. 407; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222).

Irrespective of the angle on large events, complexity as well as the huge impact (on the host destination) are the central characteristics. By summarizing aforementioned attributes, large events can be named as endeavors with clear restrictions, a requirement of major investments as well as resources and the purpose to fulfil an existing need. The exposure to public, politics and regulations, and consequently, the multiple stakeholders
involved are further descriptions of large events. Eventually, large events are influenced by communities and vice versa, and high risks and uncertainties are involved. By combining the different approaches, an elaborate definition of large events is provided. The following figure graphically summarizes all individual characteristics of large events.

Figure 1 - Characteristics of large events
(Figure designed by author, based on literature stated)

Regardless of the matter of a project’s size, its evaluation is crucial in order to find out whether the project met the stakeholders’ expectations and hence, to determine project success (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699). Therefore, project success is explained in the following.

2.2 Project Success
One area included in project research is project success. As Pinto and Slevin already noted in the late 1980s, “there are few topics in the field of project management that are so frequently discussed and yet so rarely agreed upon as that of the notion of project success” (Pinto and Slevin, 1988, p. 68 cited in Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 758). Until this day, literature agrees neither on a common definition of success, nor on specific aspects of success that are generally valid (Baccarini, 1999, p. 31; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700). Instead, success is one of the most controversial areas within project management and is especially marked by its broadness and complexity (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 713). Instead of a simplification it became even more difficult to evaluate whether a project is successful or not. Reasons are a missing commonly agreed upon definition of project success, an expansion of the topic and eventually, the fact that more aspects need to be taken into consideration. Project evaluation is further aggravated by the many stakeholders involved as well as their diverse expectations and their diverging perspective to evaluate project success (McLeod et al, 2012, p. 70, 81; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 768; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 88, 90). Nevertheless, project evaluation and hence, the determination of project success is important and crucial. Rationale behind this is the ability given by the evaluation to adjust the project efforts with the organizational aims in both the short- as well as the long-term (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699). Projects and most certainly project
success are of great importance for organizations, as successful projects have the ability to enrich corporations with changes that bring further benefits and improve the organizational performance. Therefore, project success and organizational success are strongly related with each other (Cooke-Davies, 2001, p. 189).

For the following, the definition provided by the PMI will be considered. Reason for this choice is the fact that the PMI is one of the few authors that formulate a precise definition for project success. In addition, the broadness allows the definition to be adjusted to a particular context, taking central aspects into account. Therefore, project success is achieved when “the last baselines [are] approved by the authorized stakeholders” (PMI, 2013, p. 35). As this definition states, success depends on the ‘authorized stakeholders’, which implies that merely the parties that have a legitimized claim are considered. The aspect of ‘last baselines’ illustrates the importance of evaluating a project at several temporal dimensions and in the long-term when the final requirements are met. Both aspects, namely the stakeholders and the dimensions of time, are crucial elements of project success and are discussed later on.

2.2.1 From the 1960s until now: The Development of Project Success
Before project success is further examined, the topic’s history is briefly explained. Literature clearly outlines that Pinto, Slevin and Prescott are not only the key researchers in the area of project success, but also lay the foundations for future studies (for example Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 758). As critically examined by Müller & Jugdev (2012, p. 758), research builds on the early work of these “giants of project success”. Several frameworks and models that include success dimensions, critical success factors (CSF) and success criteria (SC) were largely developed later on by researchers like Müller, Shenhar, Turner and Westerveld, who are strongly contributing to the current understanding of project success. Nevertheless, they all tend to build up on the essential findings of Pinto, Slevin and Prescott from the late 1980s. Moreover, Müller and Jugdev (2012, p. 762) identify four stages for the development of the school of project success. In the 1960s, the beginning of project management, project success was limited to the ‘golden triangle’ – later also referred to as the ‘iron triangle’ – which considers the meeting of time, budget and scope. From the 1980s, literature started to discuss project success in relation to external as well as internal factors and to develop critical success factors that influence the successful completion of a project. Moreover, in the 1990s researchers started to establish holistic and integrated frameworks that took into consideration project managers and their teams as well as possible categorizations of projects and their relating success. Since the 2000s, the school of project success is further developing, examining different stakeholder perspectives for the evaluation of project success as well as considering the multiple success criteria, success is measured with (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, 762-763). The following figure graphically illustrates the historic development of project success.
As aforementioned, CSF and SC as well as the dimension of time and the different perspectives on success further evolved over time and still no coherent agreement on project success is present (Baccarini, 1999, p. 31; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700). In the following, these elements are discussed and the diverse viewpoints of literature are critically evaluated to provide a common understanding on the area of project success and to facilitate an answer to the research question.

2.2.2 Elements of Project Success

Within project success, two central elements need to be considered, namely critical success factors (CSF) and success criteria (SC). The central difference between both elements is the fact that CSF influence the realization of success, while SC are used to eventually evaluate success (Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299). Literature agrees on these two elements of project success in general, however, particular aspects involved in both as well as linkages and relationships are still evaluated differently (Baccarini, 1999, p. 28-29; Cooke-Davies, 2002, p. 186-188; Fortune et al., 2011, p. 560; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; Pinto & Slevin, 1987, p. 26; Westerveld, 2003, p. 412).

CSF can be described as elements that influence project success from the very beginning and hence, are the ones that enhance or decrease the likelihood of an achievement of project success (Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299). Several scholars looked at CSF and concluded distinct approaches that are marked by various CSF in different frameworks (for example Cooke-Davies, 2002; Mir & Pinnington, 2013; Pinto & Prescott, 1988; Pinto & Slevin, 1987; Westerveld, 2003). In this respect, Pinto & Slevin (1987, p. 26) highlight the importance of communication. Mir & Pinnington (2013) consider project success to be strongly influenced by project management performance. The relationship between performance and success is in turn strongly influenced by the stakeholders’ perception and definition of success as such (Mir & Pinnington, 2013, p. 13). The CSF identified by Mir & Pinnington (2013, p. 13) may be primary factors that influence the achievement of project success for large events, due to the many stakeholders involved and the organizational and operational tasks required (Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239; Getz, 2008, p. 407; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210). The determination of CSF as well as including them into the managerial tasks are essential in order to increase the likelihood of achieving project success (Pinto & Slevin, 1987, p. 22, 26).
This thesis concentrates on the evaluation of project success. Since CSF influence the achievement of project success and CS are used to evaluate project success, the latter is focused on. However, a brief introduction was regarded as relevant since CSF are an essential part in the area of project success and crucial for achieving project success.

2.2.3 Measurements of Project Success: Success Criteria

While CSF influence the realization of project success, *SC are the elements used to measure project success with and are the ones that are used to evaluate project success in the end* (Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299). As mentioned earlier, in the early days of project management, project success was evaluated according to the ‘golden triangle’, by considering the success criteria time, budget and scope (Poli & Shenhar, 2003, p. 231; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700; Westerveld, 2003, p. 412). However, due to an increasing complexity and an enhancing number of stakeholders involved in a project, it is not sufficient anymore to limit the evaluation of project success to these three criteria. This also led to the fact that the so called ‘golden triangle’ was later on also referred to as the ‘triple constraint’ or ‘iron triangle’. (Baccarini, 1999, p. 26; Poli & Shenhar, 2003, p. 231; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 712; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 87; Westerveld, 2003; p. 412).

![Golden Triangle](Based on Poli & Shenhar, 2003; Shenhar et al., 2001; Westerveld, 2003)

Even though SC of meeting requirements regarding time and budget are used most frequently, researchers recognized that they are not satisfactory to determine project success anymore (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 702). Therefore, scholars proceeded to further develop this particular area of research and to identify further success criteria that can be used to evaluate project success.

In doing so, Müller & Turner (2007) broadly refer to two kinds of SC, which are soft and hard ones. Soft success criteria take the satisfaction of stakeholders into account, whereas the hard ones inspect the meeting of requirements and purposes as well as reaching a circular business (Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 306). Particular criteria of Müller & Turner (2007) can be found in the approach of Baccarini (1999, p. 28-29) as well. Baccarini (1999, p. 28-29) considers the satisfaction of stakeholders in general and users in particular as well as the meeting of requirements regarding time, cost and quality. This is further described as the achievement of a project goal and purpose. Moreover, he supplements the criteria of a qualitative project management process such as, which is mainly characterized by its efficiency (Baccarini, 1999, p. 28-29). The PMI suggests to evaluate success in regard to keeping the restrictions given by the ‘golden triangle’, complemented by quality, resources and risks (PMI, 2013, p. 35). This is contrasted by Fortune et al. (2011, p. 560) who identify thirteen SC in total. In this regard, the SC are meeting of (1) customer requirements, (2) traditional criteria, (3) safety standards and (4) organizational objectives. Additionally, the researchers identified minimizing (5) business disruption and the (6) use of contingency funds. Achieving (7) business benefits, (8) return on investment and (9) organizational reputation are further SC as well as reaching (10) strategic and operational learning for the organization and (11) best value delivery. Finally, (12) adaptation to changing needs both internal and external as well as (13) leading the organization into a future business direction can be listed as SC (Fortune...
et al., 2011, p. 560). As one of the only researchers, Fortune et al. (2011) prioritize the SC according to their relevance and importance in practice. In doing so, the recent study outlines that managers evaluate the meeting of customer requirements as the most important SC, which is followed by the meeting of the traditional criteria time and budget. In turn, business related criteria such as the achievement of a return on investment or increasing organizational learning follow later on (Fortune et al., 2011, p. 560). From the study undertaken by Wateridge (1998, p. 61), four major groups of SC can be recognized. These groups are (1) the profitability for sponsors, owners and contractors, (2) the achievement of business purposes and (3) the meeting of objectives and requirements. This is supplemented by the traditional criteria and eventually, (4) the satisfaction of stakeholders in general as well as users, sponsors and project team in particular (Wateridge, 1998, p. 61). Another approach considers meeting the requirements regarding time, cost and quality as well as technical performance, scope and safety standards as SC (Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 245). Moreover, the realization of organizational benefits and the satisfaction of stakeholders, just as the resource productivity and an effective implementation of a business strategy are underlined as important SC (Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 245). The meeting of specifications, the requirement of less time and less budget as well as the satisfaction of needs of customers and other stakeholders are the SC identified by Bryde & Robinson (2005, p. 625).

Eventually, Shenhar & Dvir (2007, p. 26-27) distinguish between five different groups of success measures, each of them described by specific criteria. As these groups of success measures the authors identify (1) project efficiency, (2) impact on the customer as well as (3) impact on the team, (4) business and direct success and finally, (5) the preparation for the future. Concerning this matter, the first measure, namely project efficiency, takes the meeting of restrictions regarding schedule, budget and yield into account. Meeting requirements and specifications, providing benefits to customers, customer satisfaction and loyalty as well as the brand name recognition are criteria of the second measure, impact on the customer. The third measure, impact on the team, is described by the criteria team satisfaction, team member growth and development of skills and knowledge. Business success, the fourth measure, considers an increase in sales, profit or market share and an achievement of return on investment or cash flow. In addition, meeting service quality is a criteria of this fourth measure. Finally, the fifth measure, namely preparation for the future, is marked by providing a new technology, market, product line, competency and organizational capability. Nevertheless, due to a projects’ uniqueness “it is impossible to generate a universal checklist of project success criteria suitable for all projects” (Westerveld, 2003, p. 412). Therefore, depending on a project’s size and complexity different SC have to be taken into account (Westerveld, 2003, p. 412). Keeping this thought in mind, Westerveld (2003) makes a consequential step into a crucial direction. He considers a total of six so called ‘result areas’ for SC, which are (1) project results - hence, budget, time and quality - and the satisfaction of five different parties involved, namely (2) the client, (3) the project team and (4) users, (5) contracting partners and (6) stakeholders. Additionally, Westerveld (2003) allocates each of the particular result areas to a specific type of project, while not all of the result areas are considered for every project type. All six result areas are taken into account for large projects (Westerveld, 2003, p. 414). The differentiation among projects and the arising selection of key SC for each project overcome the missing “universal checklist”. Moreover, appropriate SC are selected for each specific type of project that can be referred to. The importance of selecting and determining relevant SC in the beginning of a project is considered to be as an essential step. By doing so, a project’s development into the expected direction is supported and a possible threat of mismatching expectations

As mentioned previously, literature agrees on SC to evaluate project success, however, no conformity on the particular criteria as such can be found. Reasons for this might be the facts that different SC are considered as relevant among project managers and the importance of meeting criteria varies among projects (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 765; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299). In this regard, Müller & Turner (2007, p. 299) mention a five day delay, which has an tremendous impact on the success of the Olympics but less on the success of an IT project as an example of interest for this thesis. Even though, most researchers refer to the traditional SC, namely time, cost and scope, as well as the satisfaction of stakeholders, these are further complemented by several additional criteria just as replaced or renamed. A great variety within the number of SC illustrated between the different authors can be identified as well. While some researchers identify up to thirteen SC (Fortune et al., 2011), others limit their SC to six (Westerveld, 2003). Some authors such as Shenhar & Dvir (2007) and Westerveld (2003) make a crucial development. The elaborateness of SC and the well-arranged combination into five groups lead to the evaluation that the SC determined by Shenhar & Dvir (2007) seem to be beneficial for the practice. The evaluation that an elaborate list of SC is beneficial for the practice, is supported by the numerous SC identified by Fortune et al. (2011) within their “real world study”. Additionally, the identification of five groups of projects by Westerveld (2003) where each is marked by different SC seems of great importance as it overcomes limitations in generalizability and describes different projects in detail.

2.2.4 The Different Concepts of Project Success

Literature considers different SC depending on the type of project (see Westerveld, 2003). However, SC can also be subjected to the level of success. The latter is here called the success concept. In this regard, literature mainly distinguishes between project management success and project or product success. In doing so, project management success is generally achieved, when the restrictions on schedule, budget and scope are met, supplemented by quality (Baccarini, 1999, p. 25; Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 233; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 702). In turn, the concepts of project or product success are less agreed on among scholars and often supplemented by additional concepts.

Baccarini (1999, p. 25) suggests the implementation of two success concepts, which are project management success and product success. Thus, the realization of the project process and consequently, cost, time and quality, are taken into account by project management success, whereas product success focuses on the prosperity of the final outcome (Baccarini, 1999, p. 25). This thought is also recalled by Cooke-Davies (2002, p. 187), who considers product success as project success, which deals with the overall project objectives. Later on, Cooke-Davies (2007, p. 235) adds a third concept, namely consistent project success, which is characterized by organizational productivity and effectiveness in strategy implementation. Additionally, distinct descriptions of a concept’s focus were implemented by the researcher. In doing so, project management success answers the question whether ‘the project was done right’, whereat project success takes into account whether ‘the right project was done’. Consistent project success combines both questions and considers whether ‘the right projects were done right, time after time’ (Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 233-235). Following the approach of Cooke-Davies, McLeod et al. (2012, p. 70) supplement the originally two existing concepts of success by a third one, namely organizational success. Therefore, according to McLeod et al. (2012, p. 70), project success focuses on project management and hence, uses the traditional criteria for evaluation. In turn, product success considers the
achieved of project objectives, whereas organizational success deals with the organizational objectives by using business as well as strategic benefits as evaluation criteria (McLeod et al., 2012, p. 70). This is contrasted by Turner & Zolin (2012, p. 91) who differentiate the success concepts between ‘project output’, ‘project outcome’ and ‘impact of a project’. In this respect, project output considers the evaluation of product success, whereupon project outcome takes the business success into account, based on the project objectives. Eventually, the impact of a project is evaluated with the achievement of the long term strategic goals of the organization itself (Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 90). As this description shows, the approach provided by Turner & Zolin (2012) is partly based on the success concepts identified by Shenhar & Dvir (2007). Success concepts can also be drawn from the five groups of success measures of Shenhar & Dvir (2007, p. 26). Project management success is therefore described by project efficiency and hence, the success criteria time and budget. The second success concept, product success, is explained by the impact on the customer and the team, followed by business success, which considers specific criteria such as returns, sales and market shares. Eventually, the fourth success concept of organizational success, namely the preparation for the future, is reached (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 26-28). The elaborateness and structure of this approach seems to be beneficial for the practice. If not specifically stated otherwise, the author of this thesis refers to the holistic view of project success as such when mentioning project success, rather than the particular level or concept of success. The following table summarizes the different success concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Project Management Success</th>
<th>Product Success</th>
<th>Consistent Project Success</th>
<th>Organizational Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke-Davies (2002 &amp; 2007)</td>
<td>- Project Process</td>
<td>- Project Objectives</td>
<td>- Effectiveness</td>
<td>- Strategic and business benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod et al. (2012)</td>
<td>- Time, Budget, Quality</td>
<td>- Project Objectives</td>
<td>- Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner &amp; Zolin (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Success concepts

(Designed by author, based on findings of literature stated)

2.2.5 The Dimension of Time within Project Success

Few researchers like Cooke-Davies (2007), McLeod et al. (2012) and Shenhar & Dvir (2007) allocate their success concepts to a timeframe, considering short-, medium- and long-term success, from which different success dimensions evolved. Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 714) as well as Poli & Shenhar (2003, p. 231) allocate the four distinct success concepts to the timeframe. By doing so, three particular points of time arise, namely short-, medium- and long-term success, at which the specific success concept can be evaluated. This highlights the fact that at certain points in time, particular SC are most important and need to be taken into account. The project evaluation becomes a dynamic process,
whereupon attention can be drawn to the relevant criteria at certain dates (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 29). This approach is repeated by Turner & Zolin (2012, p. 91) who specify three success concepts and three points in time for the evaluation. By naming these ‘at the end of the project’, ‘after months’ and eventually, ‘after years’, Turner & Zolin (2012) allocate the success concepts to the short-, medium and long-term as well. The advantage of success dimensions is the fact that this approach supports the project team and stakeholders involved in selecting relevant SC at specific times (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 29). By doing so, the development of a project can be evaluated and an approximation to conformity of SC between stakeholders can be enhanced. Both aspects are crucial for an achievement of project success (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627). The following figure illustrates the particular success dimensions according to Poli & Shenhar (2003) as well as Shenhar & Dvir (2007).

![Success Dimensions](image)

(Figure designed by author, based on success dimensions identified by Poli & Shenhar, 2003; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007)

The particular success dimensions support the project team and the stakeholders involved to evaluate a project at certain points in time. This is of great importance, since projects may seem to be a failure first, but may turn out to be a success later on and vice versa (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 714). As an example, a project might not meet the restrictions regarding time and might be a failure in project management success on the short-term. However, the organizational objectives may be achieved in this project and consequently, organizational success may be achieved on the long-term. This implies that the large scale picture needs to be considered in order to evaluate a project, since the dimensions are insufficient by themselves (Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 246; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 714). Judging projects regarding their success at different points in time is of great relevance in order to provide a holistic view on project success. The consideration of projects as a “multi-dimensional concept” is essential (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 714). However, as Jago et al. (2010, p. 224) claim, the evaluation of large events usually focuses on economic impacts on the short-term, neglecting the long-term and further influenced areas. However, the overall evaluation of events should include social and environmental impacts as well as the medium- and long-term dimensions (Jago et al., 2010, p. 225). Due to the consideration of three points in time and their detailed and elaborate description, the success criteria, success concepts and success dimensions provided by Shenhar et al. (2001) as well as Shenhar & Dvir (2007) seem to be suitable approaches overcoming these limitation. As literature states, success dimensions as well as SC vary among the type of projects and “one size does not fit all” (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 704; Westerveld, 2003, p. 412). The success dimensions and SC of relevance have to be specified in the beginning of a project in order to increase the likelihood of achieving project success (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 308; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 718-719).

