

Sport Event Management and Knowledge Management: A useful partnership

Kristine Toohey

Professor, Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel and Sport Management,
Griffith School of Business, Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus

Sue Halbwirth

Senior Lecturer, Knowledge Management, University of Technology Sydney
Chair, Standards Australia Knowledge Management Committee

Abstract

There is a strong tradition of collecting and disseminating information and knowledge related to some areas of sport, for example, in the sports sciences for which there are comprehensive manuscript collections, data services, ongoing research and a strong body of academic literature. However there are other areas of sport where the management of knowledge has not been so effectively utilized. There is a strong case to suggest that sport event management is one of these latter areas.

Yet, the management of large sporting events, by necessity, includes the sophisticated use of information, but information management *per se* is rarely recognized as a formal component of sport event management, despite the fact that the organization of sporting events include many information actions and processes. There is however another dimension; that of knowledge. This paper explores the domains of knowledge and knowledge processes that can contribute to more effective sport event management.

Sport like any business is operating in a complex and global market. Sport event management needs to be adaptive to change, effectively manage risk, integrate technology advances and build stakeholder intimacy. Knowledge management is a multi-disciplinary approach that can assist sporting event organizations achieve operational excellence in complex environments, for example in gaining sponsorship, venue management, logistics and legacy benefits.

In late 2004 Standards Australia released an Australian Knowledge Management Standard. This standard is a descriptive guide for understanding and implementing knowledge management. The concepts it proposes and their relationship to sport event management will be illustrated in this presentation via the use of stories and case studies. Processes for the creation, sharing and use of knowledge within the business of sport will also be explored.

The presenters will argue that increased recognition of knowledge management can deliver to the business of sport events a competitive edge and an increased value to all its stakeholders - athletes, sport administrators, sponsors, the media and event managers, as well as to just to information professionals.

Introduction

The last decade has seen organizations, including event organizations, operating in environments characterised by constant change, technology advances and global interdependencies (Masterman, 2004). To meet these challenges, organizations in the private, public and community sectors are recognising the importance of knowledge as a resource, an asset and a form of competitive advantage. The concept of knowledge management as a trans-disciplinary approach to achieving organizational outcomes, by making the best use of knowledge, has developed as a practice and a topic of discussion in academic, business and government arenas. Knowledge management continues to fuel an active conference/workshop circuit, practitioner forums, journals, a growing pool of case studies and academic research. In terms of its operational perspectives however, there remains a diversity of opinions of its worth and from theoretical perspectives, how exactly to define it.

While it has been accepted that the management of large sporting events, by necessity, includes the sophisticated use of information, information management *per se*, until recently, has rarely been recognised as a formal component of sport event management, despite the fact that the organization of sporting events includes many information actions and processes (Halbwirth and Toohey, 2001). There is however another dimension to sport event management; that of knowledge. This paper explores the domains of knowledge and knowledge processes that can contribute to more effective sport event management.

Managing Knowledge

In the 1990s, the concept of knowledge management, as an integral component of a successful business, was introduced by a number of commentators, such as Davenport and Prusak (1998), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), and Stewart (1997). Their early discussions on knowledge management highlighted the importance of knowledge as an organizational asset and a resource too valuable to be ignored. They made a strong case that successful organizations needed effective approaches to managing all of their assets, including knowledge. This included the knowledge that is stored in systems, (electronic as well as hard copy), as well as the knowledge that is reflected in staff and their connections within the organization (Wenger et al., 2002).

But knowing how to manage knowledge resources presupposes there is an understanding of exactly what it is that they entail. A definition of knowledge that has been embraced by many knowledge practitioners is that proposed by Davenport and Prusak (1998), who are of the opinion that knowledge is broader, deeper and richer than what is classified as either data or information.

Knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information. It originates and is applied in the minds of knowers. In organizations, it often becomes embedded not only in documents or repositories but also in organizational routines, processes, practices, and norms' (Davenport and Prusak, 1998:5).

This definition includes a number of important foundation assumptions of knowledge : namely that it builds on what has gone before, by incorporating new experiences; and that it has both internal, personalised and external, codified components. From these understandings comes the basis of what processes are needed to manage it.

Knowledge management, as defined in Standards Australia International *Knowledge Management AS 5037-2005* is

'a trans-disciplinary approach to improving organisational outcomes and learning, through maximising the use of knowledge. It involves the design, implementation and review of social and technological activities and processes to improve the creating, sharing, and applying or using of knowledge.' (Standards Australia International, in press).

