

# UTILIZING ANALYTIC NETWORK PROCESS FOR EVALUATING EVENT MANAGEMENT COMPANIES: A CASE STUDY IN CELEBRATION ACTIVITIES

Han-Chen Huang

Department of Tourism and MICE, Chung Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan.

## **ABSTRACT**

*This study explores the selection model for event contracting companies, analyzing the differences in selection criteria across various types of activities (such as arts and culture, industry and community development, and innovative festival activities). The findings indicate that the comprehensiveness of the project proposal and the feasibility of implementation are the most important criteria across all activity types, each holding the highest weight. Furthermore, different activity types place varying levels of importance on the contractors' professional knowledge, skills, and historical performance. This study provides a specific and objective selection model, offering a reference for enterprises and government agencies when choosing contracting companies, thereby increasing the success rate of event planning and execution. Future research could further extend the applicability of this model, verifying its effectiveness and applicability in other industries.*

## **KEYWORDS**

*Activities, Selection model, selection criteria*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Since the implementation of the two-day weekend policy in Taiwan in 2001, people's leisure time has significantly increased. Coupled with rising national income, the demand for leisure activities has correspondingly risen. The Taiwanese government has promoted the "One Town, One Feature" policy to encourage local governments to develop economic and cultural assets, strengthen local characteristics, and promote the organization of festivals and celebratory events [1-3]. Festival tourism has gradually become an important means for the development of the tourism industry in Taiwan. These short-term activities, which combine local cultural resources and cultural assets, not only enhance the local tourism appeal but also promote the prosperity of the local economy [4-6]. Every year, Taiwan holds more than a thousand festival activities of various sizes. These festival activities have become an important trend in promoting tourism, and countries are actively attracting crowds and promoting economic benefits through various events. Therefore, how to successfully organize such events has become a topic of concern for many regions [1-6]. Nowadays, festival activities are typically planned and executed by organizing companies, and selecting the appropriate organizing company is key to the success of the event. However, the current selection criteria for organizing companies are overly complex and detailed, and they fail to make appropriate adjustments for different types of activities [7]. This selection method is difficult to effectively reflect the specific needs of different types of activities. The objectives of this study are to:

- Construct streamlined and differentiated evaluation criteria for selecting organizing companies based on activity demands;

- Calculate the weights of the evaluation criteria to establish concrete and objective selection standards.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Festival Activities**

Festival activities in Taiwan are characterized by their rich diversity and multifaceted content, reflecting various dimensions such as traditional customs, religious beliefs, indigenous celebrations, cultural arts, agricultural product exhibitions, natural landscape appreciation, sports competitions, and local distinctiveness. These local festivals can be categorized into three main types:

- **Arts and Culture Activities:** These festivals focus on promoting tourism through an array of cultural celebrations and artistic performances that appeal to both domestic and international visitors. They serve to highlight the harmonious blend of Eastern and Western cultures, fostering cultural exchange and appreciation.
- **Industry and Community Development Activities:** These festivals emphasize the promotion of local industries by integrating unique local characteristics and cultural elements. They are designed to support community development initiatives, resulting in engaging new festival activities that resonate with local populations and visitors alike.
- **Innovative Festival Activities:** Drawing inspiration from traditional festivals, these activities aim to imbue age-old customs with new significance and present them in novel formats. By innovating traditional rituals, these festivals attract a broader audience, encouraging participation from diverse demographics.

### **2.2. Supplier Selection Criteria**

A review of the relevant literature on supplier selection [9-11] reveals that selection criteria can be grouped into 18 major categories, including price, cost, quality, delivery time, flexibility, production capacity, technology and innovation, service, financial performance, management and organizational culture, labor relations, training, inventory and raw material management, business relationships, risk management capabilities, sustainability and environmental management, regulatory compliance, and innovation and R&D investment. When selecting suppliers, establishing appropriate evaluation criteria based on different types of activities can help buyers quickly identify suppliers that meet their needs. These selection criteria should be adjusted flexibly according to the type of activity to enable purchasers to efficiently select suppliers that align with their requirements. Additionally, experts recommend using multiple evaluation methods, such as scoring matrices, decision trees, Monte Carlo simulations, mathematical programming, AHP, Analytic Network Process (ANP), linear programming, fuzzy comprehensive evaluation, and multi-criteria decision-making [9-12].