In summary, multiple SC were identified by different scholars. Some researchers also allocate the SC to a timeframe, highlighting the fact that diverse SC can be considered at
different points in time (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007). Others allocated success criteria to certain types of projects, in order to underline the fact that projects differ in complexity and stakeholders involved and require adjusted evaluations (Westerveld, 2003). Moreover, overall project success can be distinguished by three success concepts, which in turn refer to success regarding the project management, the product or the organization (McLeod et al., 2007; Cooke-Davies, 2007 in Wiley Guide; Turner & Zolin, 2012; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007). Few researchers allocated these success concepts further to an additional timeframe, where different success dimensions evolve from (McLeod et al., 2007; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007; Turner & Zolin, 2012). By doing so, success becomes a “multi-dimensional concept” (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 714), which has to be adjusted to the particular type of project.

Nevertheless, project success is a complex and controversial area within project management. The achievement as well as the evaluation of project success is especially aggravated by large events due to their complexity and the many stakeholders engaged. Further primary reasons are the diverse expectations of the multiple stakeholders involved in a project as well as the various perspectives on success (Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 226; Shenhar et al., 2001). This shows that project success is subjected to the particular stakeholder perspectives on it.

2.3 Success Means Different Things to Different Stakeholders: Perspectives on Project Success

As the previously stated definition of success implies, the stakeholders and their perspectives are of major importance to the achievement of an overall successful project. Some scholars even underline that the project has to be aligned with stakeholders in order to enable project success (Clarkson, 1995, p. 107; PMI, 2013, p. 32). As Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 699) note, “different dimensions mean different things to different stakeholders at different times and for different projects”. This illustrates the fact that the many stakeholders involved in a project have distinct expectations in it, perceive success differently and evaluate project success according to different SC (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; McLeod et al., 2012, p. 82; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 212; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; PMI, 2013, p. 30; Shenhar et al., 2001, p.699; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 91; Winch, 2007, p. 288).

In literature stakeholders are commonly referred to as parties that have an interest, share or claim in a project (Clarkson, 1995, p. 106; Cleland, 1998, p. 55 cited in Winch, 2007, p. 272; PMI, 2013, p. 30). The fact that stakeholders might not have a legitimate claim in a project, but merely one from the moral or their assumed viewpoint is highlighted (Clarkson, 1995, p. 106; Cleland, 1998, p. 55 cited in Winch, 2007, p. 272). Generally speaking, a stakeholder is “an individual, group, or organization who may affect, be affected by, or perceive itself to be affected by a decision, activity, or outcome of a project” (PMI, 2013, p. 30). As this definition implies, parties that have the same interest or expectation in a project can be grouped together and subsequently form a group of stakeholders (Wagner-Mainardes et al., 2012, p. 1863). Moreover, among the elaborate list of stakeholders involved in a project, the key stakeholders - thus, the ones that have a major impact on the project - have to be extracted. By doing so, the project team is able to improve the usage of efforts and resources required for interaction with other stakeholders (PMI, 2013, p. 31; Wateridge, 1998, p. 63; Wagner-Mainardes et al., 2012, p. 1875). Both the identification of stakeholders involved as well was the selection of the
ones influencing the project the most can be considered as crucial for a successful project (PMI, 2013, p. 31).

Turner & Zolin (2012, p. 91) distinguish between eight key stakeholders that are involved in a project. They evaluate project success differently from each other, but have the same expectations within one group. These stakeholders are (1) investor or owner, (2) project execution or project sponsor, and (3) consumer. Additionally, (4) operators or users, (5) project manager and project team, (6) senior supplier for design and management are stated. Eventually, (7) other suppliers for services and materials and (8) the public are stakeholders (Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 91). This approach is contrasted by the PMI (2013, p. 32-33) that identifies seven central stakeholders influencing a project, namely (1) sponsor, (2) customers and users, and (3) sellers, (4) business partners, (5) organizational groups, (6) functional managers as well as (7) other stakeholder such as financial and governmental institutions or consultants. Additionally, it has to be pointed out that the PMI does not explicitly include the project manager and the project team to the list of stakeholders. Rationale may be the fact that the institute takes the project team’s point of view. Consequently, (8) project manager and project team can be added to the list above. As it becomes visible, intersections between Turner & Zolin (2012) and PMI (2013) merely exist among the sponsors and consumers as well as further business partners, project managers and project team members. However, even these are stated otherwise or are referred to in a broader or narrower way. Some researchers broadly categorize the key stakeholders involved in a project into two groups, allocating specific parties to these two categories. According to this approach, Winch (2007, p. 273) refers to internal and external stakeholders, whereas Clarkson (1995, p. 106) sorts stakeholders into official contractual relationships and non-contractual relationships. By doing so, Winch (2007, p. 273) groups clients, sponsors, financiers and additional client’s stakeholders to internal stakeholders just as consultants, contractors, suppliers and employees of the previous mentioned groups. Local residents and landowners, environmental groups, governments and regulating institutes are classified as external stakeholders (Winch, 2007, p. 273). The official contractual relationships stated by Clarkson (1995, p. 106) include but are not limited to clients, suppliers and employees, in which non-contractual relationships are marked by governmental institutions and communities. Looking at the approach of Clarkson (1995), internal and external groups can be recognized again. Both categorizations, into internal and external stakeholders as well as the detailed list of parties involved, lead to the evaluation that these approaches are sufficient, despite the fact that the project team as well as the customers are neglected. However, reason for this may be the categorization of stakeholders from the viewpoint of the project team members.

Internal and external parties have an interest in a project. The expectations of these stakeholders can be mirrored in project goals or may not be expressed at all (McLeod et al., 2012, p. 72; PMI, 2013, p. 30). However, the particular expectations may not only vary from each other but may have a conflicting relation to each other. Accordingly, different perspectives on project success evolve and distinct SC are used to evaluate success (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; McLeod et al., 2012, p. 82; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 212; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; PMI, 2013, p. 30; Shenhar et al., 2001, p.699; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 91; Winch, 2007, p. 288). As a study undertaken by Fortune et al. (2011, p. 560) shows, the SC "meeting customer's requirements" is considered as the most important one for project managers, followed by meeting the timeframe and budget. Additionally, Bryde & Robinson (2005, p. 626-627) identify the fact that the satisfaction of other stakeholders’ needs is perceived as less crucial for contractors involved than it is
for the client. In turn, contractors focus on meeting the defined schedule and budget (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 626-627). Further on, Wateridge (1998, p. 62) draws the conclusion that project managers focus on short-term criteria, such as time and budget, when evaluating success. Contrary, senior managers consider long-term criteria that are directly related to the product for the evaluation. Moreover, the perspective on success also varies among the nationality of stakeholders. As a study implies, Asian stakeholders focus on the relationships, whereas Anglo-Saxon stakeholders usually refer back to meeting time, cost and quality criteria (Wang & Huang, 2006 cited in Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 300). Furthermore, Malfas et al. (2005, p. 217) point out that commercial institutions expect a project to maximize profits, whereas governmental institutions have an interest in benefits ranging from the political perspective to the social and economic one. According to McLeod et al. (2012, p. 82), the choice of relevant SC is based on the expectations the stakeholders have in the project, supplemented by the established SC used in previous projects. The selected SC are then used by stakeholders at different points in time in order to judge the project. This leads to the fact that a project is continuously evaluated by the stakeholders involved (McLeod et al., 2012, p. 82). As a study of Müller & Jugdev (2012, p. 765) shows, not only stakeholders in general, but also project managers themselves perceive different SC as crucial for project success, depending on the type of project and the kind of industry. Nevertheless, in order to achieve overall project success, the different perspectives and the distinct SC used by the stakeholders involved need to be aligned. Consequently, both aspects have to be considered right from a project’s starting point (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627). However, this is aggravated by large projects, due to the many stakeholders involved, who in turn evaluate a project at different points in time, both during and after project execution (Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 87). In this respect, Getz (2008, p. 407) points out that stakeholders engaged in large events have different goals they want to achieve by the project. Subsequently, different expectations are involved. One of the key stakeholders in large events are the DMOs of a host destination, which are further discussed in the following chapter.

2.4 DMOs as Key Stakeholders of Large Events

In a project, multiple stakeholders are involved whose expectations have to be taken into account by the project team members. Stakeholders for large events can be considered from both the demand as well as the supply side. In this respect, tourists and event participants are examples for stakeholders on the demand side, whereas one of the key stakeholders for large events on the supply side are the destination marketing/management organizations (DMOs) of a host destination (Getz, 2008, p. 406).

As the name implies, a DMO can be described as a permanent tourism organization that “promotes tourism to a destination” (Getz, 2008, p. 406; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 937). Concerning this definition, a destination can be a city, a region or a country, whereas tourism includes both the business travel market and the leisure travel market (Getz, 2008, p. 406). In order to market a destination, a DMO is responsible for building collaborations among (potential) tourists and tourism service providers, respond to an existing demand and promote products to target markets as well as make decisions on the marketing strategy (WTO, 2004 cited in Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 81). By marketing a destination to tourism, the image and attractiveness of an area are improved. In addition, the destination’s development is enhanced, which in turn attracts more businesses and draws funding for further improvements (Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 81). Large events support DMOs in promoting a destination, attracting tourists and creating a positive image for the destination (Getz, 2008, p. 406; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222). Once a destination hosts a large
event, the DMOs are usually responsible to market the destination to the target markets by including the event in the marketing activities (Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 937).

To clarify what makes DMOs key stakeholders in a large event, the impact an event can have on a host destination is taken into account. A destination is interested in hosting a large event because of multiple reasons. First of all, a large event can support destinations to “attract tourists, to serve as a catalyst, to foster a positive destination image, to contribute to general place marketing and to animate specific attractions” (Getz, 2008, p. 405-406). The attraction of additional tourists is of special interest during the low seasons (Getz, 2008, p. 405-406). This is supported by Jago et al. (2010, p. 222), underlining the effect large events have on the destination development and branding. As a research undertaken by Mills & Rosentraub (2013, p. 239) implies, hosting a large event generates an economic income for the host destination as well as the extended region. Hosting a large event also provides the destination with an increased awareness before, during and after an event’s happening. Additionally, it implies economic benefits, enables a destination to further develop the infrastructure and improves the labor situation in the particular city (Malfas et al., 2005, p. 218). However, some authors underline the fact that these beneficial impacts have to be considered carefully and require huge efforts to be achieved (Jago et al., 2010, p.233; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 238-239). In this regard, the financial benefits resulting from hosting large events tend to be overestimated. The established jobs are mainly part-time, volunteer based and only during the event’s happening and the actual local benefits tend to be smaller compared to the estimated ones. In addition, tourists that are interested in the particular destination, but not necessarily in the event, tend to visit a city at other times, because of the increased prices for accommodations and the crowds of tourists (Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 238-239). However, it has to be mentioned that an event also increases the interest in a destination to be visited at some other time (Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 238-239). In order to achieve a positive impact, the event needs to be included into a destination’s long-term strategy (Jago et al., 2010, p. 233; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936). In turn, in order to be part of the long-term strategy of a destination, the event has to be taken into consideration by the DMO. Reasons for this can be found in a study of Singh & Hu (2008). According to this study, a cooperation, or better an alignment, between the strategy of the DMO and the strategy of the large event result in an increased destination marketing and an enhanced number of visitors (Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936). Baker & Cameron (2008, p. 83) support this assessment. The researchers recognize both a cooperation between stakeholders and a development of a strategy to be crucial for success (Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 83). To achieve the beneficial impacts a large event can provide to a destination, the DMO needs to be included into the managerial activities and hence, considered as a key stakeholder of the event.

2.5 Summarizing Remarks

Due to congruent attributes, events can be regarded as a specification of projects. These overlapping characteristics become particularly visible by looking at the nature of events, namely being temporary and unique, having an impact on the host destination, involving risks and stakeholders as well as requiring resources and investments. Both projects and events aim to create a value and to develop a competitive advantage (Getz, 2008, p. 404, 414; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239). Further on, events can be categorized by their size. In this respect, central characteristics of large events are their complexity and their immense impact on the host destination. Moreover, the characterizing attributes of large events in particular are similar to the ones of events in general, differing in the extent or the volume of the attribute. Here, the requirement of major investments and resources as well as the high risks and uncertainties involved are typical attributes (Getz, 2008, p. 407;
Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Jaafari, 2007, p. 174; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239; Westerveld, 2003, p. 416). One of the key stakeholders for large events are the DMOs of the host destination, which are defined as permanent tourism organizations that market a destination to tourism (Getz, 2008, p. 406; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 937). Rationale behind DMOs being a key stakeholder are the major impact large events have on the host destination, such as an increased tourism demand, enhanced media attention and an improved destination development (Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 83; Getz, 2008, p. 405-406; Jago et al., 2010, p.233; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 218; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 238-239; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936).

In order to determine success, three particular points in time can be considered, namely short-, medium- and long-term success. At each date, a specific success concept can be evaluated. In this respect, project efficiency is considered in the short-term. The impact on the customer and on team as well as the business success are referred to in the medium-term. Eventually, the preparation for the future is considered in the long-term, while each of these success concepts is supplemented by further SC (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 26-28). The primary advantage of taking into account success dimensions, is that the most relevant SC are used at their respective points in time, while the project evaluation becomes a dynamic process (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 29). Considering the large scale picture is essential in order to evaluate a project, as the dimension are insufficient by themselves (Cooke-Davies, 2007, p. 246; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 714).

Despite the crucial role of DMOs to achieve the potential benefits provided by large events, little is known about the evaluation of success from the DMOs’ perspective. By examining the DMOs involved in particular large events the understanding of project evaluation from the MDOs’ perspective shall be increased.
3. Research Methodology

In order to minimize the bias of the researcher and to enhance the credibility of the study, a reflection on a potential preconceived notion is required (Cousin, 2005, p. 426). Moreover, to identify the pattern how the researcher formulated the research question and assumptions, the research philosophy needs to be presented (Saunders et. al., 2009, p. 107). Therefore, in this chapter the researcher’s preconception and the choice of subject are stated. Subsequently, the research philosophy and additional choices as part of the theoretical research methodology are discussed. Finally, the practical research methodology is presented in order to further increase the credibility of the research.

3.1 Researcher’s Preconception and Choice of Subject

The author of this study has a particularly strong interest in project management from a tourism perspective. Due to my undergraduate studies in Tourism Management with a specialization in destination management and several courses in event management, I have a profound understanding of this particular area. Moreover, my further studies in Strategic Project Management provide an adequate knowledge of the area of projects and hence, project success. It was of great importance to me, to combine the aspect of tourism with that of project management in my final thesis. Several field studies with DMOs in my Bachelor studies strengthened my interest in the field of destination management. Professional experience in planning and executing events for many occasions provided an in-depth insight and enhanced my interest in this area.

From personal experience, I am aware of the multiple stakeholders are involved in an event. In my opinion the key to success of large events lies, among others, in the hands of the host destination. Besides, the residents’ support is indispensable in order to provide hospitality and friendliness to the many visitors from abroad. I intend to find out, whether my picture is applicable and what the precise role of DMOs in hosting large events is. It is of great interest for me, how DMOs perceive large events, the potential they provide and the tremendous impact they have. Moreover, it has always been fascinating how large events like the Olympics can change a destination, a country or even part of the world during the time the event is actually taking place. It seems like large events bear the potential to let participants and observers forget about their situation, even in troubling times, and to bring the world closer together. Several times I have had the chance to observe how large events – sports competitions like the Olympics as well as traditional occasions like the Oktoberfest – brought cultures together, made people celebrate and brought joy to the people involved. It is of my concern to get to know how DMOs handle the great potential large events seem to bear. From my experience, marketing activities and particularly public relation (PR) has a great impact on the perception of a service or event, respectively. It is of great interest to me, whether the marketing and PR activities undertaken by the DMOs have a noteworthy influence on the perception of success or the actual success of large events. The academic background, the professional experience and the personal interest in DMOs were the primary reasons for me to choose a tourism viewpoint on the evaluation of large events as a specification of projects.

Despite my personal experiences and resulting opinions, emphasis was put on an unbiased research, material collection and analysis. In fact, I am open to new findings that might contribute to the practice as well as to academia. My decision to talk to experienced managers within the interviews as part of the research allowed me to reduce possible impacts my personal background might have previously had on the study. Due to my experience in this particular area, statements and expressions mentioned by the interview partners may be familiar and obvious to me. This may result in missing to ask follow-up
questions or to define specific terms (Saunders et al, 2009, p. 151). However, being aware of these aspects from the very beginning, minimizes the actual risk of it happening.

3.2 Philosophy
To recognize how the researcher came across the assumptions and formulated the research questions, the researcher’s ontological and epistemological stance needs to be illustrated. Therefore, the following research philosophy “relates to the development of knowledge and the nature of that knowledge” (Saunders et. al., 2009, p. 107) and explains how the researcher sees the world and the reality as well as how she got this knowledge.

3.2.1 Ontology
Ontology as part of the research philosophy takes the nature of reality as a social entity into account, whereat references to the researcher’s assumptions, commitments and perspectives are being made (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 22; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 110, 112). In my belief, there is not one single and exclusive true view on reality. I see organizations as a social entity. Rationale behind this is my understanding of organizations being a connection of people, who are constantly interacting with each other. I believe that people within a social entity have to collaborate with each other and support each other in order to fulfil the objective of a DMO, namely to promote a certain destination to tourists. As an example, a specific tool that is used to promote a destination to potential visitors is hosting an event. Due to people involved and an event being undertaken to achieve a certain goal, events can be considered as social phenomena. In turn, achieving this particular goal strongly depends on the success of the social phenomena, hence, the event. Additionally, I believe that people are essential and indispensable for achieving success. The efforts undertaken by the employees of the DMO as well as the support of the people living in a host destination are of great importance. Both are required in order to attract tourists and to provide a unique experience to participants, visitors and observers of a large event. Moreover, in my belief, success cannot merely be evaluated by numbers and hard facts, but by the individual and subjective perception of people involved. In order to increase the likelihood of achieving success in a large event, the collaboration and communication between people involved in general, and the DMOs in particular are fundamental. In my opinion, by being in a continuous exchange with others, people within the organization as well as people outside the organization contribute to large events and the project success. People, their perceptions and their opinions are in the focus of this study. Additionally, I believe that DMOs can generally be considered as stakeholders of large events, influencing and being influenced by events as social phenomena at the same time. This picture is similar to subjectivism, which reflects to social phenomena being “created from the perceptions and consequent actions of social actors” (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 111). Referring to this, in order to promote a destination to potential tourists people include social phenomena, or large events respectively, into a social concept. This supports my belief that DMOs have a general interest in their destination hosting large events, due to the major impacts these events have on a destination and the possibility to use them as a marketing tool. Saunders et al. (2009, p. 111) identify that social interactions are continuously observed, evaluated and revised by people. This assessment can be applied to large events that are followed by people outside and inside a DMO.

3.2.2 Epistemology
The second part forming the research philosophy is the epistemological stance of the researcher, which considers the applicable knowledge that exists in a specific field of research (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 16; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 110, 112). As aforementioned, DMOs are social concepts, since they are formed by social entities that
influence the success of large events. Thus, in order to understand how DMOs evaluate project success of large events, the success perception of the social entities involved needs to be understood and interpreted first. Therefore, to get to know the organizational perception of success, the individual level regarding success perception and influence on success needs to be recognized. By looking at success of large events from the perspective of people working in the DMO, the perspective of the DMO as such can be understood. This viewpoint is close to the position of interpretivism, which considers “subjective meanings and social phenomena” (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 119). In this regard, “the details of situation, a reality behind these details [and] subjective meanings motivating actions” are focused on and interpreted (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 119). For this study, this means that the subjective meanings of people working in a DMO are taken into account. These people describe their perception of success of large events as particular real-world examples and consequently, prove the reality that lies behind these perceptions.