This is but one attempt to characterise knowledge management. To date there is not a universally accepted definition. However, in the past decade of discussion, a degree of consensus on a set of core values that knowledge management incorporates has emerged. Some of its components have developed within the community of academics and practitioners; while others are drawn from guides and standards (Standards Australia International, in press, British Standards Institute, 2001).

Some key knowledge management principles that have been agreed to are that:

- knowledge can be considered to flow between people
- knowledge can also exist within artefacts such as documents
- knowledge is an asset and as such has value
- managing knowledge is not an end in itself, but a means of achieving organizational outcomes
- effective knowledge management balances the elements of people, process, technology and content
- knowledge management can transform organizations, making them agile and adaptive to their environment
- knowledge management underpins organizational learning, improvement and innovation
- knowledge management is not something that can be bought off the shelf
- its implementation is based very much on organizational context.

While knowledge management varies in both its aims and implementation in different organizational contexts, the first major reporting of 'successful' case studies came exclusively from the commercial sector, especially large multi-national organizations, for example: IBM, Microsoft, Motorola, Boeing Company, Telstra, Shell Oil, Ford Motor Company, and KPMG Consulting (Standards Australia, 2001). However, post 2000 there has been an increase in gaining insights from public/government sector knowledge management case studies (Bryce, 2002; Chatwin, 2002; Stephens, 2000). This broadening of recognition reflects the way in which knowledge management has been used across different sectors, for example, for improving the effectiveness of publicly funded and community-based activities.

Knowledge and Sport

Sport is a multi-dimensional, multi-national and complex business. The training of elite athletes, sport development, the application of science and technology, and the execution of effective sport event management, are all areas in which information and knowledge is created and used. The 'winning edge' has as much to do with the use of information and knowledge to improve performance, as natural talent. For this reason in Australia:

'The National Sport Information Centre (NSIC) aims to contribute to the achievement of the Australian Sports Commission's objectives by enabling access to sports and related information and services. More than just a library, it is Australia's premier information resource centre for sport and its related disciplines' (Australian Sports Commission, 2005).

There has been a strong tradition of such collections and the dissemination of information and research related to sports science. There are comprehensive record collections, data services, ongoing research and a strong body of academic literature, in this area, however there are other spheres of sport, such as sport event management, where, until recently, the management of knowledge has not been so successfully endorsed (Halbwirth and Toohey, 2001).

Supporting and improving individual sport events with knowledge management

Sport events, like other businesses, are operating in a multifaceted and global marketplace. Sport event management needs to be adaptive to change, effectively manage risk, integrate technology advances and build stakeholder intimacy. Some of the specific operational contributions of knowledge management to sport event management include: improved operational efficiency; decreases in reinvention and duplication; and effective decisions.

Previous writings by the authors have explored how formal knowledge management activities supported the successful Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. For example, the Sydney Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (SOCOG) knowledge management activities spanned:

- People, for example, a culture which supported sharing and contributing to knowledge via communication tools and cross functional teaming.
- Technology, for example, intranets and portals to consolidate and disseminate knowledge
- Process, for example, shared workspaces to capture and build knowledge, learning from test events
- Content, for example, development of a warehouse of accurate and approved content for multiple users and uses (Halbwirth, 2001; Halbwirth and Toohey: 2001; Halbwirth, 2002).

While academic research regarding the organization of major sporting events, such as the Olympic Games, has usually focused on economic impacts, political outcomes, marketing and more recently legacy, accreditation, sport technology, field of play, transport, accommodation and other functional activities, the success of these functions is substantially grounded in the acquisition, production and dissemination of

information and knowledge. These core processes can often be overlooked as a key driver, resulting in the lack of coordination and integration of information and knowledge within sport event organizations.

A theoretical model for understanding and transferring knowledge across sport events

While there is a strong case for integrating knowledge management into each sport event there is also a compelling argument for the transfer of knowledge across comparable sporting events. For sport event organizations this provides an untapped potential to actively use the approach of knowledge management to take the learnings, identified better practice and knowledge outcomes from specific events and disseminate these for the use and development by future events organisers. This adds to the contributions of knowledge management to sport event management (listed above) to also potentially include identification of better practice and learning from success and failures.