In addition to the primary selection criteria, secondary criteria such as supplier experience, reputation, reliability, production capacity, and transportation convenience can also be considered to comprehensively assess supplier capabilities. This allows for the formulation of suitable selection strategies based on different activity characteristics and market environments. A rational selection process can help buyers ensure the quality and stability of products or services, enhancing efficiency and competitiveness.

### **2.3. Delphi Method and Modified Delphi Method**

The Delphi Method is a collective decision-making technique that achieves consensus among experts on future scenarios or problems through expert questionnaire surveys [1,7,12-14]. The steps include selecting an expert group, conducting questionnaire surveys, anonymous statistical analysis, and feedback, ultimately leading to expert consensus. The Delphi Method is widely used in assessing current situations, future planning, quality improvement of policies, and business transformation diagnostics.

### **2.4. Analytic Network Process (ANP)**

The Analytic Network Process (ANP) is suitable for uncertain situations and multi-criteria decision-making problems [15,16]. By constructing a relative weight system for criteria and combining professional knowledge with mathematical statistics, the accuracy and reliability of the analysis are enhanced. The relative importance of the criteria is further confirmed through pairwise comparison matrices and eigenvectors, thereby strengthening the credibility of the evaluation.

## **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1. Literature Review Method**

This study begins by reviewing recent domestic and international journal articles to clarify the research topic and methods, and to identify the key factors for selecting organizing companies for activities, thereby establishing a hierarchical structure and evaluation factors. To optimize the selection process and address the issues of excessive and overly detailed criteria, as well as to consider the special needs of different types of activities, this study aims to develop a streamlined and differentiated evaluation model for selecting organizing companies for activities. Through literature exploration, experts from various types of activities were interviewed and surveyed, and a hierarchical structure of evaluation criteria was constructed. Subsequently, the Analytic Network Process (ANP) was used to determine the weights of the evaluation criteria. A review of relevant literature [1,7,9-13] indicates that the main factors for selecting suppliers or organizing companies can be broadly categorized into 4 to 6 major criteria, such as overall planning and feasibility, company professionalism, reliability and image, and service quality. The detailed sub-criteria can exceed 30 items, including the completeness of the proposal, feasibility, professionalism, reasonableness of cost estimation and allocation, effective marketing planning, alignment of planning content with activity objectives, expertise and skills of project management personnel, venue planning and layout, management of event details and execution efficiency, crisis response capabilities, coordination abilities of subcontractors, resource allocation, overall image and reputation, company size, historical performance, compliance performance, management philosophy, human resource management, dedicated service teams, proactive communication of progress, teamwork and communication, problem response speed, immediate professional knowledge support, and interaction quality of contact personnel.

### **3.2. Modified Delphi Method**

The Modified Delphi Method is an expert forecasting technique that falls within group decision-making technologies. This method gradually builds consensus on issues by gathering the professional knowledge, opinions, and experiences provided by experts. Experts complete questionnaires in written or electronic formats, allowing them to express their opinions fully in a confidential environment based on their expertise and self-awareness [12,14,17-20]. The response

rate typically declines with an increasing number of repeated surveys; therefore, this study limits the number of questionnaire rounds to two and invited 12 experts to participate. These experts come from Taiwan's government, academia, and industry, each bringing extensive professional backgrounds and practical experience (see Table 1). They represent institutions such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Hsinchu Science and Technology Company, the Convention and Exhibition Foundation, the Cultural Tourism Association, Huayu Company, and professors and administrators from Chung Hua University, Yu Da University of Science and Technology, Fo Guang University, and Kainan University.