3.3 Research Approach
This thesis shall provide an answer to the question of how DMOs evaluate project success of large events. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, a great range of literature on project success as such exists, however, little literature can be found on success of large events and hardly anything is known about the perspective of DMOs. This implies that project evaluation of large events from the perspective of DMOs is an under-researched area. Due to missing literature, a specified hypothesis that can then be rejected or supported by the empirical data gained cannot be phrased. Rather, sufficient data needs to be collected in order to theorize on the area of research and eventually, to compose new theoretical matters on the topic. Conducting a research in order to gain empirical material and to build a new theory from it is the description of the inductive research approach. The inductive research approach is typically mirrored by the deductive research approach, where the data gained is used to test existing theories (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 13-14; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 25; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 124-126). Thus, in this thesis, the inductive research approach is drawn on to theorize about the topic and hence, to compose new theoretical themes that can be used as a guideline by DMOs to evaluate project success of past, current or future large events. The choice of this particular research approach is supported by Saunders et al. (2009, p. 126), who advise the inductive research approach when the research topic is comparatively new and merely little literature exists. Providing findings that can be used as a guideline rather than generalizing on the area of research, advocates for the inductive approach as well (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 127). For certain aspects, it is referred back to existing theoretical understandings and matters, which reflects elements of a deductive approach. Nevertheless, overall an inductive research approach is followed.

Once an appropriate research approach is selected, further considerations regarding the research design can be made in a more informed manner, which in turn consists of the research method and research strategy (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 127).

3.4 Research Design
A research design can be described as a logical plan set up to get from the research question to conclusions (Yin, 2009, p. 26). In the following, the research design is examined, by taking the research methods and research strategy into account.

As the research question implies, this particular study examines how DMOs evaluate project success of large events. Therefore, this research can be considered as an exploratory one, as it is undertaken to find out “what is happening, to seek new insights [and] to ask questions […] in a new light” (Robson, 2002, p. 59 cited in Saunders et al.,
2009, p. 139). Moreover, in order to answer the research question, the qualitative approach is chosen. A qualitative research approach strongly focuses on non-numerical data described by words or pictures (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 28; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 151) and is contrasted by the quantitative approach taking into consideration numerical data (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 28; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 151). The choice of a qualitative approach is reinforced by the research philosophy as well as the research approach. Interpretivism and induction imply a usage of qualitative research methods, while interpretivism usually comes along with small samples and in-depth investigations (Bryman, 2012, p. 408; Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 28; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 119). As Bryman (2012, p. 408) underlines, considering the perspective of people is in the focus of a qualitative approach. As this particular research examines the perspective on project success by DMOs, which are formed by people, it supports the choice of a qualitative approach. In this regard, the structure of the research is determined by the concerns of the people in the DMOs (Bryman, 2012, p. 408). Due to people being in the center of the research and to increase the empirical material, a rather unstructured approach is required, which in turn supports the choice of a qualitative approach (Bryman, 2012, p. 408). Moreover, characterizing attributes of the qualitative approach reinforce it to be the appropriate one for this particular research. The emphasis on understanding rather than generalizing advocates the suitability of a qualitative approach, which is further supported by the focus on the meaning of the empirical material rather than people’s behavior. The consideration of social reality in natural environments instead of tendencies in established structures reinforce the choice of a qualitative approach (Bryman, 2012, p. 408, Saunders et al., 2009, p. 482).

In order to be able to answer the research question of this paper, the research strategy has to be chosen accordingly (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 141). Here, DMOs and the way they evaluate project success are investigated. In this respect, not only the phenomenon, ergo the event itself is examined, but strong attention is brought to the context, namely project success of large events as well. Picturing a phenomenon empirically and taking its practical context into account are typical characteristics of a case study (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 25; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 146, Yin, 2009, p. 18). This is further supplemented by a case study’s ambition to provide a better understanding of an area by exploring a certain phenomenon (Cousin, 2005, p. 421-422). From this follows that for this exploratory research, the case study strategy seems to be most appropriate. Rationale for this can be found in the fact that a case study strategy neither strongly controls the context - as it is in the experimental strategy - nor is the context restricted by the amount of themes to gain data for - as it is in the survey strategy (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 146). Moreover, an exploratory research implies the selection of a case study strategy as it takes the exploration and understanding of matters into account (Cousin, 2005, p. 426). Case studies are particularly appropriate, when the “boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009, p. 18). In this regard, neither the connection, nor the distinction between a DMO and the project success of large events are distinct. This reinforces the choice of a case study strategy. Further on, a multiple case study strategy is picked, also referred to as collective case study strategy. This particular research shows how things are among DMOs from a more representative, general perspective, considering the DMO as a whole, rather than examining the particular divisions or one specific DMO as such (Cousin, 2005, p. 422; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 27; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 146-147). A multiple case study strategy provides an improved foundation for the theoretical matters drawn from the empirical material and increases the research’s accuracy (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 27).
Within case studies, interviews are more frequently used as the primary data source as they enable the researcher to gain “rich, empirical data” in a proficient manner (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 28). In order to collect elaborate data within the multiple case studies in this research, semi-structured individual interviews were selected as part of a qualitative technique. Semi-structured interviews differ from in-depth interviews or structured interviews by the extent of structure and formality, as already indicated by the name (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). Therefore, semi-structured interviews are sorted by themes and questions, that are not strictly followed and that might differ among the interviews. This allows the interviewer to freely respond to the interview partner by referring to organizational specific contexts that may come along. In addition, it enables the interviewer to follow up in more detail on particular answers that seem valuable for the research (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). By doing so elaborate answers within the empirical material can be achieved, which makes this technique most appropriate for this particular research. Further on, the use of semi-structured interviews is also supported by interpretivism, since it is “concerned to understand the meanings that participants ascribe to various phenomena” (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 234). In order to understand mentioned meanings the semi-structured interviews seem to be most appropriate as follow-up questions are possible and detailed explanations may be asked for (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 324). Moreover, semi-structured interviews are advantageous for this research due to the following reasons. First, as a study of Saunders et al. (2009, p. 324) points out, potential respondents are more likely to participate in a study, when they can freely reflect on a topic they are interested or experienced in. In this regard, interviews are preferred over questionnaires. As an elaborate empirical material is required, this aspect is beneficial for the research as well. Second, interviews are most appropriate when the questions are open-ended and require elaborate explanations. Since both aspects are valid for this research, it further supports the choice of semi-structured interviews in this particular research. The interview guide that comes along with a semi-structured interview reminds the researcher of the interview’s overall purpose and a shift in content can be avoided (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 329).

Before an introduction of the practical approaches within the case study strategy are introduced, the selection of sources presented in this paper is critically discussed.

3.5 Source Criticism
In order to find relevant articles on the topic of project success, the search engine provided by the library of Umeå University was used. This grants access to trustworthy data bases (e.g. Business Source Premier), where academic articles of business journals can be found. Within the search engine, several key search words were used, related to the area of projects, events and DMOs in general as well as project success, success criteria, large events, event evaluation and destination marketing in particular. Concerning this matter, different combinations of the particular words were inserted in the search engine. By using the specific terms as well as umbrella terms, general areas of relevance and specific aspects of interest as well as developing contexts are considered. In this regard, project and project success can be considered to be general areas of relevance, whereupon events as large projects and success of large events are part of specific aspects of interest. In turn, success evaluation of large events is a developing context, as it is a combination of general and specific aspects of relevance. Moreover, due to the different combinations and particular key words, further literature that may not be directly related to the topic but is applicable to it can be gained as developing contexts. Additionally, the search included but was not strictly limited to the context of economics, tourism and business administration in order to enable a broader insight into the area of project success. However, as aforesaid, developing contexts were considered as well, if they were
applicable to this particular research. Subsequently, the great variety of search results was narrowed down to the most relevant articles, in order to get significant findings that support the field of study best. Especially the relevance and value of literature were taken into consideration, following the checklist established by Saunders et al. (2009, p. 93). Referring to the recency of an item on the checklist, merely articles published between the 1980s and the year 2013 were included. Rationale for this timeframe is to include the elementary findings in the beginning of project success in the 1980s as well as to show the topics development by referring to most recent and up-to-date publications. By focusing on the latest publications, the validity and relevance of the findings for this particular research are enhanced. Reason behind this is the consideration of possible environmental impacts on the topic. Moreover, attention was brought to the credibility of the articles. This is implied by the checklist of Saunders et al. (2009, p. 93), asking if the item is likely to be peer-reviewed. Only articles published in trustworthy academic journals that were peer-reviewed were further considered. One of the articles was not published in the printed version of the journal yet (Mir & Pinnington, 2013: “Article in Press”). To enhance the relevance of a publication for this paper, attention was brought to the research questions of a publication and whether it is somehow close to the one of this research. This is supported by the checklist of Saunders et al. (2009, p. 93), asking if the research questions is close to the own. Literature referred to by other well-known, acknowledged scholars was implemented to ensure the relevance and significance of the sources used. On the checklist this is advised by Saunders et al. (2009, p. 93), asking whether the references of an item were recognized in other articles. Moreover, attention was brought to the methodology of the literature in order to ensure the sufficiency and value of the publication’s findings (referring to the checklist of Saunders et al., 2009, p. 93).

Despite the aforementioned focus on academic research, the latest edition of the PMBOK, a guideline developed by the PMI, is a source in the thesis as well. As the PMI is an association of practitioners of project management, the practical insights given by the institute are considered to be relevant as well. The in-field experience and practice-based recommendations given by the association allow a broad overview on the area of project management that can be applied to specific circumstances as well. In addition, the PMBOK fulfills certain criteria mentioned in the checklist of Saunders et al. (2009, p. 93).

3.6 Case Selection Criteria
In order to find cases that can be considered in this study, a brainstorming technique was applied in the first step. By doing so, a wide variety of large events that take place all over the world were recognized. From this elaborate list of large events, the second step was implemented, namely the comparison of the numerous events with the specified selection criteria. Hereby it was identified, whether the pre-selected cases fit into the study and enhance its trustworthiness. The applied selection criteria are introduced in the following.

Due to this study focusing on large events, exclusively events that fulfill the characteristics of such are taken into consideration. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, the characteristics of large events can be summarized by (1) complexity, (2) huge impact on the host destination, (3) clear restrictions (4) requirement of major investments and resources (5) purpose to fulfil an existing need, (6) exposure to the public, to politics and regulations, (7) involvement of multiple stakeholders (8) being influenced by communities and vice versa (9) high risks and uncertainties. Only, if an event fulfills these nine characteristics, it is considered to be large and hence, legitimate to be selected to participate in the study. Moreover, only large events that took place in
the recent years, thus, between 2009 and 2013 are taken into consideration. This timeframe underlines that events must be rather close to each other in temporal terms. Rationale behind this is the fact that temporally remote events might not be comparable, due to differences in their economic situation, for example the worldwide economic crisis starting in 2009, and distinctions in the technical development, for instance the recent use of social media as a communication platform. By comparing events that are marked by distinct circumstances, a distorted result might be gained and difficulties in comparison might arise. Further on, large events that took place far in the past might aggravate the selection of interview partners. Due to staff turnover and resignations, employees that were responsible for an event might not work for an organization anymore. To overcome mentioned limitations, merely events that took place in the recent five years are considered. Further on, in order to compare the results, the destinations where the event took place are required to be contrastable as well. Thus, the destinations as well as the countries hosting an event are required to have a similar level in the economic, technical, environmental and social perspective. Therefore, merely hosting destinations that are located in the European or North American area are legitimate to participate in the research. As aforementioned, three types of events, namely sports competitions, cultural events and commercial happenings, can be identified (Getz, 2008, p. 404; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210). To provide an elaborate insight and a variety of cases, each type of event is represented within at least one case and included in this research.

Once the cases that can be used for the study were specified, the DMOs that were involved or have an interest in these events were searched for online. By doing so, it also became apparent, whether a host destination was directly involved in an event and what the precise characteristics of the event were. According to Saunders et al. (2009, p. 241) selecting cases by following this approach is considered as a ‘self-selection technique’, as particular DMOs are asked to participate and empirical material is gained from those who follow the request. Once suitable cases were identified, appropriate respondents that can be interviewed on the events needed to be recognized. In order to so, selection criteria were used once again.

### 3.7 Respondent Selection Criteria

To find an interview partner with a detailed knowledge on the DMO and the event, ergo on general processes, the organization itself and the evaluation of the event, several selection criteria were taken into further consideration.

First of all, the interview partner needed to work for a DMO that fulfills the characterizing definition stated above. Further, the interview partner was required to have a suitable position in the middle or top management, to ensure that significant information can be provided and the respondent has an elaborate knowledge on the topic. In this respect, a suitable position is mainly described by the respondent’s responsibilities. The interview partner is required to be authorized to make choices that influence the business of the organization. The (potential) respondent needs to have tasks that include aspects of controlling and leading. Eventually, being in charge of tasks that can be related to the examined event as well as tasks that have an influence on or that are influenced by the event are elementary for a respondent’s selection. Further on, the years of employment were significant in the selection process. Concerning this matter, the interview partners were required to have already worked for the DMO when the event actually took place and in a position as defined before. By doing so, it was ensured that the respondent was part of or at least was aware of the event’s preparations, the event itself as well as its evaluation after completion. Eventually, due to the nature of qualitative interviews, the
respondent had to be willing to participate in the research and to provide honest answers to the questions asked.

The contacting of the respondents, the preparation, construction and execution of the interview itself as well as the follow-up analysis, truth criteria, and the research ethics are explained in the following.

3.8 Respondent Contacting
Once suitable cases were defined, possible interview partners needed to be identified. In order to do so, the DMO of the event’s host destination was recognized and contact information was searched for online. In some cases, a detailed list of employees, their accountable departments, their tasks and responsibilities as well as their contact information were listed on the DMOs webpage, whereas in other cases merely the general e-mail address for organizational information was stated. In the first case, a suitable employee was selected by the criteria stated above and an e-mail was sent directly to the respective employee. If no elaborate information was provided on the organization’s webpage, a general request was sent to the information e-mail address, asking for it to be forwarded to the employee that is familiarized with the topic. In both cases, the e-mail sent included background information on the study and the precise research question as well as the request for an interview appointment. The further use of given material was indicated and an assurance to provide the findings of the research to the respondent was given (E-Mail request in appendix one). Moreover, an interview guide including the themes was offered to be sent to the respondents and, eventually, was distributed to the interview partners in most cases (Interview guide in appendix two).

In total, 54 interview requests were sent out via e-mail, whereat another reminding e-mail followed. Eventually, eight agreed to conduct an interview, while twelve rejected their participation in the research due to a shortage in time, missing information or organizational regulations. Nevertheless, several requests were not answered or responded to at all. A possible explanation for this rather low response rate might be the fact that the research was undertaken to the largest part in December. This is one of the busiest month of the year, due to the year-end closing where several tasks and organizational responsibilities have to be finalized. Additionally, the month December is marked by less labor days, because of Christmas holidays and New Year’s. Moreover, as also mentioned among the denials, some of the non-responses might also be reasoned with a lack of information on the topic. Organizational limitations regarding participation in studies and strict regulations on sharing valuable data might be reasons as well.

3.9 Interview Construction
Once the respondents agreed on participating in the study, interview appointments were set via e-mail. Setting an appointment allows the interview partners to prepare for the talk and to reserve a timeslot in the respondent’s schedule in order to ensure the questions to be answered qualitatively and without distractions or haste. In this regard, possible interview dates were either suggested to the interview partners or proposed by them or their assistants, respectively. Attention was brought to the fact that every interview had an approximate timeframe of two hours. Even though the duration of the interview was expected to be approximately thirty minutes, additional time for possible delays in contacting or for an extension of the talk itself was considered. Furthermore, time for an introduction of the researcher and for an adequate preparation before the interview takes place as well as time to summarize it after completion from the researcher’s standing point was scheduled. In most cases the scheduled dates and appointments were kept,
however, almost every interview exceeded the estimated interview duration of thirty minutes.

Due to the physical distance between the researcher and the interview partners as well as to avoid distractions from the surrounding, the interviews were scheduled to be held on the phone instead of face-to-face or video-calls. Further reasons for this choice are to enable the interview partners to be in a place where they are comfortable to give the interview. The phone interview also allows the researcher to focus on the verbal statements rather than including possible nonverbal meanings given by gesture and facial expressions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 329, 349). In order to ensure the results’ comparability, also the interviews with respondents close to the researcher’s residence were conducted via phone. Nevertheless, due to temporal restrictions and required adjustments with the director, both from the DMO’s angle, one respondent asked to undertake the interview via e-mail. Since the case was considered to be relevant for the thesis, the empirical material was collected via e-mail. The interview guide was sent to the respondent who then answered each question in bullet points. By conducting the interview in this way, it was neither possible to ask for elaborate descriptions and practical examples, nor to ask follow up questions evolving from the context. As it can be recognized from the empirical material presented in the later chapter, the answers provided by this respondent are therefore significantly shorter.

3.9.1 Interview Guide
Prior to the appointment the interview guide structured by themes was sent to the respondents. In one specific case, following the organization’s request, the overview of interview themes was sent to the assisting office. Subsequently, the latter contacted the manager, who is most familiar with the area of research, and an appointment was set accordingly. In certain other cases, the overview of interview themes was requested by the contacted person even prior to an agreement to the interview, to ensure that the questions can be answered adequately in the first place. In the one particular case where the interview was requested to be given via e-mail, the interview guide was sent and the answers provided were directly related to each of the themes. Rationale behind providing the overview of interview themes prior to the interview itself, is to ensure that respondents are properly prepared for the interview, confident with the area of research and know what to expect. Further on, by sending the overview of interview themes prior to the interview, respondents had the possibility to decide whether they were capable of answering the questions based on either their knowledge or organizational restrictions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 328).

As aforementioned, this thesis follows the inductive approach, while partially deductive elements can be recognized. A particular deductive element is the fact that the themes for the interview guide were to the largest part developed by considering the theoretical approaches. Moreover, the particular themes were sorted and aligned in a logical order. Specific terms and expressions of the research area were avoided to a large extent in order to make the interview guide comprehensive for the interview partners (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 239). As it can be seen in appendix two, the interview guide that was sent out to the respondents in advance and which was used for the interview itself, is structured by eight themes. Starting with (1) background information on the event, the DMO and interview partner allows the researcher to be ‘on the same page’ with the respondent. Further, it ensures once again that the event and the interview partner meet the previously identified selection criteria. Moreover, as the name already implies, it provides useful background information that allow a better insight into the case to be examined. Besides, the risk of being biased in regard to the event or the DMO can be overcome (Saunders et
al., 2009, p. 332). The second theme, (2) perception of success, indicates practical examples how success is perceived by the DMO and/or how the success of the event can be recognized in the destination. Additionally, the themes revolving around (3) the elements of success, where CSF and SC are examined, (4) the different perspectives on success within the DMO, (5) the dimension of time and eventually, (6) the stakeholders of the event are included in the guide. These themes follow the aspects discussed in the theoretical framework. As these particular aspects are important parts of project success, they are considered to be crucial in order to not only get to know, but rather to understand how DMOs evaluate project success of large events. Moreover, as the theoretical framework indicates, each of these aspects is connected with each other. Further on, (7) challenges in the event in general and in the evaluation of project success in detail are discussed. The consideration of challenges DMOs face within the particular event and its evaluation supports the development of a guideline and suitable recommendations for past, current and future host destinations of large events. Eventually, (8) final remarks allow the respondent to add statements that have not previously been covered but seem important to discuss. In turn, this enables the researcher to get to know aspects that were not considered in the beginning. It also allows the interview partner to add specific statements that he/she believes to be relevant.