This last aspect of knowledge management is akin to discussions on the concept of the intelligent or learning organization (Senge, 1990; Garvin, 1998). Like the term 'knowledge management', the definition of the learning organization is elusive. However, Garvin (1988:51) notes that 'a learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behaviour to reflect new knowledge and insights.'

The challenge for sport event organizations is knowing what is worthy of 'capture' and transfer and in what structure/format it might be of best use to the future event organisers as, according to Garvin (1998), continuous improvement programs have had more failures than successes, because many organizations are not committed to learning. A starting point is to understand different types of knowledge.

Machlup (1980), in his seminal work *Knowledge and knowledge production*, introduced some of the different attributes of knowledge, such as: to know that; to know what; to know how; and to know why. These types of knowledge he deemed respectively to be descriptive, historical, procedural and theoretical, each having a key contribution to make in the 'knowing of' and 'knowing about' the delivery of a sporting event.

In light of this understanding of knowledge components, some of the key issues and questions that might be relevant for sport event organisers to ask in order to collect knowledge within their organization would be:

- What we did
- Why did we do it
- Who did it?
- What were the issues along the way
- What resources did we need
- How did we work with others
- How much did it cost
- Did it work
- What would we do differently next time?

The literature of knowledge management recognises that knowledge can be transferred within an organization in a number of ways. Table 1, following, gives a suggested generic framework for how knowledge might be transferred across sport events. The concepts are adapted from the work of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995). This framework argues for multiple methods of both knowledge capture and transfer to ensure the inclusion of as many domains of knowledge as feasible.

Table 1: Transferring knowledge in a sport event organization

Theory (adapted from Nonaka and Takeuchi)	Practice
<p>Socialization - the sharing of personal knowledge (sometimes referred to as tacit) and know-how results from sharing another's experiences either through language or actions.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that this is not so much about knowledge capture but about knowledge sharing - often transient and reliant on people to people interactions.</p> <p>In organizational theory this has to do with group processes and organizational culture.</p>	<p>This would involve the establishment of mentoring (or apprenticeship programs) communities of practice (including virtual), and ready access to 'experts' from previous events. Other techniques might be seminars, meetings and reviews.</p> <p>The concept would be to develop a 'knowledge pool' of individuals and organizations that have established experience and expertise. This 'knowledge pool' would have a role of sharing their knowledge/judgments.</p> <p>Pre-requisites for success are an open culture, high levels of trust and adequate rewards and incentives to support the knowledge sharing.</p>
<p>Externalization - refers to the process of articulating the tacit knowledge referred to above into explicit form.</p> <p>By transferring the knowledge to explicit form it can be captured and stored.</p>	<p>This might occur via agreed monitoring and capturing of virtual conversations, decision diaries, documenting stories, minutes of meetings, videotaped interviews, recorded focus groups and collaborative work environments. In some environments skilled observers or knowledge gathers can be employed to shadow and document key people or processes.</p>
<p>Combination - has its roots in information management and processing. It is the combining of different bodies of explicit knowledge.</p>	<p>This is achieved via document management systems, knowledge repositories, templates and formal reporting processes.</p> <p>Another key role for the 'knowledge pool' as explained above would be the review, including value added processes (analysis and synthesis) to identify patterns and 'better practice' across events.</p>

The key question from this discussion is, could this reuse of knowledge make events less complex, more effective, streamline their organization and delivery, and provide

cost and project efficiencies? For the International Olympic Committee, beginning from 1998 the answer was 'yes' (Halbwirth and Toohey, 2001).

Despite the complicated logistics in organising an Olympic Games, until the 2000 Olympic Games, there was little knowledge or even information passed from each Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (OCOG) to the next, except for those staff who worked on successive Games, or a small number of Olympic consultants who sold their personal or tacit knowledge to the next Host city (Halbwirth and Toohey, 2001). When an OCOG was dissolved post Games, valuable information, knowledge and experience most commonly disappeared. Also, the power brokers from the upcoming Host Cities, which aimed to stage better Games than their predecessors, sought to do so on their own, rather than being reliant on past Games. This meant that there has not always been strategic information seeking from earlier OCOGs.

The first example of this practice changing occurred in 1998, when a commercial agreement was signed between the IOC and SOCOG, which formalised SOCOG's selling of its explicit and tacit knowledge to the IOC for \$A5 million. This material was then disseminated to the OCOGs of the Salt Lake City (SLOC) and Athens (ATHOq Olympic Games. This program was known as the Transfer of Know How (TOK) and established Olympic knowledge as a corporate asset (Halbwirth and Toohey, 2001).