Fitting the selection criteria presented above, eight interviews were conducted, while each of them is representing a different large event and a distinct DMO. The following table summarizes the interview partners, structured by the date the interview took place. A shortage is allocated to each respondent, stating the function and the DMO, the related event and the date when the interview was conducted as well as its duration and the language it was held in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>DMO</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; PR Manager</td>
<td>Tourismusverband Linz</td>
<td>Linz Capital of Culture 2009</td>
<td>Monday, 02.12.2013 at 11.15h</td>
<td>00:47 h</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Project Manager Cross Sectional Marketing</td>
<td>Hamburg Marketing</td>
<td>International Garden Expedition 2013</td>
<td>Wednesday, 04.12.2013 at 11.00h</td>
<td>00:42 h</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Head of Marketing Communications</td>
<td>Vancouver Tourism</td>
<td>Vancouver Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games 2010</td>
<td>Wednesday, 04.12.2013 at 17.00h</td>
<td>00:50 h</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Kultuurikatel Tallinn</td>
<td>Tallinn Capital of Culture 2011</td>
<td>Thursday, 05.12.2013 at 10.30h</td>
<td>00:28 h</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Head of Event Marketing</td>
<td>Hamburg Tourism</td>
<td>Hamburg Cruise Days 2012</td>
<td>Wednesday, 11.12.2013 at 12h</td>
<td>00:37 h</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Director Trade &amp; Media Relations</td>
<td>Munich Tourism</td>
<td>Oktoberfest 2013</td>
<td>Thursday, 12.12.2013 at 08.30h</td>
<td>00:21 h</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Head of Research &amp; Insight</td>
<td>Visit England</td>
<td>London Olympic and Paralympic Summer Games 2012</td>
<td>Friday, 13.12.2013 at 12h</td>
<td>00:38 h</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>International Marketing Manager</td>
<td>Kosice Tourism</td>
<td>Kosice Capital of Culture 2013</td>
<td>Answers sent per e-mail</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Overview of interview partners

3.9.2 Limitations of Examined Cases
A study indicated that depending on their cultural background, stakeholders perceive success differently (Wang & Huang, 2006 cited in Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 300). This indicates that also within Europe, stakeholders might perceive success differently due to
cultural reasons. Nevertheless, as the previously stated table indicates, merely cases from central and Eastern Europe are considered in this research, while the southern European area is neglected. Due to cultural differences among the destinations, the evaluation of project success might be different as well, which is a limitation of the examined cases. Moreover, even though all cases examined fulfill the characteristics of large events, differences in the extent of these characterizing attributes can still be recognized. For example both the Olympics and the Hamburg Cruise Days have many stakeholders involved and require major investments. However, it can be assumed that more stakeholders are involved in and larger investments are required for the Olympics, partially due to the stronger worldwide recognition and the historical development. These differences can even be recognized between the Summer Olympics and the Winter Olympics. Nevertheless, since all cases suit the prior established selection criteria they are considered to be comparable despite their differences. In fact, these differences contribute positively to an elaborateness and broadness of this research.

3.10 Process of Interviews

After the appointments were set and the interview guides were sent, the respondents were contacted over the phone. In order to minimize uncertainties and doubts from the respondents’ viewpoint and hence, to increase the credibility of the interview, the purpose of the research and the structure of the interview were briefly explained to the interview partners (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 331-332). This was considered of great importance, because the interview was held over the phone, resulting in limitations in establishing trust. However, these limitations were minimized by explaining the circumstances elaborately and ensuring the respondents a careful and respectful usage of the material (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 349). Moreover, it was repeated, that no names are stated, merely the respondents’ positions and the organizational names are listed. Eventually, the interview partners were asked for approval to audio-record the interview. Even though hand-written notes were taken during the interview progress, audio-recording was considered to be a suitable appliance. Rationales are to ensure that everything was understood accordingly and unbiased, to enable the implementation of exact quotations and to listen to the interview again if note taking was not sufficient (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 341). The acceptance for audio-recording was provided for all interviews undertaken and started right away. Attention was brought to the language the interview was supposed to be held in, referring to practical contexts and avoiding theoretical terms and expressions. Moreover, the researcher focused on listening to the descriptions and explanations provided by the interview partners (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 333-334). The tone of the interview partners’ voice did neither indicate stressfulness, nor insecurity or haste. Instead, the respondents seemed to be very confident with the topic and took their time to answer all questions, describe the situations and further elaborate on their statements. Last, both the notes and the records were used to compose the interview summary right after the interview took place to avoid a potential loss of information. In the summaries, the information and statements provided by the respondents were written down in detail, complemented with quotations. Subsequently, the summary was sent to the respondents to ensure that everything was understood accordingly and accurate. It was then reviewed by the respondents, while changes were undertaken and suggestions were given in some cases. These changes and suggestions, however, were not about the accuracy. Instead, modifications were related to the context, more careful formulations and more elaborate descriptions. Once the changes and comments were implemented, the summary was approved by the respondents. Eventually, the written summary of the interviews was adjusted and included in the findings as the empirical material. When the
interview was undertaken in German, the summary was translated into English in all conscience, before implementing it into the empirical findings.

As it can be recognized from the table pictured earlier, four interviews were held in English, whereas four interviews were undertaken in German. The latter is the researcher’s mother tongue and does not bear any challenges. Also in the interview held in English neither difficulties in understanding the respondents, nor limitations in further implementing the empirical material were faced. Once the interview summaries were approved, the German ones were translated into English as close to their original meaning as possible. Nevertheless, particular living expressions and metaphors stated in German needed to be excluded to some extent, as suitable translations in English do not exist. Due to a potential risk of losing the concreteness and purity of the statements by rephrasing them, the empirical material presented in the later chapter is partially supplemented by certain quotations in German as the original language. Therefore, the bi-lingual interview conduction does neither have a negative impact on the research in general, nor on its trustworthiness or credibility.

### 3.11 Process of Analysis

In general, researches that follow a qualitative approach are likely to undertake the collection of the empirical material simultaneously to the analysis (Cousin, 2005, p. 425; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 485). The rich and elaborate empirical material that is gained from qualitative interviews implies the process of the analysis. Since the empirical material is not standardized, the findings need to be categorized in order to enable a significant and reflexive analysis (Cousin, 2005, p. 425; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 482). Concerning this matter, a template analysis is followed as an inductive based procedure to examine the empirical material. In order to do so, Saunders et al. (2009, p. 505) suggest to use “a list of […] categories that represent the themes revealed from the data that have been collected” for the analysis. By taking their central statements into account, the themes of the interview guide are allocated to the particular sub-purposes of this thesis. The sub-purposes therefore illustrate the categories of the template, being complemented by additional sub-categories. These are in turn based on the themes of the interview guide and the answers of the respondents. Central attributes of the template approach are its flexibility to adjust it to the occurring requirements as well as the possibility to present hierarchical relationships. Categories and hierarchies within the template can be revised along the process of analysis, until the empirical finding is inspected significantly (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 507). Since little is known in this area of research, these characteristics support the choice of this particular analysis procedure. Nevertheless, this approach lacks in illustrating relationships and dependencies as well as in presenting visual networks. Due to the nature of the research question, these aspects are considered to be less relevant for this particular study and may thus be neglected. In fact, the template analysis overcomes limitations identified in other approaches. In this regard, unlike the analytical analysis, the template approach requires less temporal and resource-related efforts. Additionally, it overcomes the threat of lacking in adequate explanations to understand the research area by not considering the specified procedure well enough, as it is in the analysis procedure of grounded theory (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 508-509). Partially, specific quotations are stated within the presentation of the empirical material as well as the analysis. As aforesaid, these may be listed in their original language to some extent, in order to keep the initial meaning, for example, when no suitable, equivalent English metaphors exist. Moreover, direct quotations are given when they are considered to be of great relevance to the topic and significantly express what the respondent wanted to say in the first place.
Within the analysis, three central categories are developed, which are based on the sub-purposes of the thesis stated in the introduction. Following, empirical findings are allocated to these categories, resulting in possible revisions, relocations and changes of the categories as such and their hierarchical structure, based on their importance and relevance. Finally, the analyzed findings will be compared to existing theoretical matters, in order to enhance the understanding (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 503). The selection of existing theoretical matters is based on assumptions regarding their appropriateness (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 159). In order to minimize negative impacts of theoretical matters on the conclusion, both, existing theories and the literature they are published in are considered carefully and examined thoroughly, as already stated before. This in turn enhances the credibility of this research. The credibility of this thesis is further discussed within the truth criteria that are illustrated in the following.

3.12 Truth criteria
Choosing semi-structured interviews may have particular impacts on the quality of the empirical material gained. In this regard, attention has to be drawn to the transferability and reliability of the findings (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 40; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 326).

In order to increase the quality and the credibility of this research, both aspects are taken into further consideration. Transferability and reliability are focused on within the truth criteria, as they are considered to be the most suitable ones. In fact, validity can be neglected here, since no causal relationships and dependencies are examined in this thesis.

3.12.1 Transferability
Due to the fact that projects are unique and that “one size does not fit all” (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 704), the findings gained in this research may not be “equally applicable to other research settings” in general, as it would be within a generalizing study (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 158). However, this research does not have the ambition to generalize on the evaluation of project success as such in the first place, which in turn increases its credibility (Cousin, 2005, p. 426). Rather, the findings allow to theorize on the subject and to conclude theorizing matters. These can be implemented by the DMOs of present, current and future host destinations as a guideline to evaluate project success of large events. Nevertheless, as explained by Lukka & Kasanen (1995), different types of generalization exist. One of these types is the descriptive model of generalization, which tries “‘to show how things are’ in a problem field” (Lukka & Kasanen, 1995, p. 72). This specific type of generalization seems to be suitable for this research. By implementing a case study strategy different DMOs are examined in order to show ‘how things are’ for distinct large events. The findings further represent a descriptive model of generalization that “shows how things are […] and […] that people can learn from” (Lukka & Kasanen, 1995, p. 72) and that can eventually be transferred to other DMOs to evaluate project success of large events.

3.12.2 Reliability
In order to enhance the reliability of the research, four possible threats to reliability were taken into account (Robson, 2002 cited in Saunders et al., 2009, p. 156). In this regard, the “participant error” was minimized by scheduling the interviews at times that are convenient to the respondents. Moreover, the “participant bias” was reduced by interviewing people in managerial positions, by sending the interview guide in advance and by not mentioning names in this particular paper but allocating numerical codes. The “observer error” was overcome by developing a semi-structured interview guide. Eventually, the “observer bias” was lessened by supplementing note taking by the audio-recording as well as by asking for the approval of the interview summary by the respondents (based on Robson, 2002 cited in Saunders et al., 2009, p. 156). As great
attention is brought to each of the four threats to reliability, these threats are minimized to a great extent, increasing the overall reliability of the study.

3.13 Research Ethics

According to Saunders et al. (2009, p. 183-184), research ethics can be defined as “the appropriateness of the researcher’s behavior in relation to the rights of those who become the subject of a research project”. In this regard, attention was brought to central issues, namely the privacy of (potential) respondents, their volunteering agreement to participate and the confidentiality of the empirical material. In addition, the respondents’ reaction regarding undertaking the interviews and the impact the analysis might have on them were taken into consideration. Eventually, the behavior of the researcher was adjusted accordingly (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 185-186). These central issues are elaborated in the following. Within the interview, the respondents were asked whether their personal background may be published along with the name of the DMO, pointing out that their own name will not be stated. By doing so, the privacy of the participants is ensured and their approval is obtained. The request for an interview given via e-mail as well as the realization of the interviews after sending a written agreement to do so both support the voluntary participation of the respondents. Providing a written summary for accuracy and asking for approval to publish the empirical material, advocate for the confidentiality of the empirical material collected. Therefore, merely statements, quotations and descriptions that are cleared to release are actually presented. Great attention was brought to the contact with the respondent, the handling of the interviews, and the analysis of the empirical material, where embarrassment, stress and discomfort were strongly avoided. To do so, for example a detailed introduction of the interview process was given, the free selection of an interview date was offered and the interviews were undertaken over the phone. In addition, not stating the respondents’ name but anonymized shortages in the analysis supports this aspect. The researcher always acted polite and used a suitable, adequate language.
4. Presentation of empirical material

Following the research method described in the previous chapter, eight interviews were conducted, which are presented in the following.

4.1 Introduction of Interview Partners

As the table in chapter 3 already pictures, eight interviews were conducted, while each respondent represents another DMO as a key stakeholder of a certain large event. In the following, background information on the respondents, the DMOs and the relating large events are stated, as provided by the interview partners. The brief descriptions are structured by the particular large event and sorted by the date the interview took place.

The table below summarizes the shortages used for the respondents, events and DMOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Shortage</th>
<th>DMO</th>
<th>Shortage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1  Linz Capital of Culture 2009</td>
<td>Linz09</td>
<td>Tourismusverband Linz</td>
<td>TBLinz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2  International Garden Expedition 2013</td>
<td>IGE</td>
<td>Hamburg Marketing</td>
<td>HM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3  Vancouver Olympic and Paralympic Winter</td>
<td>Olympics /</td>
<td>Tourism Vancouver</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games 2010</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4  Tallinn Capital of Culture 2011</td>
<td>Tallinn11</td>
<td>Kultuurikatel Tallinn</td>
<td>KT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5  Hamburg Cruise Days 2012</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>Hamburg Tourism</td>
<td>HHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6  Oktoberfest 2013</td>
<td>Oktoberfest</td>
<td>Munich Tourism</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7  London Olympic and Paralympic Summer</td>
<td>Olympics /</td>
<td>Visit England</td>
<td>VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games 2012</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8  Kosice Capital of Culture 2013</td>
<td>Kosice2013</td>
<td>Kosice Tourism Board</td>
<td>KTB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Shortages for respondents, events and DMOs

4.1.1 Tourism Board Linz

The primary task of the Tourism Board Linz (TBLinz) is to promote the city Linz as a travel destination to the specified target markets. Businesses of certain industrial sectors in Linz provide financial contributions to TBLinz that are supplemented by the local visitor tax. In return, TBLinz undertakes tourism marketing for its members and can therefore be named a marketing organization. Around 23 employees are working for TBLinz. The tourism marketing is categorized into four task areas, namely promotion, meeting and convention service, press and media relation as well as marketing activities. The area of promotion is marked by the cooperation with tour operators and handling the requests of group travelling. In both cases, TBLinz acts as a negotiator between service providers (e.g. hotels, gastronomy) and operators, providing consultancy and recommendations. The tasks of the meeting and convention service are the acquisition of such, consultancy and the interposition between service providers and operators. Press and media relation takes the consultation of journalists into account as well as the support of journalists visiting Linz and the organization of press trips. Specific marketing activities include but are not limited to the development and distribution of tourism information brochures. R1 has been working for TBLinz since January 2005 and is responsible for marketing and press relations. During Linz09, R1 was acting as a connection between the purpose-founded company for Linz09 and tourism in Linz as such.

4.1.2 Hamburg Marketing

Hamburg Marketing (HM) is an organization that pursues marketing for the city Hamburg. HM has two objectives, namely to increase the international and national brand awareness of Hamburg and to present the attractiveness of Hamburg. In order to do so, a broad sphere of influence is aimed, hence, reaching tourists and businesses as well as investors and the general public. Consequently, the central task of HM is to increase the recognition of the city whereon subsidiary companies can build. HM takes care of the
foundational marketing strategy as well as the cross-sectional marketing, while the three subsidiary companies are particularly responsible for tourism, business development and conventions. The planning and execution of the international garden expedition 2013 (IGE) was undertaken by a purpose founded company, where HM was not directly involved. The event was rather used by HM for cross-sectional marketing activities for Hamburg that included IGE in topic centered press releases. As R2 states, “we did not undertake marketing for IGE, but used IGE for undertaking marketing for the city.” R2 has been working for HM since more than 5.5 years and is now responsible for the cross-sectional marketing. The department takes care of the marketing activities that cannot be specifically allocated to one of the particular subsidiary companies or that include several divisions.

4.1.3 Tourism Vancouver
Tourism Vancouver (TV) is a private nonprofit business association, and, according to R3, is a “full service DMO”. Three areas are included in TV. The meetings/conventions area is responsible for attracting city-wide conventions to Vancouver. The leisure travel and digital marketing area, is primarily responsible for working with travel trade and tour operators in key markets, to influence large alliances of businesses to come to Vancouver. Further components in this area are the research department as well as the digital marketing, including the website and social media. The third area, namely ‘Experience Vancouver’, takes care of visitor services, including the visitor and information center of Vancouver. The idea behind that area is “to get people to spend more time in the city and to generate business for the 1000 members of TV”. R3 has been working for TV for more than 14 years and is responsible for the membership area. This area offers workshops and networking possibilities. In addition, R3 oversees the marketing services and destination marketing. Another area R3 is responsible for, is the travel and trade relations. In this respect, journalists are hosted in Vancouver and communicated with via the press releases that are continuously sent out in order to generate media coverage for the destination.

4.1.4 Kultuurikatel Tallinn
Kultuurikatel Tallinn (KT) is responsible for the organization of media relations in order to carry out international market promotions. The central task of KT during Tallinn European Capital of Culture 2011 was to prepare the experience gained in Tallinn11 to be able to re-use it, to exchange the knowledge among the participants and to positively affect the economy in Tallinn. KT was responsible for ensuring the quality of the program. The official program of Tallinn11 was formed by a combination of individual projects. Whether and which individual projects will be supported, further developed and qualified for the official program of Tallinn11 was defined by an independent artistic board. R4 considers the individuality of this board as a very important aspect. Since Tallinn11, this approach is further carried out and R4 considers it to be a “main rule” of KT. According to R4 Tallinn11 can be seen as a marketing project that aimed to increase the city’s and country’s awareness in the target markets and the internationalizing of Tallinn, respectively. The project focused on its own sustainability. Summarizing Tallinn11 in one sentence while the main idea is presented, R4 describes the event as “a contemporary, alternative cultural program”, which was especially promoted to young, cultural subjects. Besides the international audience and participants, Tallinn11 aimed to attract and to activate young, local artists. R4 is the director of KT. The tasks of R4 included the strategic and sustainable development of Tallinn11. In this regard, the main responsibility was the construction and management of KT as a platform for cultural activities.
4.1.5 Hamburg Tourism

Hamburg Tourism (HHT) covers two major task areas. One major task of HHT is the ‘tour operator’ for trips to Hamburg. This includes the responsibilities of product management, promotion and marketing of trips as well as partner acquisition, development of brochures and the provision of a call center. The further task is the ‘city marketing’, namely to carry the attractiveness of Hamburg to the public in order to raise the desire for visiting Hamburg among potential tourists. The event marketing is part of the city marketing. Main responsibilities of the event marketing are the execution of events that suit to the strengths and the image of Hamburg. The events are then used for further marketing purposes and are included in marketing activities. According to R5, HHT strongly focuses on the “medialization” of events, hence, whether particular events can present Hamburg appealingly in the media. Within the Hamburg Cruise Days (HCD), HHT acts as a cooperation partner and is responsible for the international media relation. The objective is to achieve an “emotional extension of the event”. Both, the international media relation as well as the inclusion of events in such support HHT in communicating a certain image/picture of Hamburg to the target groups. By doing so, the desire and aspiration for visiting Hamburg is raised. R5 describes HCD as a bi-yearly event that is executed by selected organizers, following the themes and program settings defined by HHT. Within the framework of the event, several cruise ships land simultaneously in the harbor of Hamburg and an artistic light installation is constructed that turns the harbor into a blue scenery (Blue Port). Additionally, several program settings take place and finally, the cruise ships drive along the river (Elbe) in a parade escorted by fireworks. In 2012, HCD counted 570,000 visitors, whereupon 50% were identified as real tourists as they arrived from the outer region of the metropolitan area of Hamburg. R5 has been working for Hamburg Marketing since 2007, being the provisional head of event marketing since two years.

4.1.6 Munich Tourism

The primary tasks of Munich Tourism (MT) is to promote Munich as a destination worldwide, to increase the touristic revenue and to provide particular services to the visitors on site (e.g. tourism information, guided city tours). The main responsibility of MT is to undertake marketing activities for Munich. Alike in any other competitive industry sectors, USPs are of great importance in order to differ from other destinations and to stand out of them. R6 mentions that in order to “carry the image of Munich in the world and to enable Munich to stand out as a destination”, MT uses the Oktoberfest as a USP. The Oktoberfest is an annual, traditional event, organized by the municipality of Munich. The “traditional and original Oktoberfest” takes place in Munich since more than 200 years and is known worldwide as the “biggest folk festival”. The event itself is a USP for the city and acts as an image carrier. The marketing department of MT does not actively promote the Oktoberfest. As a reason R6 calls the event to be a “Selbstläufer”, which means that it promotes itself due to its reputation. In fact, the great degree of brand awareness of the event is used in order to illustrate “what else is happening in Munich”. Reasons for the decision to not further promote the Oktoberfest are among others the already tremendous amount of visitors and the resulting huge occupancy rate (reaching the capacity limit). According to R6, any further marketing activities for the Oktoberfest would not be beneficial from a strategic viewpoint. R6 has been working for MT since 1997 and is responsible for the department of trade and media relation, where he and his team of eleven people take care of the worldwide marketing of Munich.
4.1.7 Visit England

Visit England (VE) is funded by the governmental department for culture, media and sports (DCMS), but is working independently of it which is called an “arms-length-body”. R7 states that “on behalf of the government, VE is responsible to look after tourism”. In order to do so, VE set the overall aim to support an average year on year growth of 5% in the visitor economy over a 10 year period. In order to do so, several objectives shall be achieved. Increasing England’s share of global visitor markets and offering visitors compelling destinations of distinction are stated as an objective by R7. These objectives are complemented by supporting a successful, thriving tourism industry and facilitating greater engagement between the visitor and the experience. Moreover, VE is organized in three major departments. First, the marketing department is primarily responsible for encouraging British people to spend their vacation in England rather than abroad. The marketing department of VE mainly focuses on the domestic market, whereas Visit Britain targets the international, overseas market. Further departments are the enterprise department, in charge of business support and partnerships, as well as the strategy and development department, responsible for policy, research, destination management, strategic partnerships and corporate communication. R7 sees the role of VE to be about leveraging events in order to raise the profile of the domestic holiday product outside London. Therefore, events were used to motivate and inspire people to take trips within England. R7 is the head of research and insights and has been working in this position since five years. Her team is formed by two further people, while the central task is to conduct different types of research on domestic tourism, business performances and the destination’s attraction among visitors.

4.1.8 Kosice Tourist Board

The general tasks of Kosice Tourist Board (KTB) include building public partnerships in the tourism sector, marketing the destination and setting up a city brand. Moreover, the management of the destination and the international networking of KTB with potential partners are part of the tasks. Within Kosice2013, KTB was responsible for the welcoming service for the visitors, the organization of press trips and providing services and information to the media abroad. Further on, KTB participated in tourism fairs abroad within the ‘attack brand’ European Capital of Culture. The interview partner has been working for KTB since over 1.5 years and is the International Marketing Manager.

4.2 Presentation of Findings

In the following, the empirical material gained from the interviews is presented. Due to the elaborateness of the information provided by the respondents, the findings are structured by the particular large event, sorted by the date the interviews were undertaken. Due to the fact that each interview was structured differently the themes of the interview guides where used for further structuring. This is supported by the fact that the respondents provided the information in distinct contexts and details, as implied by semi-structured interviews.

4.2.1 Linz Capital of Culture 2009

According to R1, the Tourism Board Linz (TBLinz) was particularly involved in Linz09. In this regard, information material was developed that informed about both tourism in general and the several cultural activities within Linz09. A strong connection and relation between TBLinz and the members is still present. A specific characteristic of Linz09 is the cultural enhancement of the city. Prior to Linz09, the significance of culture among potential users and inhabitants of the city was considered to be relatively small. According to R1, for Linz09 particularly these groups were included. Press trips were undertaken and press information was provided prior to the official start of the event. By doing so,
the awareness for the cultural activities was increased and the planned program was presented to journalists. In this regard, additional attention of tour operators was gained. Among others due to this process, the cultural activities and the program for 2009 were further developed and improved; several of the activities established within Linz09 are still being executed nowadays (e.g. annual comic-festival, the first of its kind in Austria).

**Perception of success**
From the beginning, great attention was paid to the ambition to gain a financial surplus from Linz09, which can be used for a sustainable enhancement of the cultural program. According to R1, this underlines the event’s focus on sustainability. R1 recognizes that “the efforts were worth it, as the sustainability of the Capital of Culture is still recognizable.” Because of Linz09, the city’s residents are more open to cultural activities and cultural programs now; the several cultural sites are significantly better connected with each other. Additionally, an increased recognition of the city can be determined. The success of Linz09 is mirrored in the enhanced landing of river cruise ships since the event took place. For Linz09 different cultural sites, cultural organizations and cultural programs were combined within one umbrella term. R1 mentions that the combination was very successful and the approach was followed in the upcoming years as well. Since Linz09, every year an annual topic is determined and an aligned cultural program is offered (e.g. in 2014 the topic ‘Donau’). Linz09 significantly contributed to the city’s development. This includes constructions of new buildings and a positive change of both the city and the cityscape. As mentioned by R1, the success of Linz09 is still noticeable. Considering the increase of publications and coverage in the media, Linz09 was specifically successful. TBLinz, service providers and further parties involved learned a lot from Linz09; for hotels, gastronomy and retail industry, the event was successful; “everyone is still fed by the success of the event”, as mentioned by R1.

**Elements of success**
The success of Linz09 can primarily be identified with the tangible criteria of an increased number of overnight stays and landing of ships in the city. Since it is hardly possible to measure a potential increase in the number of day visitors, the satisfaction of partners in the gastronomy and retail industry are considered here. Additional criteria that are less concrete can be used as well, namely the cooperation among the cultural sites, the significantly enhanced quality of life as well as the noticeable interest in the city among tourists. **Note by R1:** When Linz09 took place, the worldwide financial crisis was most distinctive. Because of Linz09, an increase in leisure travelers was recognized, however, the number of business travelers did not increase due to the financial crisis. Due to the overall increase of overnight stays, R1 concludes that “the increase in leisure travelers balanced the decrease in business travelers”.

R1 considers capabilities in communication and the systematic array (implementation of TBLinz) as critical success factors. According to R1, another critical success factor is the possible risk of knowledge loss. The purpose founded company for Linz09, acting as an external consultancy, would take the inserted and enhanced knowledge with them after the event’s completion, while the city would not directly profit from this knowledge. Measures were undertaken to avoid this. R1 stats that it was of great importance to the city to include the residents and locals in Linz09. The employment of a foreign artistic director for the design of the program was partly evaluated as a disadvantage for the city by the artists. However, in retrospect, this was not the case. In fact, it was beneficial that “someone new, who did not know the city before, takes a fresh look at it”. R1 is confident that rich discussions imply changes, whereat positive changes are beneficial for the city
and eventually, had a positive impact on Linz09. According to R1, providing a great variety of cultural activities in Linz09 increased the quality of life of the residents.

**Perspectives**
A continuous process of setting and coordination was present during the execution of Linz09. Since Linz is a comparatively small city, TBLinz knows the particular parties involved. Potential challenges were discussed with them in an on-going process. In general, all parties involved were quite satisfied.

**Time Dimension**
The success of Linz09 was evaluated to most part after the event’s completion and respectively, no half-yearly figures were set up. TBLinz was in an ongoing, personal contact with the service providers. After the event’s completion, it was critically reflected on by using the publications and articles in the media.

**Stakeholders**
Besides TBLinz, R1 names artists, residents and the media as stakeholders of Linz09 as well as politics and the region Upper Austria. R1 states that “once there is an event in an area, everyone tries to profit from it”. Therefore, businesses outside of the city and other destinations were included in Linz09 as well. In general, all stakeholders provided a positive feedback, merely the so called ‘local independent scene of artists’ was more reluctant.

**Challenges**
The greatest challenge for TBLinz was the huge number of visitors and the resulting pressure for the employees. Moreover, according to R1 the communication of the cultural activities was difficult. “Tourism and art speak their own language and TBLinz had do act as a translator between them”. Further on, it was difficult to keep an eye on the several brochures and the large range of program settings. R1 mentions that the multiple brochures and program settings may be considered as too many, since requests for guiding and consultancy services accreted. The evaluation of the success of Linz09 did not bear any greater challenges. R1 mentions that a finalizing evaluation after completion was not considered to be necessary, as no need for explanation was identified.

**Final remarks**
Several campaigns were included in Linz09 in order to increase the quality of the city. Thus, staff educations and language courses were offered and further groups that are in a direct contact with tourists were instructed in hospitality by providing information material, language guides and educational programs on Linz09. R1 considers the Capital of Culture to be a „city development project“, rather than a specific „tourism escalation project“. The respondent questions whether this may be intended to be like this by the European Union.

### 4.2.2 International Garden Expedition Hamburg 2013
According to R2, the International Garden Expedition (IGE) can be considered to be a city development project. In order to further enhance the district, IGE was placed in Wilhelmsburg. R2 stats that IGE had a short-term motive, but the event “left something in the long-term”. A park with several attraction points was developed for the event that enhances the district and leaves a noticeable additional value. Sustainability was a great aspect of the IGE, as mentioned by R2. The event had long-term objectives like the district development and therefore, was not merely aimed at an increased brand awareness of Hamburg.
Perception of success
Hamburg Marketing (HM) did not evaluate the overall success of IGE, as the event was not organized by the DMO. R2 states that in turn, the success of the marketing activities that included IGE were evaluated. Distinct figures and indicators were taken into consideration, whereupon different approaches and measurements can be recognized within the holding. According to R2, a general indicator for successful marketing activities is the echo of the city or event in the media. Due to an active media and press relation, (international) coverage is observed, taking the customer groups of the particular media into account. Further on, the number of tourists and overnight stays are another figure to evaluate the success of the marketing activities. By taking the origin of the visitors into consideration, the marketing activities can be evaluated related to the target markets. However, some figures, for example an increase in overnight stays, can hardly be allocated to specific activities or particular events. In fact, the marketing activities and events support an increase in the awareness, which in turn leads to an escalation of overnight stays. R2 underlines that it is of great importance to look at the certain figures from a broad viewpoint. Another indicator to evaluate the success of marketing activities, the increase of attractiveness or the escalation of awareness can be found within social media, counting the number of so called “Likes” or “clicks”.

Elements of success
Since IGE was an event, organized by a purpose found company, HM did not consider any specific CSF. IGE was included in the marketing activities, because “it fit to the marketing strategy.” HM focuses on “what is happening in Hamburg and how can it be used for the marketing of the city. It was not the task or responsibility of HM to evaluate IGS as an event or project.” Rationale behind this is the fact that HM was not involved from the financial or the project management viewpoint. The regular brand analyses of Hamburg determine the strengths of the city. Whether an event is implemented in the marketing of HM is decided by taking these strengths into consideration. R2 states that the following question is asked: “Does the event fit to the strengths, the city and the image of Hamburg?” This assessment usually allows HM to estimate whether an event appears successfully for Hamburg in the international marketing – already prior to an event’s happening. Here R2 notes: „This is not valid for an estimation of visitors etc., but merely for an appraisal whether the event has a positive impact on the existing image of the city. “ The success criteria to evaluate the marketing activities are the echo of the city, or event respectively, in the media as well as the number of tourists and overnight stays and the amount of so called “Likes” or “clicks” in social media (see also perception of success).

Perspectives
The success of the marketing activities within HM is examined from different perspectives, as mentioned by R2. As an example, the business development takes figures regarding the industrial settlements in Hamburg or the transacted investments into account.

Stakeholders
The central stakeholder at IGE was the public authority of city development, which was responsible for the supervision of both IGE and the purpose founded organizing team from the city’s perspective. Moreover, the residents of the city district represented individual interests in the city development. HM, gardener unions, sponsors and other partners were part of smaller, regional stakeholder groups.
Challenges
A garden expedition is of great relevance for the European market and a mainly touristic target group. Other events were focused on in other markets, while IGE was merely mentioned along with it. In this regard, identifying which themes, projects and events fit best to which market and can be implemented sufficiently in the marketing is a major challenge. The attractiveness and the brand awareness of Hamburg are difficult to measure. In order to evaluate them, distinct indicators need to be referred to. An increase of attractiveness or awareness can hardly be allocated to one specific event. In order to get some indicators, a market analysis is undertaken every four to five years. HM undertakes occasional surveys among visitors at events which have a strategic value for the DMO.

4.2.3 Vancouver Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games 2010
Perception of Success
R3 states that “there are many ways to measure success and it depends on what you were hoping to accomplish by hosting the Games.” The success of the Olympics can be perceived by the following aspects. According to R3, for the Olympics, the media coverage was unprecedented: “We have never seen that much media coverage in the city and probably, will not reach this level again, unless we host another major international event”. R3 mentions that “directly following the games, three new pieces of business were signed in Vancouver that might not have come to the city without the Games”. Building relationships and the existence of such “is another measure, which is more difficult to put a number to it, but it is measured over time”. Relationships were established in the lead up as well as during the Games and eventually, “Tourism Vancouver (TV) continued to have those relationships.” Success is evaluated by the hotel revenues and occupancy as well as the number or increase of people staying in the city both during the Olympics and in that particular year. According to R3, during the year of the Olympics just as in the following year, Canada was the ‘number one country brand in the world’. Previous to the Games, Canada was number seven and before that number 15. It becomes apparent that the international attention due to the Olympics helped Canada to reach this position, as mentioned by R3. As another example to perceive success R3 states the purpose built convention center. The year 2010 was a record-breaking year for the city-wide conventions at that time – which was even outbid in the year 2011. In general, huge successes were reached for Vancouver, where R3 states that “a lot of those successes can be clearly tied to the Games. It was visible that people wanted to be here”.

Elements of Success
According to R3, several critical success factors (CSF) play a role within the Olympics. By looking at them from a touristic perspective, the following main CSF can be identified. Cooperation with the Organizing Committee, sponsors, governments and tourism colleagues on a number of fronts is a CSF. R3 mentions this aspect to be complicated, because different parties focus on distinct aspects. A further CSF is the cooperation with the international broadcast media. During and after the Games these relationships need to be established, since the broadcasters are the ones who carry the destination’s message to the rest of the world. Eventually, people representing the broadcasting media spend a lot of time in Vancouver and get to know the city. Thus, these people need to have a good impression of the city in order to carry the message further. Another CSF is leveraging “a product or entity called the Olympics that carries your destination message” and the engagement in the communication process. R3 mentions that it is important to inform the members about what to expect or what not to expect from the Games and finally, to manage these expectations. A crucial CSF is the support and awareness of the community.
Volunteers are needed for the Games or “at the very least [the community] has to learn how to be good as hosts”, as underlined by R3. Visitors have to be provided with an unforgettable experience that they are unaccustomed to in their usual travelling around the world. R3 highlights the fact that “success factors work predominately around relationships, because everyone wants a piece of the ‘Olympic-pie’. If you can establish and build relationships early on in the planning stages, it helps you later on when issues arrive.” The amount and type of media coverage, the number of businesses that were attracted and the amount of business generation as well as the relationships built and the existence of such are success criteria. Moreover R3 states an increase of the hotel package revenues, the number of people staying in the city both during the Olympics and in that particular year, the gross revenues and number of transactions during that time drawn by the ticket center and ticket booth. The impact of Olympics on the country as a whole, the amount of businesses that come to the city and the amount of investments made are further SC stated by R3.

Perspectives
TV might use the perspective of the economic commissions, which is responsible for attracting people to move to Vancouver or to establish businesses. By doing so, the number of newly established touristic businesses, for example hotels, in Vancouver can be used to evaluate the Games.

Time Dimension
According to R3, it is not possible to determine success merely one or two years after the Games. In fact, there is an immediate impact in the host year and the year after, but the long-term impact has to be considered at as well. In this respect the following questions need to be reviewed, as mentioned by R3: Is there an increase in tourism and tourism infrastructure? Is there a willingness to grow and extend beyond the major event? How is the tourism industry working together on the next big event? R3 estimates that the evaluation process will go on for a 10 year period, where TV wants to make sure that people will still recognize Vancouver’s capabilities in eight years because of hosting the Olympics once.

Stakeholders
In order to bid on sporting events, city support is needed to determine whether investments are wanted and worth it. The city of Vancouver was a key stakeholder within the Olympics. According to R3, at the same time, the city can be considered to be a partner rather than a stakeholder. The federal government is a stakeholder, just as the economic division. As stated by R3, a variety of organizations can be considered as stakeholders to some extent, but are generally referred to as suppliers. Examples are the transportation system like airports, taxi companies and trains. The IOC, the broadcasters and the sponsors can be considered as stakeholders as well. However, R3 underlines that in general, “a stakeholder can be anybody and everybody”.

Challenges
R3 states that it would have been beneficial to have more money than TV actually had in order to promote Vancouver to the key markets. R3 would have “put a lot more money into the post-marketing campaign in order to leverage the attention Vancouver received during and after the Games.” According to R3, it would also have been beneficial to have a “legacy fund”, specifically to attract large sports events to the city. Vancouver has great venues and the capability to host major events. Yet, nobody has the monetary capabilities or is willing to put up the financial support for the bidding process as well as for some of
the operating costs until the event arrives. According to R3, TV was restricted in the marketing with the sponsors.

Final remarks
The Olympics had several effects on Vancouver. R3 underlines the fact that “once you are an Olympic host city, you are always an Olympic host city”, which is a bragging right that not many cities around the world can use. “If a city is capable to host an event that is fairly detailed and takes years to plan as well as that not only has a focus on the athletes, but further protocols around VIPs, sponsors and company partners, it works as an advantage for the city”, as stated by R3. The Olympics also affected the infrastructure. According to R3, some of the developments were purpose built, others were built to complement the Olympics (e.g. Convention Center, rapid transit system). R3 underlines that these developments can be used in a pitch when bidding for other sporting events or major meetings. An intangible factor resulting from the Games is the fact that Vancouver has people with expertise, which again is an important resource that the city can draw on when hosting other major events or bidding for them. R3 states that “these are things that should never be underestimated.” In this respect, Vancouver is now able to present itself to major media planners or to major sports federations. R3 underlines that it is also worth mentioning and must not be forgotten that the Olympics include the very successful Paralympics as well. “Vancouver is one of the most accessible destinations for people with disabilities, which elevated Vancouver to yet another level, which is tough for other cities around the world to compete with.” According to R3 “for Vancouver this is not only the right thing to do, but also a business advantage that should never be underestimated.” R3 concludes: “Would we do it again, yes, we probably would.”

4.2.4 Tallinn Capital of Culture 2011

Perception of Success
Success can be considered from many different points of views. R4 states that success has “many levels of layers”, which makes it difficult to measure. Due to the event, Tallinn was able to list a record-breaking amount of around 1.5 Million visitors in 2011. An increase of media coverage and the presentation of Tallinn in the media, especially first page coverage, can be taken into consideration. Looking at this indicator, R4 underlines the fact that Tallinn11 can be seen as an extreme success, since “the international media coverage increased so much”. The amount of requests made by interest groups and communities can be used as indicators. From the economic point of view, a significant indicator is an increase in businesses registering in Tallinn, among which artists and cultural organizations are considered. Tallinn11 had a great support among the residents and the public, which is another indicator for the event’s success.