Lessons learned from an attempt to capture knowledge

The TOK from Sydney 2000 involved both written and oral delivery of intellectual property from relevant SOCOG managers in 90 plus individual packages or guides. The first written material was collected in January 2000. SOCOG managers were required to complete a series of written templates provided on the corporate intranet site. Over the period of the next 10-12 months managers were obliged to update and expand their contributions. While managers were generally compliant, the quality of input was variable. For some managers the pressures of time and deadlines constrained their efforts, for others it was a desire to maintain their personal intellectual capital for possible future event roles (Halbwirth, 2002).

The TOK template was generic across the SOCOG functional areas and included material in categories such as:

- Definition of program
- Working assumptions and key issues
- Core resources/service providers, human resources, budget, logistics and equipment, IT systems and publications
- Planning - phases and process
- Milestones
- Operations
- Recommendations (Halbwirth, 2002).

However, by setting generic guidelines, often specific functional knowledge had to be compacted into inappropriate sections or omitted completely. There was also a lack of knowledge gathered from key stakeholders (such as government authorities involved in Games delivery) and limited opportunity to show cross-functional knowledge.

For most contributors the tone of the reporting into the templates was very objective and business like (Halbwirth, 2002). It is hypothesized by the authors of this paper that there was perhaps an underlying belief that one's performance as a manager was open to judgment because of the type of material that needed to be included. The richness of insight, opinions, stories and mistakes was generally not provided or sought.

To compensate for these recognised limitations of the written templates, a series of interviews between SOCOG managers, the IOC and ATHOC staff were held in the first half of 2000. These proved a valuable addition to the knowledge acquisition of ATHOC and the IOC, with mostly open and honest communication between the various stakeholders, allowing stories to be told and questions asked. Key issues from this phase related to the context of knowledge transfer: the readiness of the ATHOC staff to 'accept' knowledge, in terms of recognising what they needed to know four years in advance; and the need for processes to collate hours of taped interviews and transcripts. The final stage in the TOK process was a debriefing of the Sydney Games by its senior managers, to ATHOC, held in Athens during November 2000. This acted as a useful 'after action' review (Halbwirth and Toohey, 2001).

The concept behind the TOK was that the knowledge provided would form the foundation of generic Olympic management guides designed to evolve following each successive Games. The eventual outcome would be a 'franchise' set of manuals designed to streamline and simplify the management of the event.

Case study: Olympic Movement and leveraging event knowledge

The problem for the IOC, post 2000 was that through the TOK, they had captured a huge quantity of information in the form of printed documentation, electronic files, video and audiotape and artefacts. Knowledge was possibly contained within this explicit store but how would they extract the key messages, those learnings that were generic to the operation of the event and not specific to Sydney?

A number of key issues and questions were quickly recognised:

- there was the need for ongoing analysis, synthesis and management of this potential knowledge asset
- what was the knowledge that could be transferred across time and culture to future Games organisers or potential Candidate cities
- consideration needed to be given to future Olympic Games in relation to how the knowledge could be captured and best integrated
- who was the audience for the knowledge - was it limited to only future Olympic organisers
- what was the best way to leverage and commercialise the knowledge - was this in conflict with the ethos of the Olympic Movement (Halbwirth, 2002)?

To develop answers to these and other questions a company, Olympic Knowledge Services, now Olympic Games Knowledge Services (OGKS), was formed in 2002 to manage the knowledge, in the form of the know-how, know-what, the know-why, and the know-who, generated by the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games and to be built upon by successive Games. This was originally a joint initiative between the IOC and

Monash University, through its commercial arm, Monash Ed (Monash University, 2002).

'From this time (2002), OGKS was entrusted by the IOC as its exclusive knowledge management services company, in collaboration with its shareholders - the IOC in particular, providing advice, support and knowledge services for the Olympic Games and other major events across the globe.' (OGKS,2005)

In 2004 the IOC became the sole owner of OGKS when it bought out the Monash share (IOC, 2004b).

At OGKS's launch, in Salt Lake City, the president of the IOC, Dr Jacques Rogge, recognised the importance of the new direction as an Olympic milestone and an integral part of the IOC Games support system. Rogge was quoted as saying:

'The IOC has always provided significant financial support to Olympic Games organisers. Now the IOC also wants to bring greater efficiencies to bear in the organisation of the Games. OGKS was designed to help us do just that. OGKS will also help level the playing field so candidates and organisers from different parts of the world can all start with the same knowledge base'. (Monash University, 2002).

In a presentation to the Sports Accord Conference in May 2003 Craig McLatchey, the Chief Executive of OGKS recognised the need to provide knowledge in different ways and content at different times according to the needs of the client - 'an integrated and tailored approach for each stage of the event lifecycle'. (McLatchey, 2003: slide 12). He outlined an approach for segmenting the knowledge into several phases. The first stage of knowledge delivery was based around the candidature or bidding phase of acquiring the rights to hold an Olympic Games, in the following four stages: Country Feasibility; Pre-applicant; Applicant; and Candidate. OGKS delivers its knowledge product to these customers via seminars, workshops, knowledge based products such as CD ROMs, access to the Knowledge Centre (extra net of resources and information from previous events) and observer visits. Emphasis in these stages is on codified knowledge and direct guidance (McLatchey, 2003: slide 13).

Once a Games is awarded the delivery of knowledge is again targeted to the life cycle of the event. In this way information overload is avoided and the client organization (the OCOG) has access to knowledge that is of high relevance to it at the appropriate time. The cycle includes the following stages:

- Foundation (G -7, i.e. Games minus 7 years)
- Strategic planning (G -5 to G -3)
- Operational planning (G -2 to G -1)
- Test events (G -1)
- Operational readiness (Games)
- Dissolution (G +1)
- Legacy (McLatchey, 2003: slide 15).

The process of OGKS knowledge management operations to these OCOGs involves four phases: information capture, management, transfer and retirement. It passes on this knowledge through the following sources and processes:

- Workshops and seminars
- Subject matter experts
- Research services
- Observer Programmes
- Debriefing
- Post event analysis (McLatchey, 2003: slides 13 and 15).

In addition to codified (recorded information), value-added services that rely on people, through their expertise and knowledge, is delivered via advisor services (experts) and communities of practice. It is also proposed that during the OCOG's later stages, particularly from test event onwards, that the activity of knowledge capture is integrated into the Games organization. The OCOG, supported by the OGKS team, actively contribute to the Knowledge Centre. For the OGKS Chief Executive Officer, Craig McLatchey the goals for OGKS are to 'stop reinventing the wheel' and to encourage 'adaptation rather than invention' (McLatchey, 2003: slide 7).

In October 2004, the IOC President, Jacques Rogge, opened a series of OGKS Olympic Games debriefing meetings in Beijing, host of the 2008 Olympic Games. Representatives from Athens 2004 were there to address approximately 200 delegates from the following OCOGs (Turin 2006, Beijing 2008, Vancouver 2010) as well as representatives of the five Candidate Cities bidding to host the 2012 Olympic Games (Paris, New York, Moscow, London and Madrid). In his opening address Rogge noted various aspects of successful Knowledge Management, including learning from practice and managing the Olympic Movement's cultural elements. He stated:

'We are going to draw upon the experiences of the past and transfer the knowledge so as to ensure we do not replicate any past errors. We have the tool to do that, thanks to the knowledge transfer process we set up just over four years ago, more specifically 'Olympic Games Knowledge Services'. But having the tool is not enough. You also need humility: humility on the part of the organizing committees to realize they do not have all the knowledge, and so need to ask for help; and humility on the part of the IOC to recognize that we can also make mistakes. We have that humility' (IOC, 2004a).

While it could be argued that an organization that tells the world that it is humble, may not be so, there is no denying that the Olympic Movement, through the TOK and OGKS, has made great steps towards the management of its knowledge. Their challenge is to continue this program of knowledge capture and to integrate and enhance the knowledge environment of future OCOGs.

OGKS has also branched out beyond the Olympic family and has sold its services to other events, such as the Commonwealth Games and the Rugby World Cup. Whether this is sustainable and viable in the future remains a discussion point for the IOC, however in the short term the interest by non-Olympic sport event organisers in the value of knowledge management is encouraging. This signals that knowledge management is finally being accepted, not just as a component of event management, but also as a commercial asset.

Conclusions

In a world where events are characterized by growing complexity in both their internal and external environments, programs such as OGKS aim to provide event managers with a multidisciplinary approach to increase their operational effectiveness, mitigate risk and streamline processes. The task remains for OGKS, and comparable businesses to implement robust processes for capturing, value adding and disseminating knowledge as an ongoing product and service.