Elements of Success
As one of the primary critical success factors, R4 states the cooperation between the state and city government. Additionally, the transparency of the event is seen as critical to influence the achievement of success. Therefore, Kultuurikatel Tallinn set up a ‘board of cultural groups, artists and specialists’ who were invited to make program decisions. According to R4, another critical success factor is the professionalism of the team around Tallinn11 and KT. The team’s responsibility was to coordinate the program and the cultural activities rather than leading the event. Therefore, several centralized rules and bureaucratic criteria were established that supported KT in their coordination of activities. The increase of visitors coming to Tallinn can be considered as the most profound SC, complemented by an increase of media coverage and the presentation of Tallinn in the media. R4 states the amount of requests made by interest groups and communities as an
An increase in businesses registering in Tallinn, among which artists and cultural organizations are considered as well, is mentioned as an additional SC by R4. This is supplemented by the support among the residents and the public.

**Perspectives**
Both an internal as well as an external evaluation process took place. R3 underlines, that the principle root of an evaluation is that success is determined by external institutions who are open and independent, rather than by KT. An organized board of scientists and universities determined the success of Tallinn11 as well. Additionally, the routine processes were evaluated by the European commission. Looking at the influence Tallinn11 had on the city, the event can be described as a “success story”, according to R4. In this respect, Tallinn’s recognition in the international market place raised and an increase of tourists is recognizable. Tallinn gained an enhanced recognition among being a destination for ‘alternative travelling’. R4 states that “Tallinn11 supported the city’s promotion to the environment for being attractive to young people, start-up organizations and IT centers, not only for ‘mainstream groups’ anymore”. From another perspective, the success of Tallinn11 is apparent in the development of the city and the influence on the city planning. According to R4, not only the personality of Tallinn got strengthened by the event, but the strong personality is also reflected by the inhabitants of the city. From the economic perspective, an increase in businesses registering in Tallinn, among which artists and cultural organizations are considered as well, can be identified. R4 states that all these factors played together, and lead to the fact that “the success of Tallinn11 can be seen by every eye, not only by the specialists”.

**Time Dimension**
According to R4, running numbers and figures were evaluated on the contemporary level in order to determine the event’s success by KT during the year. Eventually, an independent study was undertaken by an organized board, where the results are published by the end of 2013.

**Stakeholders**
Tallinn11 had several different institutions as co-partners, which form a big group of stakeholders. Further groups of interest are the state government as well as the city government, the ministry of culture and the established enterprise associations that supported many projects by further investments and required buildings.

**Challenges**
R4 mentions that in 2011, when the event took place, the worldwide economic crisis was still strongly recognizable. The crisis especially affected the preparation period, starting in 2009. This had an influence on the budget and financial sponsors as well as led to some complications in planning the program. R4 highlights that “all of the mentioned are important areas”. The feedback of institutions taking part in Tallinn11 was overall positive, merely some political challenges between the city and the state government were stated.

4.2.5 Hamburg Cruise Days 2012

**Perception of Success**
R5 considers the amount of visitors, the attractiveness of the program settings and their smooth progress as the basic requirements for the Hamburg Cruise Days (HCD) to actually “work”. This in turn enables the marketing department to do their job: “The event has to work, in order to make everything else work as well.” Once the basic requirements
are fulfilled, they are implemented in the marketing activities. Eventually, the event marketing perceives an event as successful when a broad and positive media perception is achieved. According to R5, it is important to distinguish between an internal perception on success (within the event) and an external perception of success (how successful can the event be used in the media).

**Elements of success**
R5 identifies the basic requirements that are needed to make an event “work” as the critical success factors. Therefore, CSF are the amount of visitors, the attractiveness of the program settings and a smooth progress of the program settings. The media coverage of an event is considered to be the success criteria for Hamburg Tourism (HHT).

**Perspectives**
Distinct approaches are implemented within HHT in order to determine the success of an event. As an example, R5 states the department ‘tour operator’ considering an event to be successful when a certain amount of tourists have booked a ‘HCD Trip’. The marketing department refers to the media coverage. Furthermore, distinct viewpoints on event success can be recognized outside of HHT. According to R5, the organizer considers an event to be successful, when “it is worth it” and determines the success by taking the revenue into account. However, when considering the revenue for success evaluation, the program settings have to be taken into account, as they may have an impact on certain revenue numbers. R5 adds that hotels usually evaluate the success of an event by observing the operating grade of beds, while the retail industry considers the revenue and potential increases in the sales quantity.

**Stakeholders**
As stakeholders of HCD, R5 mentions the hotels and the retail industry, the cruising industry and the ocean carriers. Touristic service providers, public transportation, museums and tour guides are stakeholders in HCD that profit from the event and have a certain influence in it. Tasks and responsibilities of these stakeholders are included in the evaluation of an event as well. The actual value creation is difficult to determine, since several aspects and factors (e.g. the weather condition during an event) need to be considered as well. Therefore, HHT talks to partners in order to gain an approximate result, which in turn can be used as a guiding value for future events.

**Challenges**
R5 states that “every large event causes dissention votes (“Gegenwind”)” and critical opinions, because everything that is directed to a large group has certain counterparts. When hosting an event, one has to be aware that some people may be disturbed.” In this regard, cruise ships are looked at from a critical viewpoint regarding environmental pollution, onshore power and the ships’ impact on the landing area. No event is exclusively exposed to a positive reaction, while some discussions are provoked by hosting a large event. According to R5, the PR department of HHT is engaged with this topic. In this regard, it prepares for potential “threats”, talks to stakeholders and increases the awareness of these challenges among groups of interest. Avoiding a conflict is hardly possible, since requests and doubts from the public and further stakeholders come along with large events. Nevertheless, these requests and doubts also result in discussions, which in turn make politics act. As an example, HCD caused a reason for discussions on the onshore power concept, while these discussions and critiques made politicians act. Determining success of an event is considered to be very difficult. R5 points out that the identification of specific numbers requires a financial and temporal effort. It has to be
weighed whether this effort needs to be undertaken or if a guideline is sufficient. According to R5, a positive development of an event can be recognized without a detailed measurement or survey. In most cases the impression among the stakeholders and involved partners mirrors the actual success of an event very well. R5 indicates that the activities of partners and colleagues in an event influence the marketing in addition. As mentioned by R5, determining the success by media and coverage assessment bears distinct challenges. An international monitoring of media is difficult to undertake and quite expensive. A survey is hardly possible due to the internationality of the media. The higher-level objectives of the marketing activities in tourism differ from those in trade. Since the tour operator of HHT merely acts within Germany, the total international media success cannot be evaluated by taking into consideration the sales figures of package trips. R5 underlines that even though the total success of marketing activities can be evaluated on the basis of an increase in tourists, a specific allocation of this increase to certain marketing activities or events is not possible. Moreover, marketing activities may not result in an immediate booking action, but increase the interest in Hamburg among potential tourists, who then may book a trip several years later. R5 identifies statistics as a further challenge of evaluation. Determining the number of visitors and spectators is very difficult, because of the spacious area of the event’s location as well as not selling tickets for HCD. The impression of people involved is captured and provides an approximate guideline for orientation. According to R5, a specific determination without a large financial and temporal effort is almost impossible. Despite these challenges an assessment of an event is of great relevance, since the evaluation is implemented in the marketing and promotion activities.

Final Remarks
R5 adds that PR is particularly important in order to achieve persuasion of (potential) tourists. Additionally, the recommendation of Hamburg by (potential) tourists to friends is of relevance. The development of an authentic, emotional marketing concept is specifically important for the future. An improved implementation of particular events in the holistic city marketing needs to be enabled. Concerning this matter, from 2015 on, HCD will take place in the same week as the cruise fair ‘Seatrade Europe’, resulting in a ‘Cruise Week’. The central ideas behind the combination of both occasions are the following, as stated by R5. Due to the ‘Cruise Week’, a public event is combined with an industry and eventually, the possibility to reach both the B2B market and the B2C market is established. The ‘Cruise Week’ offers the possibility for companies to present themselves to customers and partners on the fair and supplementary, to express the enthusiasm for cruises within HCD. The combination of the ‘Seatrade Europe’ and HCD simplifies the search for sponsors from the viewpoint of HCD and enables an emotional extension of the fair from the viewpoint of the ‘Seatrade’. Moreover, the ‘Cruise Week’ enables travel agents to inspect the cruise ships that they sell trips for in the travel agencies and therefore, simplifies the access to sales partners from the shipping carriers’ perspective. The ‘Cruise Week’ results in additional media attention for Europe’s biggest cruise fair as well as for shipping and for Hamburg as a cruise destination. The combination of both occasions had an extensive effect so far, apart from the specific city marketing as such. R5 concludes that the ‘Cruise Week’ combines several different channels and founds a basis for a sustainable topic.
4.2.6 Oktoberfest 2013

Perception of success
A central task of MT is to increase the touristic revenue. In this regard, the Oktoberfest is an essential factor for generating the touristic revenue. According to R6, the annual touristic revenue of Munich counts around 7.2 Billion Euro, while one Billion Euro are already generated by the Oktoberfest. The success of the Oktoberfest can therefore be considered from two perspectives. The department of economy and labor, where MT belongs to, evaluates the success of the Oktoberfest by taking its economic contribution and the revenue for the city into account. R6 adds that in turn, the marketing department evaluates the success of the Oktoberfest by considering the media value. In this regard, not merely the media value as such, but the attributes and the content of the publications are of greater importance. A successful presentation of the Oktoberfest and Munich is therefore a coverage on ‘the traditional family event’, rather than on a ‘drinking festival’. The ambition of MT is “to carry a realistic image of the Oktoberfest in the world”, as stated by R6.

Elements of success
The Oktoberfest is an image carrier for Munich as a destination. R6 considers the echo in press and media during the event’s happening as a CSF. By presenting the Oktoberfest as ‘a folk festival sending out vitality’ the media success of the Oktoberfest is influenced positively. Contrary, publishing excessive drinking behaviors has a negative impact on the media success. When the event takes place journalists and TV-teams are supervised by MT and several PR activities are taking place. To evaluate the success of the Oktoberfest, the feedback of journalists as part of the coverage are considered, as stated by R6. The publications are further assessed, as they are an essential criteria for the evaluation of the overall success.

Perspectives
The success of the Oktoberfest is considered from different perspectives (also within MT). R6 mentions that “regarding to the viewpoint, distinct evaluation criteria are used”. The organizing team takes the satisfaction of partner on-site and organizational aspects into account. According to R6, the tourist information center focuses on customer satisfaction and the feedback in the center, whereupon the marketing department uses the PR-value of the Oktoberfest to determine its success.

The dimension of time
The PR-activities have both a direct and a medium-/long-term effect. MT evaluates the media success of the Oktoberfest once the particular coverage is published, as it is hardly possible to determine it prior to the publications. The assessment of social media would enable an up-to-date evaluation of the event. R6 mentions that “social media would be of great interest, because immediate impacts and sentiments could be observed”. However, currently MT does not have the “manpower” to do so, as stated by R6.

Stakeholders
The central stakeholders of the Oktoberfest are the tourist service providers, including hotels (over-night stays), gastronomy (guests on-site, „After-Party“-guests). This is supplemented by R6, stating the public transportation system, taxis and further service providers in the tourism industry, e.g. guided city tours. Politics and the municipality are stakeholders as the Oktoberfest is an image carrier for the city, while an economic value of one Billion Euro enables further tax revenues. R6 concludes that the Oktoberfest...
Challenges
The greatest challenge within the task area of MT is the required sensitivity for using the Oktoberfest as a political topic. In this regard, MT has to pay great attention the fact that using the Oktoberfest in certain marketing activities has a positive impact on the city’s image, rather than attracting more tourists to the Oktoberfest itself. R6 underlines that “it is difficult to keep the split”, as the event sells itself and no more tourists shall be attracted to visit the Oktoberfest. Moreover, including the Oktoberfest in marketing activities results in contrary perceptions and opinions among the touristic partners. Thus, some partners are less satisfied when the Oktoberfest as a USP is implemented too much or too little in the marketing activities. According to R6, the greatest challenges for the evaluation of the event is the aspect of social media. A lot of coverage can be found in social media, while “a lot happens here”. However, this tool is currently neglected as MT does not have the “manpower” to include social media in the evaluation of the event’s media success. This is underlined by R6 mentioning that “the ideal way to do so is still missing”. In the future, more attention will be paid to a potential implementation of social media. R6 mentions that – aside from social media – the media observation for determining the media value and hence, evaluating the media success of the event is working quite well within MT.

4.2.7 London Olympic and Paralympic Summer Games 2012
Visit Britain used the event in its international marketing to leverage the impact of the Olympics overseas. Instead, Visit England (VE) ensured that “the rest of the country” benefits from the event as well. According to R7, the different celebrations and events (e.g. Diamond Jubilee, Olympic Torch, and Olympics) in 2012 were considered as a whole, rather than focusing on the Olympics. Several PR activities were undertaken and the domestic marketing campaign “Holidays at home are GREAT” (GREAT) was developed. This campaign included a television advertisement and was carrying the message of “why leaving the country in 2012, when so many special things happen here”, as stated by R7.

Perception of Success
The success of the Olympics can be seen in many ways, such as the number of visitors or the impact on the destination. Nevertheless, form the tourism perspective of VE, the success of GREAT was taken into account, including the Olympics as a driver for tourism. According to R7, VE was “very pleased with the results” of the television advertisement within the domestic marketing campaign. As indicators for the success of the campaign, the ROI and generated incremental spending were considered, as mentioned by R7. Usually, the ROI of marketing campaigns is about 20:1, while GREAT exceeded this number. Moreover, the campaign delivered around £300 Million additional spending. Another indicator of success is the fact that based on these results, the government decided to continue the “GREAT” campaign into 2013. Another point showed that 20% of the population says that the 2012 events had made them more likely to consider taking holidays in England. R7 states that this may not necessarily be a direct impact of VE’s work, but is an indicator of how the 2012 events affected perceptions within the domestic market.

Elements of Success
In order to evaluate the success of the marketing activities around the Olympics, several criteria are considered. Within an ongoing tracking survey, the level of campaign recall
and message take-out can be measured, as stated by R7. The ROI is a helpful criteria to evaluate success, measured via the brand tracker and surveys of website visitors. Further, within the marketing campaign, businesses were invited to provide special offers to (potential) visitors. According to R7, the spending generated within these offers can be used as another criteria.

**Perspectives**

R7 states that from the touristic perspective, the Olympics were a “fantastic showcase for this country”. However, the role as well as the event’s purposes can be taken into account from different perspectives, e.g. the sports department perspective.

**Time Dimension**

According to R7, the success of the GREAT campaign was evaluated both during its execution and after its completion. During the campaign’s broadcasting, studies regarding the visitors’ recall, messaging and motivation were undertaken. R7 mentions that at the end of the year 2012, once the campaign was over, a study was undertaken, asking the visitors to what extent the campaign influenced their decision on their summer trips. By doing so, the ROI of GREAT could be determined, as stated by R7.

**Stakeholders**

As GREAT was a joint campaign, R7 states other national tourist boards of Great Britain and local DMOs as stakeholders. Due to the special offers provided by individual businesses, these businesses can be considered as stakeholders. R7 adds DCMS as the funding body as another stakeholder. The GREAT branding was used among other departments, like the foreign office and the department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS). In this regard, R7 considers, central government departments to be stakeholders as well. Due to the many stakeholders involved, “the tourism industry is a complex picture”, as underlined by R7. R7 notes, “In the UK, we tend to refer to Visit England, Visit Britain etc. as „National Tourist Boards“ and local organizations (e.g. Visit Cornwall, Visit Kent) as DMOs – so for this campaign Visit England worked with the other National Tourist Boards and also a range of DMOs.”

**Challenges**

As the major challenge in the evaluation of marketing campaigns, R7 states the difficulty “to draw a line between the marketing activities and further circumstances”. In this regard, the economic circumstances affect the travel behavior of people. R7 mentions that since the UK economy is currently weak, Europe is more expensive for UK citizens. This in turn leads to the fact that more citizens spend their vacations in Britain. In addition, the weather affects the choice of vacation destination, as stated by R7. When the weather in Britain is good, citizens are more likely to stay in their country rather than travelling somewhere else. Since the marketing campaign is not made for one company with one specific product and detailed sales data, R7 considers the determination of success as challenging. Many private sector companies are involved in the tourism industry and can profit from the campaign. However, precise ‘sales data’ is almost impossible to gain from all these tourism companies, as underlined by R7. Nevertheless, R7 states that these challenges are faced by every DMO and thus, VE does not face more challenges than any other DMO.

**Final remarks**

According to R7, the fact that some tourists do not visit a destination because of a large event being hosted at that time is of greater relevance for the international market. As a study shows, the events taking place in 2012 in London (e.g. Olympics) affected the
choice of individuals, but had relatively little impact on the country or the year as a whole in terms of domestic travel behavior.

4.2.8 Kosice Capital of Culture 2013

Perception of Success
Kosice Tourism Board (KTB) considers the event to be successful, when the destination is known outside the borders and hence, when “Kosice is placed on the tourism map”. According to R8, a development of touristic offers in the leisure market is a manner to perceive success, since tourism in Kosice is currently marked by the business segment. Additionally, strategic partnerships with low-cost airlines are part of the perception of success.

Elements of success
In order to evaluate project success, KTB uses four specific success criteria. First of all, an increase in the number of overnight stays is considered as a criteria to determine the success of Kosice2013. This criteria is complemented by an increase in the number of tourists visiting the destination as well as the attraction of new markets among the incoming tourists, such as Germany and Austria. As the final criteria, KTB uses the increase of tourist spending in the destination to evaluate Kosice2013.

Besides the certain success criteria that are taken into consideration to evaluate the event, the non-governmental foundation “Kosice 2013” was instructed to undertake a study on the impact the event had on the destination.

Stakeholders
According to R8, the following major stakeholders were identified to be involved in Kosice2013 along with KTB. In politics, Regional Authority, the Slovak Ministry of Culture and the British Council are stakeholders. R8 states the Slovak National Tourism Board and universities as further stakeholders that are supplemented by a collaboration of big companies as key investors in the destination. The latter is forming the “Coalition 2013+”.

Challenges
During the project, KTB realized complications in financing the major investments that had to be made within Kosice13 from the funding provided by the European Union. The competences and roles of partners in the project were not clearly defined, a lack of capacities and expertise was identified in the team of KTB. An increased support from the institutions based in the Capital (Bratislava) would have been beneficial, as mentioned by R8. A lack of private funding to financially support the event as well as missing involvement from the business community in the project were discovered. Eventually, R8 states that the marketing budget was restrictive. After project completion, KTB had to face a challenge with the high costs for the sustainability of the event. In addition R8 underlines the challenge faced with the cultural institutions. These expected to receive the same financial support as they have received before and during Kosice2013 in order to prepare for and to undertake the event.
5. Analysis

The analysis is structured by relating the sub-purposes of the study. By doing so, the overall purpose, namely to increase the understanding of how DMOs evaluate project success of large events, is addressed.

5.1 The Role of DMOs and Their Tasks and Responsibilities in Large Events

As identified by Sing & Hu (2008, p. 937), DMOs market the host destination of an event by including the event in marketing activities. The empirical material supports this assessment and shows that the examined DMOs are generally less involved in the organization or leading of the particular large event. In most cases, purpose built companies were founded that involve the planning, leading and execution of the event. In fact, the event is used by the DMOs for marketing purposes and is implemented in marketing activities. As R2 states, “we did not undertake marketing for the event, but used the event for undertaking marketing for the city”. However, variations can be found in the DMOs of destinations that host the European Capital of Culture. In this regard, DMOs are strongly included and present a ‘connection between tourism and culture’ (R1). The DMOs of the European Capitals of Culture are less responsible for the actual leading of the event, but their tasks partly include the program coordination and decision-making processes, as R4 underlines.

5.1.1 Tasks and Responsibilities

The description of the primary task of a DMO stated by the respondents is supported by literature, namely to “promote tourism to a destination” (Getz, 2008, p. 406; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 937). Nevertheless, this definition needs to be extended by the marketing to specified target markets, as indicated by R1, R3 and R4. Moreover, the primary task is accomplished by further responsibilities that are taken care of in five task areas, as mentioned by the respondents. These task areas generally include (1) marketing and promotion, (2) business relations, (3) convention service and (4) press and media relations. In particular cases, such as R1, R3, R6 and R8, the task areas are supplemented by (5) visitor services. According to literature, the central task of a DMO, namely to market a destination, is achieved by building cooperation, promoting products and developing a marketing strategy. This description needs to be adjusted, as the aspects of convention services and visitor services are not stated, while the other aspects are not elaborately specified. In addition, literature calls the respond to an existing demand as responsibility (WTO, 2004 cited in Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 81). However, according to the respondents, the DMOs also targeted new markets, where so far no demand was existing but was aimed to arise by reason of the marketing activities. Concerning this matter, the responsibility has to be adjusted accordingly. The respondents underline that by suitable marketing activities, the awareness and attractiveness of a destination as well as a destination’s image and brand are developed further. This aspect is encouraged by Baker & Cameron (2008, p. 81), who highlight the attraction of tourists and a destination’s development and improvement.

R5 stresses that events that suit to the destination’s strengths have a positive impact on the destination’s image. In turn, the implementation of events in marketing activities result in an “emotional extension of the event.” This evaluation is intensified by R6 who considers the particular event to be a unique selling proposition (USP) for the destination. This allows the destination to differ from others and to stand out from them. Literature supports both evaluations by recognizing large events as tools to attract tourists on the one hand and, at the same time, to create a positive image for the destination (Getz, 2008, p. 406; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222). Harvey (1989, cited in Malfas et al., 2005, p. 211) refers
to large events as drivers for development that are used by destinations to enhance the image. This supports the assumption of DMOs being a key stakeholder in large events.

In order to sufficiently market a destination to a specified target market, the development of an authentic, emotional marketing concept is important. In this regard, an improved implementation of events in the city marketing is required (R5). R5 states the new marketing concept in which a large event is combined with a topic-related fair. By doing so, (1) both the B2B and B2C markets are reached. It further allows (2) companies to present themselves and express their enthusiasm for a topic. Additionally, a combination (3) simplifies the search for sponsors and enables the important emotional extension of an event. A combination provides an (4) access to sales partners and (5) additional media attention, (6) a linkage of channels and (7) the basis for a sustainable topic. The combination seems to be very sufficient and may be a suitable tool for other DMOs as well. Combining large events with other topic-related occurrences may increase the positive impact of large events and may increase the likelihood to enhance the potential benefits large events may provide to a host destination. As aforementioned, the event is required to be included in a destination’s long-term strategy (Jago et al., 2010, p. 233; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936). Literature considers a cooperation between the DMO and a large event as crucial to draw a potential benefit from the large event (Baker & Cameron, 2008, p. 83; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936). The described combination of a large event with another occurrence may facilitate the required cooperation and the achievement of potential benefits.

5.1.2 Challenges DMOs Face in the Event
According to the empirical material, the DMOs are less involved in the event’s managerial activities, but strongly include it in the marketing activities to promote a destination to target markets. Concerning this matter, a central challenge is to identify which themes or events work best in which market and how it can be implemented in a campaign or activity sufficiently (R2). Another challenge for DMOs in the event are monetary issues. In order to leverage the attention a destination receives during the event, investments have to be made in marketing campaigns. This is supported by literature, noting the requirement of major financial investments for large events in general (Jaafari, 2007, p. 174; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239). Due to the investments in venues and city development for a large event, a host destination possesses the capabilities to host further events in the future. However, the bidding on such events requires financial support as well as covering operating costs (R3). The economic circumstances have a major influence on the sponsorships, budgets and travel behavior of tourists. These monetary challenges, faced by certain DMOs, recall the high risks involved in large events and the exposure to the environment, as identified by literature (Getz, 2008, p. 404, 419; Jaafari, 2007, p. 174; Miller & Hobbs, 2005, p. 42). Determining the actual value creation of an event is stated to be challenging, because additional factors, such as the weather condition and the economic circumstances, have to be considered as well. Implementing an event in the marketing activities without promoting the event as such was assessed as an additional challenge for the DMO. The communication is one of the central challenges within an event. As pictured by R1, the many parties involved in a large event “speak their own language”. This aggravates the communication process and demands a DMO to act as a translator.

Within all challenges the enormous financial investments, the requirement of immense resources in infrastructure and the exposure to the environment are stated. This is supplemented by the many stakeholders involved. All these challenges are recognizable in the overall characteristics of large events. This supports the basic assumption that
events are a specification of projects, resulting in the characterizing description of large
events. Thus, as stated in the theoretical framework and confirmed by the research, large
events are marked by complexity and a huge impact, clear restrictions, a requirement of
major investments and resources and the purpose to fulfil an existing need. Moreover,
large events are exposed to the environment and consequently, multiple stakeholders
influencing the event are involved, just as high risks and uncertainties (summarizing
Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210, 217; Miller & Hobbs, 2005, p. 42; Mills & Rosentraub; 2013,

5.2 The Perception of Project Success in Large Events
Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 699) underline that success is perceived differently among distinct
stakeholders. This evaluation is recalled by R6, who states that depending on the point of
view, each party involved has a certain perception of success. This in turn leads to
different evaluation criteria used. In the following, the particular perceptions of project
success in large events are introduced, highlighting the DMOs’ perceptions.

5.2.1 Different Stakeholder Perception of Project Success of Large Events
Literature underlines the fact that each stakeholder perceives project success differently
and considers distinct and individual SC (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; McLeod et
al., 2012, p. 82; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 212; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; PMI, 2013, p.
primary stakeholder group of an event that was stated by all respondents is politics.
Politics perceive an event as successful if its economic value and resulting tax income are
sufficient. A further group of stakeholders are businesses, while the retail industry
considers the revenue and the sales quantity to determine success. R3 refers to businesses
as suppliers, while R4 and R8 refer to them as enterprise collaborations. A central
stakeholder group in events are tourist service providers. This group is stated by almost
all respondents, while some refer to them as partners. Within tourist service providers,
hotels evaluate success by referring to the operating rate of beds. Sponsors and the
organizer of the event are mentioned as further stakeholders. The event’s organizer
considers whether on-site partners are satisfied and specifies organizing aspects and the
revenue as an evaluation criteria. Eventually, the public, residents and media are partially
listed as stakeholders. As described by Winch (2007) it can be distinguished between
internal stakeholders and external ones. Following the approach of Winch (2007), internal
stakeholders are sponsors, businesses and suppliers. Tourist service providers, politics,
public and media as well as the DMO itself can be classified into external stakeholders.
As this list indicates, most perceptions and criteria of the stakeholders involved are related
to revenue. This evaluation is supported by Getz (2008, p. 422) who states that the main
reason to host an event is the economic development that comes with it. The DMOs
predominantly identify the stakeholders that are influenced positively by a large event.
As mentioned by R6, ‘everyone who profits has an interest in the event’. However,
attention has to be drawn to this fact. As expressed by R5, ‘no event is exclusively
exposed to positive reaction’. In fact, “every large event causes critical opinions, because
everything that is directed to a large group has certain counterparts” (R5). According to
the definition, stakeholders are parties that have an interest, share or claim (Clarkson,
suggests that both positive as well as negative influences by stakeholders have to be taken
into account.
Leaving the stakeholder’s perspective in general, the empirical material indicates that DMOs perceive success from two central angles. These are the (1) impact the event had on the destination and the city development as well as the (2) amount and content of media coverage.

5.2.2 DMOs’ Perception: Impact on the Destination and its Development
The success of large events is partly perceived by the impact the event has on the destination and its development. In this regard, particularly DMOs of European Capitals of Culture name the event ‘city development projects’ that had a sustainable impact on the city’s design and development (R1, R4). Success is recognizable by the latest construction of buildings, the development of the touristic infrastructure and the increase of (touristic) business settlements. An infrastructural and architectural impact of large events on the host destination is supported by literature. Literature refers to the impact as a characteristic of large events, supplemented by the effect on the host destination being an objective to host an occasion in the first place. (Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Getz, 2008, p. 407; Sola, 1988 cited in Malfas et al., 2005, p. 211). If the development of the cityscape and touristic infrastructure are objectives of hosting a large event, meeting these aims implies success as well. Consequently, success is perceived when a social, economic or environmental impact (Jago et al., 2010, p. 222) that is aspired by the DMOs is achieved.

5.2.3 DMOs’ Perception: Amount and Content of Media Coverage
Mills & Rosentraub (2013, p. 239) state an increased awareness for a destination as an impact generated by a large event. However, the increased (media) awareness is an indicator for success from the DMOs’ perspective, rather than merely an impact of the large event. DMOs implement a large event in marketing activities. Therefore, DMOs perceive a large event to be successful if the amount and content of media coverage are sufficient. Success is recognizable by an increase of publications in media. As R3 states, “we have never seen that much media coverage in the destination”. This is supplemented by R4, mentioning that “the international media attention increased so much”. Consequently, an event is considered to be successful by the DMOs if a “broad and positive media perception” is achieved (R5) and if “a specific presentation of the event in media” is recognized (R6). This leads to the evaluation that DMOs perceive the success of marketing activities by the amount and extend of media coverage, complemented by the kind of coverage and the content. In particular cases, the DMOs limit the perception of success to the related marketing activities rather than considering the event’s impact on the destination (R2, R5, R7). In this regard, R5 indicates the importance to distinguish between an internal perception of success, namely within an event, and an external perception of success and an event’s implementation in media, respectively.

As R4 underlines, the success of an event “can be seen by every eye, not only by the specialists”. This is reasoned by the fact that the event had an impact on several aspects. In this regard, tangible aspects are for example a city development, a tourist enhancement and a media attention. Less concrete aspects are for instance a strengthened personality of both the destination and the residents as well as an increased quality of life. Yet, due to an event’s implementation in marketing activities, most DMOs determine success by taking the amount and content of media coverage into account.

5.2.4 Different Perspectives within the DMO
As shown before and precisely stated by Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 699), success “means different things to different stakeholders”. However, this assessment needs to be adjusted, as success is not only perceived differently among distinct stakeholders. As a matter of
fact, different success perspectives become visible among the five task areas within the DMO, representing one stakeholder. As stated before, the DMOs are marked by five task areas. Concerning this matter, the task area marketing and promotion in general refers to the success of the marketing activities, while the press and media relation takes the media or PR value into account. Moreover, the task area business relations evaluates an event from the economic perspective, namely an increase in businesses registered in the destination and the amount of investments made. The customer (tourist) satisfaction and the feedback received in the information centers describe the perspective of the visitor services. As it can be seen, the perspectives on success of the particular task areas vary from each other, but have supporting relationships rather than conflicting ones. The assessment of literature, stating that particular expectations vary from each other and thus, result in different perceptions of success, is therefore applicable to both DMOs in particular and stakeholders in general (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; McLeod et al., 2012, p. 82; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 212; Müller & Turner, 2007, p. 299; PMI, 2013, p. 30; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699; Turner & Zolin, 2012, p. 91; Winch, 2007, p. 288).

5.2.5 Critical Success Factors Influencing Success

According to Pinto & Slevin (1987, p. 22, 26), recognizing CSF and including them into the tasks are crucial for achieving project success. To some extent, this consideration is recalled by the DMOs. Communication is considered to be one of the major challenges the DMO has to face. Several respondents recall this assessment and state that communication is a CSF for the DMO. In this regard, especially a DMO’s capabilities in communication are taken into account. As R1 states, “once there is an event in the area, everyone tries to profit from it”. This is supported by R3, who mentions that “success factors work predominantly around relationships, because everyone wants a piece of the Olympic pie”. In this regard, the respondents highlight the need to establish and build relationships early on. This is precisely reasoned by R3, mentioning that “it helps you later when issues arrive”. Consequently, relationships and cooperation, in particular with the media, sponsors, organizing companies, governments and tourist service providers, are essential CSF. The respondents further identify the systematic array, namely the implementation of a DMO as well as potential users and the destination’s residents in the event as a CSF. By doing so, the event’s program settings and circumstances are illustrated openly and transparently to the community, in order to receive their support and awareness. Thus, the support of the public is crucial for achieving a successful event (R1, R3, R4). In addition, the risk of knowledge loss and rich discussions are stated to be CSF (R1). R3 states the leveraging of an event as “an entity that carries your destination message” to be a CSF, which is supplemented by the professionalism of the team (R4). Summarizing, the essential CSF for DMOs are communication, relationships and collaboration as well as the implementation of the community and DMO in an event.

Certain respondents indicate that their DMO does not take any CSF into account, because the organizing and leading of the event was not part of their responsibility. However, from additional statements, CSF can be recognized although not specifically named as such by the respondents. R2 underlines that an event is merely included in the marketing activities, when it fits to both a marketing strategy and the strengths of a destination. This ‘strategic fit’ influences appealing marketing activities and consequently, appropriate presentations of the destination in media. Since DMOs perceive success by considering the success of marketing activities, the “strategic fit” between an event and the marketing strategy can be considered as a CSF. As previously indicated, literature underlines the importance of an event to be implemented in a long-term strategy of the DMO in order to achieve potential benefits (Jago et al., 2010, p. 233; Singh & Hu, 2008, p. 936). This supports the assessment that the described ‘strategic fit’ has to be considered as a CSF.
that influences success. Even though some DMOs may not actively determine and include CSF in their tasks, factors that influence the success of a large event, or respectively the marketing activities, become visible.

5.3 Success Criteria Considered by DMOs
As R3 states, “there are many ways to measure success and it depends on what you were hoping to accomplish by hosting the event”. DMOs perceive success as the impact on the destination and its development as well as the amount and content of media coverage. Therefore, related SC are taken into account by the DMOs in order to precisely evaluate the success of the marketing activities and the impact on the destination. Considering relevant SC is strongly supported by literature, underlining the possibility to facilitate a project’s development and to reduce a threat of mismatching expectations (Bryde & Robinson, 2005, p. 627; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 719; Wateridge, 1998, p. 59). As stated by R1, SC can be distinguished in tangible and intangible criteria, which provides an additional description to the nature of SC. To some extent, this is encouraged by Müller & Turner (2007) who differ between hard and soft SC. The distinction between tangible and intangible criteria is kept in the following.

5.3.1 Success Criteria for the Success of Marketing Activities
The primary tangible criterion is an increase of tourists and overnight stays in the year the event takes place and in the following years. As mentioned by R2, the origin country of the tourists can be considered in order to determine the success of the marketing activities in the target market. However, as stated by almost all respondents, it is not possible to allocate an increase of tourists and overnight guests to one specific marketing activity or event. In fact, the marketing activities or event support the destinations awareness in target markets, which in turn increases the number of tourists. In this regard, R2 underlines that it is essential to look at the figures from a broad perspective. Moreover, the attraction of new markets can be included here as well. This also applies to the requests by interest groups and communities. Other criteria to evaluate success are the hotel package revenues and the spending generated by special pack offers provided during the event. Specific SC are the amount and types of publications in media. The publications present the echo of the destination or event, picture the feedback of journalists and especially first page coverage is drawn on. Concerning this matter, the customer groups of the media are examined. The impressions are also presented in social media, where the so called ‘clicks’ and ‘likes’ can be counted. Further SC are the level of campaign recall, the message take-out and the ROI of specific marketing activities, while the latter can be measured by a brand tracker and a survey on website visitors. Intangible criteria, or respectively less concrete ones, to evaluate the success of marketing activities are the image, reputation and brand awareness of the destination or related country. Another intangible criterion is the support by residents and public for the destination or event.

5.3.2 Success Criteria for the Development
Determining the success by the city development, the number of business settlements, particularly in the tourist industry, and business generations are tangible SC. The conventions held in the destination can be taken into account, as well as the economic impact on the destination by designating the revenue or economic value of the event. Since one destination was located at a river, the respondent states a landing of ships to be a SC. This tangible criterion can be used by other destinations that are located at rivers or the sea, or may also be adjusted to the landing of planes at the airport or arrival of trains at the railway station. A less concrete SC for the city development is the satisfaction of partners in the gastronomy and retail industry. Another intangible criterion is the quality of life for residents and inhabitants. Besides the relationships built and existing between
the DMO and partners, the cooperation between cultural sites and cultural organizations are additional intangible SC.

By distinguishing between tangible and intangible SC as well as SC for marketing activities and city development, overlapping criteria become apparent. For example, the number of ships landing at a destination is considered to be a SC of development. However, some shipping carriers or tour operators may be interested in the city because marketing activities raised their awareness for the destination in the first place. This implies that the success of marketing activities can be evaluated by this criterion as well. As already stated by R2 in another context, it is essential to look at the figures from a broad perspective. This is supported by literature, stating the necessity to consider the large scale picture (Cooke-Davies, 2007; Shenhar et al., 2001). R5 adds that it is not always necessary to determine a specific number to evaluate success. In fact, the impression of partners usually mirrors the success of an event very well and can be used to indicate a positive development of an event (R5).

5.3.3 The Dimension of Time

Literature highlights the necessity to consider particular points in time to evaluate a project in order to consider a project’s development and the ‘big scale’ (Cooke-Davies, 2007; McLeod et al., 2012; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, Westerveld, 2003). Few respondents mention that no finalizing evaluation took place for the particular large event in their host destination. This was reasoned with the fact that a ‘need for explanation’ was not recognized. However, running figures were observed on a contemporary level, while the event took place (R4). In most cases the event, or respectively the marketing activities that included the event, were evaluated after the event’s completion. As identified by the respondents, the marketing activities have an immediate, medium and long-term-impact. The immediate impact can be observed by taking social media into account. After its completion, an event can be critically examined by considering the media values and media coverage, reflecting the medium and long-term impact. An event’s impact can be taken into account to determine the success at these particular points in time. In addition, R3 highlights several questions that need be asked to evaluate the long-term success of a large event. These are ‘Is an increase in tourism and tourism infrastructure recognizable?’, ‘Is there a willingness to grow and extend beyond major event?’ and ‘How is the tourism industry working together on next large event?’. These questions cannot be answered on the short-term, in fact, the long-term perspective is essential instead. Considering the answers of the respondents, an event’s success was evaluated in the medium or long-term perspective to the most part. Considering project success from different points in time, as identified by literature stated before, is therefore applicable to the evaluation of large events by DMOs. Nevertheless, the medium- and long-term success is focused on, paying little attention the short-term impact a large event has.

5.4 Developed Framework of Success Concepts and Success Criteria for DMOs

By the majority, literature on project success mainly refers to product-based projects, for instance in the working areas of construction and information technology. Due to the fact that events are intangible and include services rather than products for the most part, particular SC need to be adjusted to evaluate project success of large events. Thus, the SC ‘organizational reputation’ (Fortune et al., 2011), needs to be related to the destination perspective and becomes ‘destination reputation’ as stated before. The profitability for owners and sponsors (Wateridge, 1998) needs to be adjusted to the profitability for tourism service providers and DMOs. As these examples imply, the frameworks developed by scholars for project management need to be adjusted for the DMO perspective. Earlier, the framework of Shenhar & Dvir (2007) was considered to be
sufficient and beneficial for practice, because of it being a dynamic process as well as its organized structure and elaborateness. Additionally, particular approaches of other scholars can be recognized in the framework of Shenhar & Dvir (2007). For example, scholars such as Cooke-Davies (2007) considered the temporal dimensions, McLeod et al. (2012) took success concepts into account and Westerveld (2003) allocates SC in different project types. Nevertheless, the framework of Shenhar & Dvir (2007) is the most complete one that partially summarizes other approaches. In the following, the framework of Shenhar & Dvir (2007) is transferred to the SC stated by the respondents. The previously summarized SC and the temporal dimensions are adjusted accordingly, establishing a purpose built framework for DMOs.