However, there are cautionary messages for sport event knowledge management providers. David Snowden, when exploring the third generation of knowledge management, observed that it is necessary to 'grow beyond managing knowledge as a thing to also managing knowledge as a flow. To do this we will need to focus more on context and narrative, rather than content.' (Snowden, 2002: 101). He provided three heuristics to illustrate 'the change in thinking required to successfully manage knowledge':

1. 'Knowledge can only be volunteered; it cannot be conscripted
 2. We can always know more than we can tell and we will always tell more than we can write down.
 3. We only know what we need to know when we need to know it'
- (Snowden, 2002: 102)

Sport event management organisers not only need to know more about knowledge management, To be successful, they also need to understand how to best implement it in the context of changing and increasingly complex and competitive internal communities of practice and external environments.

References

- Australian Sports Commission (2005) National Sport Information Centre Home Page. [Online] Available at: <http://www.ausport.gov.au/nsic/index.asp> [Accessed 8 February, 2005]
- British Standards Institute (2001) *Knowledge management: a guide to good practice*. (PAS 2001). London, BSI
- Bryce, C. (2002) 'Knowledge sharing in the public sector', *Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration*, 103,66-71
- Chatwin, D. (2002) 'A 'knowledge enabled' environment: knowledge management at the Australian Bureau of Statistics', paper presented at *Singapore Statistics Conference*. [Online] Available at: http://www.singstat.gov.sg/conferences/consultative/material/sabs_knowledge_management_story_Jeb2002.pdf [Accessed: 20 June 2003]
- Davenport, T. and Prusak, L. (1998) *Working knowledge: how organizations manage what they know!*, Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Garvin, D. (1998) 'Building a learning organisation' in *Harvard Business Review on Knowledge Management*, Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press, pp. 47-80
- Halbwirth, S. (2001) 'Beyond 2000 Towards Knowledge: Information Management and the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games'. *Sports Information in the Third Millennium: IT" IASI World Conference*, Olympic Museum and Studies Centre, Lausanne: Switzerland, 25-27 April 2001
- Halbwirth, S. (2002) 'Knowledge Management and the Sydney 2000 Games: a case study', in *Case studies in knowledge management. Volume 1*. Sydney, N.S.W.: Standards Australia International Limited, 2002, pp27-37.
- Halbwirth, S. and Toohey, K. (2001) 'The Olympic Games and knowledge management', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 1(2):91-111
- IOC (2004a) 'Rogge speaks to assembled past and future Olympic Games hosts' [Online] Available at: http://www.olympic.org/uk/games/beijing/full_story_uk.asp?lid=1132, [Accessed 27 January, 2005]
- IOC (2004b) 'Olympic Games knowledge services becomes IOC fully owned company' [Online] Available at: <http://en.beijing-2008.org/46/45/article211624546.shtml> [Accessed: 27 January, 2005]
- Machlup, F. (1980) *Knowledge and knowledge production*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Masterman, G. (2004) *Strategic sports event management: an international approach*, Oxford: Elsevier

McLatchey, C. (2003) 'Improving events and their legacy', Available at <http://www.sportaccord.com/visite/vfile/page/fileurl/366> [Accessed: 27 January, 2005]

Monash University (2002) 'Ioc and Monash combine on Olympic Games know-how' Available at <http://www.monash.edu.au/pubs/monmag/issue9-2002/iocju2002.html> [Accessed: 27 January, 2005].

Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995) *The knowledge-creating company*. New York: Oxford University Press.

OGKS (2005) 'About OGKS: company origins' Available at <http://www.ogks.com/ogkspublic/controller/SITE/OGKS/OGKS02/index.html> [Accessed: 27 January, 2005]

Senge, P. (1990) *The fifth discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Snowden, D. (2002) 'Complex acts of knowing: paradox and self-descriptive awareness', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(2), 100-111

Standards Australia (2001) *International best practice-case studies in knowledge management (HB 275 Supplement 1-2001)* Sydney, Aust: Standards Australia.

Standards Australia International (in press) *Knowledge management (AS5037-2005)*, Sydney, Standards Australia International..

Stephens, D. (2000) 'Knowledge management in the APS: a stocktake and a prospectus'. Paper presented to the *IPAA Conference: Five + years of reform*, Canberra, 20 November 2000. [Online] Available at: <http://hl.com.au/knowledge-management/articles/IPAApaper2nd.doc> [Accessed: 1 June 2003].

Stewart, T. (1997) *Intellectual capital: the new wealth of organizations*, New York: Doubleday.

Wenger, E.; McDermott, R. and Snyder, W. (2002) *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

THE IMPACTS OF EVENTS

UTISE

UTS: AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR EVENT MANAGEMENT

Associated events
 EVENT EDUCATION AND RESEARCH
 NETWORK AUSTRALIA SYMPOSIUM
 15 JULY 2005

SETTING AN AGENDA FOR DISABILITY AND
 TOURISM RESEARCH WORKSHOP
 12 JULY 2005

THINK.CHANGE.DO

THE IMPACTS OF EVENTS

PROCEEDINGS OF INTERNATIONAL EVENT RESEARCH CONFERENCE HELD IN SYDNEY JULY 2005

EDITED BY JOHNNY ALLEN

© Copyright Australian Centre for Event Management, 2005.

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced without written permission of the Australian Centre for Event Management.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent those of the Australian Centre for Event Management.

First published in July 2005 by the Australian Centre for Event Management
University of Technology, Sydney, PO Box 222, Lindfield NSW 2070

Tel: 61 2 9514 5156 Fax: 61 2 9514 5195 Email: John.Allen@uts.edu.au

<http://www.acem.uts.edu.au>

ISBN: 0 975095722

Printed by UTS Printing Services

PREFACE

Johnny Allen

Conference Convenor

Australian Centre for Event Management

At the First International Event Management Research Conference *Events Beyond 2000*, held in Sydney in July 2000, the economic impact of events and related methods for their measurement dominated the agenda of the Conference. However, the need for a wider and more holistic evaluation process was noted by the Conference, and reinforced by the Second Conference in 2002.

Since then, a triple bottom line approach to evaluation encompassing economic, social/cultural and environmental impacts has continued to emerge, notably in areas of academic research, the event industry and local government involvement in events. The response to the theme of this Conference would seem to indicate that this approach is now well established, with a wide variety of research projects exploring the full spectrum of event impacts and outcomes. In the Call for Papers, the theme of the Conference was broadened to include related areas such as event tourism, regional, community and event industry issues, and there has been a satisfying response in these areas also.

The area of event education and research has also continued to grow in tandem with the growth of the event industry, as demonstrated by the wide geographical spread of the Conference, encompassing delegates from most states of Australia and New Zealand, as well as from North America, Europe, Asia and Africa. As discussed at the last Conference, a special one-day Symposium has been added to the program to explore event education and research issues, and to establish an on-going association of event educators.

Papers from both the Conference and the Symposium have been published in the Conference Proceedings. All papers were submitted to a double blind peer review process, with papers grouped into thematic areas and each author invited to review the papers of two other colleagues. Authors were then invited to respond to the reviewers' comments in compiling the final drafts of their papers. The review process was overseen by the Conference Academic Committee consisting of Leo Jago, Rob Harris and Johnny Allen. The papers are presented in the same thematic areas in the Conference Proceedings, with working papers denoted by an asterisk and in some cases represented by an abstract only, at the discretion of the Committee. The papers have been edited to conform as far as possible to a uniform style, whilst respecting the differing styles and cultural backgrounds of the authors.

In order to promote a dialogue at the Conference among academic researchers, industry practitioners and government representatives, several industry guest presentations and workshops were incorporated in the Conference Program. These were not subject to the review process, and are not included in the Conference Proceedings, but where possible

have been placed on the Australian Centre for Event Management website at www.acem.uts.edu.au.

On behalf of the Conference Committee, I would like to thank warmly the guest presenters, academic authors, conference volunteers, and the many individuals and organizations that have contributed to the success of the Conference. Last, but not least, on behalf of the Conference Committee I would like to thank all our sponsors, without whose generous assistance we would not have been able to stage the Conference. Tourism Australia, the NSW Department of State and Regional Development, CRC for Sustainable Tourism, Victoria University, Southern Cross University, and the University of Queensland.

Johnny Allen, Sydney 2005

3200700366 81
The Journal of
Event Management
Volume 10
Number 1
2006
Published by
Sage Publications
Los Angeles, CA
London
New Delhi
Singapore
Washing DC
New York

394.50994
INTE
(2005)



**THE IMPACTS OF EVENTS
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS 2005**

PUBLISHED BY UTS AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR EVENT MANAGEMENT
ISBN 0 975095722