The first concept identified in literature is project management success, which is marked by efficiency (Baccarini, 1999; Cooke-Davies, 2002 & 2007; Shenhar & Dvir 2007). The examined DMOs neither took care of project management tasks, nor of the organization, leading and planning of the particular large event. Therefore, the first concept can be neglected. This assessment is supported by the fact that the short-term success, which is related to efficiency, is less significant for DMOs. However, the three following concepts are of great relevance to the DMOs, representing the medium and long-term success.

Product success is the second concept recognized by literature (Baccarini, 1999; Cooke-Davies, 2002 & 2007; McLeod et al., 2012; Shenhar & Dvir 2007). According to Shenhar & Dvir (2007), it is marked by impact on the customer and impact on the team. Regarding the DMOs, product success can be renamed event success. The first term can be specified into impact on the tourist, as DMOs are touristic organizations, whose customers are tourists for the most part. The related three groups of success criteria need to be adjusted accordingly. Therefore, based on the empirical material, benefits to customer becomes benefits to tourist. It is characterized by specific success criteria, namely the number of conventions held, the support of residents and public and eventually, cooperation between cultural sites. Brand name recognition is another group of SC. It is specified by the impact the large event has on the destination or the country regarding its reputation, image and brand awareness, as mentioned by the respondents. In addition, customer satisfaction and loyalty can be adjusted into tourist satisfaction and loyalty. SC belonging to this group are an increased number of tourists, the number of requests made by interest groups and communities and the business settlements, as underlined by the interview partners. Additionally, built and existing relationships, satisfaction of partners in gastronomy and retail industry and the quality of life are SC of the group tourist satisfaction and loyalty. Rationale behind this allocation is the fact that all these SC represent the impact on the tourist the large event had, by taking into consideration financial and reputational consequences. Impact on the team and the SC development of skills and knowledge, as stated by Shenhar & Dvir (2007), needs to be adjusted for the DMOs as well. Therefore, the group can be named Impact on the DMO. Even though, the respondents did not specifically state a SC that suits to this aspect, an appropriate SC can be recognized from the information provided by R4. This DMO prepared the experience gained in the large event, in order to re-use it in the future, to exchange the knowledge among the participants and to positively affect the economy in the destination. Consequently, a large event provides additional knowledge and skills to the DMO that can learn a lot from the event and further improves the skills and knowledge of the employees in the tourist organization.
For clarification, the following table summarizes the adjustments made within the first success concept for the medium-term dimension, namely event success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shenhar &amp; Dvir (2007)</th>
<th>Adjusted to DMOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-term dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium-term dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Concept: Product Success</strong></td>
<td><strong>Success Concept: Event Success</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on customer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact on the tourist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benefits to customer</td>
<td>• Benefit to the tourist:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customer satisfaction/ loyalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brand name recognition</td>
<td>• Brand name recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on team</strong></td>
<td>• Satisfaction/ Loyalty of the tourist:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Event success

As the third success concept, Shenhar & Dvir (2007) identify *business success* that is described by an *increase in sales, profit and market share* as well as an *achievement of return on investment*. For the DMOs, *business success* can be related to *destination success*, while both groups of success criteria can be identified from the responses. In this regard, an *increase in sales, profit and market share* can be determined by an increased number of tourists and over-night stays. In addition, the hotel package revenues and spending generated by relating offers, the landing of ships, planes and trains and the increase of tourist spending are SC to determine the destination success. This is complemented by business generations and conventions held, as mentioned by the respondents. The economic impact of the event determines the destination success by considering the number of tourist business settlements, for example hotels, and the resulting revenues and economic values. As underlined by R7, the *return of investment* can be measured by a brand tracker and a survey on website visitors. It is further supported by the level of campaign recalls and the message take out. Due to the DMOs perception of success as the achievements of marketing activities, this success concept needs to be supplemented by an additional group of SC, namely *media attention*. In this regard, media attention considers the amount and type of media coverage, the echo of a destination and event in media, the feedback of journalists and the impression in social media, by counting ‘clicks’ and ‘likes’.
The following table illustrates the modifications made regarding the success concept destination success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shenhar &amp; Dvir (2007)</th>
<th>Adjusted to DMOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-term dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium-term dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success concept: Business success</strong></td>
<td><strong>Success concept: Destination success</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in sales, profit, market share</td>
<td>• Increase in sales, profit, market share:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement of return on investment</td>
<td>○ Increased number of tourists and over-nights stays during the year and in the following years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Hotel package revenues and spending generated by special offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Landing of ships, planes and trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Increase of tourist spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Business generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Conventions held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Economic impact: Number of tourist business settlement (hotels) and resulting revenues and economic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achievement of Return on Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ ROI, measured by brand tracker and survey on website visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Level of campaign recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Message take-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Amount and type of coverage in media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ The echo of a destination and event in media and the feedback of journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Impression in social media, by counting ‘clicks’ and ‘likes’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Destination success

In the long-term dimension, literature defined *organizational success* as the appropriate success concept (McLeod et al., 2012; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007). In this regard, *preparing for the future* is named, which is specified by the *attraction of new markets* and the *achievement of competencies and organizational capability* (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007). From the empirical material it can be concluded that this success concept needs to be complemented by the preparation for future large events. Therefore, the success concept is marked *Preparing for the future and future large events*. Both groups of SC can be transferred to the DMOs’ perspective. According to the respondents, the attraction of new markets is a SC just as the competencies and organizational capabilities gained from the large event. In this regard, the latter is described by the lessons learnt, the organizational structures and competences gained. This is supplemented with the purpose built and existing relationships that the DMO can draw on in the future, as stated by the respondents.
The table below summarizes the final success concept, namely organizational success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shenhar &amp; Dvir (2007)</th>
<th>Adjusted to DMOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term dimension</td>
<td>Long-term dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success concept: Organization success</td>
<td>Success concept: Organizational success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for future</td>
<td>Preparing for future as such and future large events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New markets (target markets)</td>
<td>• Attraction of new target markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competency and organizational capability</td>
<td>• Competency and organizational capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Lessons learnt, organizational structures and competences gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Purpose built and existing relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Organizational success

Summarizing, the success dimensions stated by scholars, and Shenhar & Dvir (2007) in particular, can be transferred to the DMOs perspective on project success of large events, while certain adjustments have to be made. By doing so, the following model is developed. The short-term dimension, namely project management success that is marked by efficiency, can be neglected in this respect. Both, event success, described by the impact on the tourist and on the DMO, and destination success are success concepts of a medium-term dimension. Preparing for the future and future large events is part of the organizational success that describes the long-term success of large events from the DMOs’ perspective. The figure on success dimensions presented in the theoretical framework can therefore be adjusted accordingly, picturing the success dimensions for the DMO as below.

5.5 Challenges in the Evaluation

As stated by R4, “success has many levels of layers”. This is encouraged by Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 713) who underline the broadness and complexity of success. The evaluation of large events and related marketing activities is therefore aggravated and results in further challenges for the DMOs. However, both literature (Cooke-Davies, 2001, p. 189; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699) and respondents stress the importance of success evaluation. Literature sees the reason in the resulting ability to adjust project efforts and to improve the organizational performance (Cooke-Davies, 2001, p. 189; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699). The respondents in turn consider the evaluation as essential, because the success of an event is included in marketing activities, which in turn increase the attractiveness and brand awareness for the destination (R5). One of the challenge in evaluation is the aspect of statistics. According to the respondents, contrary to other industries, it is hardly
possible to consider revenues or sales volumes in tourism to determine the success of marketing activities. Even though an increase of tourists, overnight stays or revenues of packages tours can be observed, none of these can be specifically allocated to a certain marketing activity. In addition, marketing activities increase the awareness among (potential) tourists, however, the actual booking process or purchase of a trip may happen even years later (R5). In order to get numbers that are approximate to the actual results, immense financial and temporal efforts as well as manpower would be required. However, ‘DMOs have to outweigh, whether these efforts are worth it’. An approximate positive development can be observed by the impression of other stakeholders or criteria stated before.

As aforementioned, the evaluation of an event is crucial. In fact, positive results can be implemented in further marketing activities, which in turn may attract additional tourists, enhance the recognition and improve a destination’s image. As pictured by R3, "once you are an Olympic host city, you are always an Olympic host city". These attributes can be implemented by the DMO in further marketing activities that may be beneficial and profitable.
6. Conclusion and Discussion

The purpose of this thesis is to increase the understanding on the success evaluation of DMOs as a key stakeholder in large events. In order to address this purpose, first the existing knowledge on project success and DMOs was discussed within the theoretical framework. Subsequently, several cases of DMOs involved in particular large events were examined. From the analysis of the empirical material gained, central conclusions can be drawn.

DMOs of a host destination are usually neither involved in the organization of large events nor in managerial tasks. In fact, the large event is used for marketing purposes and included in marketing activities to promote a destination to the specified target markets. By marketing a destination, its image and brand awareness shall be increased and additional tourists shall be attracted to visit the destination. In order to draw potential benefits from large events, it needs to be implemented in a DMOs long-term strategy, while cooperation is crucial. Moreover, DMOs are seen as a connection point between a large event and tourism, which underlines the important role DMOs have. These aspects indicate that project managers and (purpose founded) organizing companies have to include DMOs in a large event and have to focus on them as a key stakeholder. Earlier, large events were characterized by the involvement of multiple stakeholders, the large impact on the host destination and the requirement of immense financial investments and resources (Getz, 2008, p. 407; Jago et al., 2010, p. 222; Malfas et al., 2005, p. 210; Mills & Rosentraub, 2013, p. 239). These attributes were stated to be major challenges the DMOs have to face in a large event. This advocates the approach to look at large events from a project perspective. By doing so, the understanding of certain matters is supported. Moreover, both DMOs and organizing companies have to take these challenges into account in order to minimize potential threats and to increase the likelihood of an overall project success.

From the empirical material, it can be concluded that DMOs perceive success from two different angles. DMOs primary implement an event in marketing activities, rather than being involved in managerial tasks. In this regard, an event is perceived as successful if a large amount of international media coverage can be recognized. This is supplemented by a positive content, which pictures an appropriate image of the destination. In addition, large events have a great impact on the host destination. From the second angle, DMOs consider an event to be successful, if a sustainable development of the destination can be identified. Regarding this perception, new constructions, an enhanced (touristic) infrastructure and an increase of (touristic) business settlements are evaluated in particular. The DMOs’ perception has to be taken into consideration by both project managers and the organizing companies of large events, in order to gain overall project success. A sustainable development represents the impact on the destination, which in turn, is recognized as both a challenge and a general objective of hosting large events. Once the challenges that come along with the impact on large events are overcome, a sustainable development of the host destination can be achieved. This in turn allows an implementation of the general objective of hosting a large event and represents the DMOs’ perception of success. This means that by coping with the challenges, certain benefits are drawn from the impact, which leads to a fulfillment of the general objectives and illustrates a key stakeholders’ perspective. In turn, an overall project success can be achieved, which is crucial for further enhancements. Moreover, the particular task areas in a DMO have distinct perspectives on success. This means that success is not only perceived differently between the particular stakeholders involved, but also between task areas of one stakeholder. Nevertheless, due to a DMOs central responsibility, namely to
promote a destination to specified target markets, distinct perspectives consolidate in the two angles described.

The DMOs’ perspective on success of large events can be better understood by taking into account the project (success) literature. In this regard, the models developed by scholars relating to temporal dimensions, success concepts and success criteria are suitable to the DMOs’ perspective (Baccarini, 1999; Cooke-Davies, 2002 & 2007; Shenhar & Dvir 2007). However, they need to be adjusted accordingly, since large events are rather intangible occurrences that are marked by services. This means that company specific terms can be related to the DMO, while customers can be stated as tourists. Projects in general can be adjusted to large events, while destinations represent businesses. The success criteria can be distinguished in tangible and intangible criteria and broadly allocated to the two perceptions, namely sustainable development and media coverage. In particular, a framework is developed, considering the crucial temporal dimensions, the certain success concepts and the related success criteria. DMOs use an event to market a destination, rather than being involved in project management tasks related to it. This means that the concept of project management success that is marked by efficiency can be neglected, which thus disregards the short-term dimension. In fact, DMOs focus on medium-term and long-term success dimensions. The medium-term dimension is marked by two concepts, which are event success and destination success. Event success further considers the impact on both the tourist and the DMO. Success criteria like an increased number of tourists, support of the residents, brand name recognition and the knowledge development in the DMO are considered to determine event success. Destination success can be specified by success criteria related to sales and profit, such as the landing of ships, planes and trains, business generations and hotel package revenues, as well as the return on investment. Additional success criteria to determine destination success are associated with the media attention. These are for instance the amount and type of media coverage as well as the impression drawn from social media. In the long-term dimension the organizational success is taken into consideration, which is marked by the preparation for the future and future large events. In this regard, the attraction of new markets, competences built and the existing relationships are examples for success criteria used to specify organizational success.

Considering the success criteria used by DMOs supports project managers and organizing companies to achieve overall project success of large events. In fact, a cooperation between these parties involved and an implementation of large events in the long-term strategy of DMOs enhances the likelihood to draw potential benefits from the large events and to fulfill the objectives of being the host destination of a large event.

6.1 Theoretical Contribution

By looking at large events from a project based viewpoint, this thesis has a theoretical implication on the current understanding of both project management and events. The thesis contributes to both schools of thought as the frameworks of project management can be adjusted accordingly to be applicable for events. By doing so, new theoretical matters developed that contribute to the current knowledge. In this respect, the analyzed findings and the conclusions drawn contribute to the literature on project success by supplementing it with the findings on project success of large events. A contemporary perspective to the present literature on events is provided by including the project based viewpoint.
6.2 Practical Implications

The identified perception of project success by DMOs and the success criteria used to determine project success of large events are transferable to other DMOs and large events. The developed framework can be used as a guideline to evaluate project success by DMOs of destinations that host a large event. By doing so, the evaluation is alleviated and particular challenges faced by DMOs in determining success may be overcome. Specifying a DMO’s perspective on project success allows project managers and organizing companies of large events to take the success criteria of this key stakeholder into account. This in turn increases the likelihood of an overall project success by satisfying the stakeholders’ expectations. However, as stated by literature, events are unique in their nature and “one size does not fit all” (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 704). Due to the many characterizing attributes, this may be particularly true for large events. The framework developed can therefore be used merely as a guideline for DMOs and project managers. However, it must not be considered as the one true solution to evaluate project success of large events. Depending on the destination, the type of event, the stakeholders involved and the particular requirements, the framework needs to be further adjusted individually and approved.

6.3 Societal Implications

As indicated by the examined DMOs, large events are used for marketing purposes. This is specified by Getz (2008, p. 406), who states that events may be considered to be a resource. However, exploiting this resource “can be problematic from a social and cultural perspective” (Getz, 2008, p. 406). The extent to which a large event is used as a resource for marketing purposes and marketing activities has to be chosen carefully in order to enhance the potential benefits and minimize the possible threats. This is particularly important for local events that focus on tradition, as an increased arrival of tourists to a cultural happening may threaten the cultural authenticity of an event (Getz, 2008, p. 407). It is crucial to determine whether an event is made for commercial reasons rather than for traditional ones and hence, to adjust the marketing strategy accordingly.

6.4 Future Research

Within this thesis the role of DMOs in large event, the perspective of DMOs on success and the success criteria to evaluate project success of large events were identified. However, as aforementioned, several selection criteria were established in order to find suitable cases for the study. These selection criteria and the resulting selected cases bear some limitations. Merely host destinations with a similar level from the economic, technical, environmental and social perspective are considered. Therefore, this thesis does not provide an insight into how the evaluation of project success for large events is undertaken in Asian, South American or African destinations. Since this research shall explain how the project success is evaluated by DMOs, the empirical material needs to be comparable and is required to have the same basic requirements. However, future studies need to examine how project success is evaluated by DMOs in distinct countries or on different continents in order to enable a worldwide comparison. Limiting this research to large events neglects smaller, regional occasions that yet might have a significant impact on the city or tourist development as well. Further studies that compare the evaluation of project success between large and small events and identify differences and similarities are required. Due to the limitation of this study to perception of project success, future studies that take into account the perception of project failure are needed. Eventually, this research focuses on the evaluation of project success by considering success criteria. However, project success is influenced by critical success factors from the beginning. Further studies on the critical success factors affecting the success of large events in general, and from the DMOs’ perspective in particular are required.
Appendixes

Appendix 1 - E-Mail Request

Personal Request in English

Dear name,

Within the European studies in Strategic Project Management at Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh and Umea University, I am currently undertaking a research for my master thesis on how destination management organizations evaluate project success of large tourist events.

I am highly interested in how DMO evaluated the event in place as successful, what criteria you considered and how you perceived your role in this large event. Therefore, I would like to have a brief interview with you, which will take around half an hour, and get to know the role of DMO in the event better.

May I contact you for this brief interview within the next days when it is suitable for you?

If you wish, I will send you an overview of interview questions in advance in order to enable a better insight into the area of research. It goes without saying that the provided information will be treated respectfully. A summary of the interview will be provided to you afterwards in order to ensure that everything was understood accordingly. Eventually, it would be my pleasure to provide you my master thesis after completion and inform you about my findings that might be of value for DMO as well.

I would highly appreciate your time and information and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,

Personal Request in German

Sehr geehrte(r) Name,

im Rahmen meines europäischen Studiums in Strategic Project Management an der Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh und Umea University führe ich für meine Masterarbeit derzeit eine Studie durch, die sich damit befasst, wie Tourismusämter den Erfolg von touristischen Großprojekten bewerten.

Daher bin ich sehr daran interessiert wie das Tourismusamt DMO den Erfolg von Event bewertete, auf welche Kriterien Sie sich bezogen haben um den Erfolg zu bestimmen und wie Sie Ihre Rolle in diesem Event sehen. Dazu würde ich gerne ein kurzes Interview mit Ihnen führen, das ungefähr eine halbe Stunde dauert, und dabei die Rolle von DMO in Event besser kennen lernen.

Darf ich Sie für dieses Interview in den nächsten Tagen kontaktieren?


Ich freue mich bald von Ihnen zu hören.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Appendix 2 - Interview Guide

Background Information

1. The DMO
   a. What are the general tasks and responsibilities of the DMO?
   b. Where is the DMO generally involved in?
2. The event
   a. What is this event about in detail?
   b. What are the event’s special characteristics (unique selling propositions)?
3. The interview partner
   a. What is your position in the DMO?
   b. What are your tasks and responsibilities include?
   c. How long are you working for the DMO?

Perception of Success

4. How does the DMO perceive success?
   When is the project considered to be successful from the DMO’s perspective?

Elements of Success

5. Have you considered any critical success factors (CSF)? If yes, which one?
   CSF: Factors that might influence the achievement of project success in both a positive and/or a negative manner?
6. What specific criteria do you use to evaluate project success?

Perspectives of Success

7. Do you evaluate success from different perspectives?

The dimension of time

8. At what points in time do you evaluate the project?
   Do you evaluate the project already during its execution, at specified milestones or/and after the event’s completion?

Stakeholders in the project

9. What key stakeholders are involved in the event besides your DMO?

Challenges

10. Did you face any difficulties regarding the event or project evaluation, both during the project execution or/and after project completion?
    If yes, what difficulties did you face?

Final remarks

11. Additional comments and final remarks?