Table 1. Experts and Service Units in the Modified Delphi Method

Title	Service Unit	Title	Service Unit
Specialist	Ministry of Agriculture	Professor	Chung Hua University
Chairman	Hsinchu Science and Technology Company	Professor	Yu Da University of Science and Technology
Section Chief	Convention and Exhibition Foundation	President	Cultural Tourism Association
Director	Huayu Company	Professor	Fo Guang University
Team Leader	Taiwan's Tourism Bureau	Technician	Scenic Area Management Office
General Manager	Tourist Hotel	Professor	Kainan University

### 3.3. Analytic Network Process

The Analytic Network Process (ANP) is a multi-criteria decision analysis tool aimed at addressing complex decision-making problems, particularly those involving multiple criteria and interdependent relationships [15,16]. Unlike traditional Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), ANP offers greater flexibility in considering the interactions among criteria, making it more suitable for decision-making processes characterized by high uncertainty or interactive criteria.

In ANP, decision-makers first construct a network structure composed of criteria, sub-criteria, and alternatives. They then evaluate the relative importance of each criterion through pairwise comparisons and utilize mathematical methods to calculate the weights, ultimately arriving at a comprehensive assessment result. The application of ANP is widespread, encompassing various fields such as supplier selection, project evaluation, and policy formulation, enabling decision-makers to make more rational choices in the face of complex multi-dimensional selections.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Through literature synthesis and analysis, this study designed a hierarchical structure and evaluation factors. The Delphi Method was employed to define the assessment criteria, and the selection criteria were finalized through two rounds of expert questionnaires (Table 2).

Table 2. Hierarchical Structure of Activity Selection Indicators

Assessment Criteria		Description
<b>Primary Criteria</b>	Feasibility of Planning	Overall planning and its feasibility for implementation.
	Company Expertise	The professional evaluation given to the organizing company.
	Reliability and Image	Whether the organizing company has a successful history and good reputation.
	Service Quality	Whether the organizing company provides relevant services during the event process.
<b>Secondary Criteria</b>	Feasibility of Planning	Completeness of the proposal: Whether the plan is comprehensive and achieves all necessary effects.
		Feasibility of plan implementation: Whether the plan aligns with actual implementation conditions.
		Reasonableness of budget analysis: Whether the fees charged by the planning are appropriate.
	Company Expertise	Knowledge and skills: Whether the personnel of the organizing company have sufficient expertise in arts and culture as well as planning capabilities.
		Efficiency of plan execution: Whether the details of the planned artistic and cultural event can be executed on time, to quality, and within budget.
		Crisis response capability: Whether the organizing company has the ability to handle emergencies.
	Reliability and Image	Historical execution performance: Whether the company has previously organized representative and successful artistic and cultural events.
		Brand image and market recognition: Whether the organizing company has a good reputation and strong recognition.
		Company size and resources: Whether the company size is sufficient to support the smooth execution of the event.
	Service Quality	Allocation of professional service teams: Whether a dedicated service team can be provided to improve efficiency during the event process.
		Team collaboration and communication: The extent to which relevant matters can be effectively coordinated.
		Regular updates on execution progress: The quality and efficiency of progress reports during the event execution.

These criteria include four primary criteria and twelve secondary criteria. Subsequently, the ANP expert group determined the relative weights of the evaluation criteria for three types of activities: artistic and cultural events, industry and community development events, and innovative festival events, with results detailed in Table 3.

Table 3. Weight Analysis of Assessment Criteria for Three Types of Activities

Weight Rank	Arts and Culture Activities	Weight	Industry and Community Development Activities	Weight	Innovative Festival Activities	Weight
1	Comprehensive Planning	0.2418	Comprehensive Planning	0.2221	Comprehensive Planning	0.1998
2	Feasibility of Implementation	0.1301	Budget Reasonableness Analysis	0.1741	Feasibility of Implementation	0.1687
3	Professional Knowledge and Skills	0.1201	Feasibility of Implementation	0.1262	Historical Performance	0.1348
4	Professional Service Team Configuration	0.1085	Efficiency of Implementation	0.1094	Efficiency of Implementation	0.1078
5	Historical Performance	0.0947	Team Collaboration and Communication	0.0941	Team Collaboration and Communication	0.0995
6	Efficiency of Implementation	0.0887	Regular Progress Updates	0.0666	Budget Reasonableness Analysis	0.0843
7	Crisis Response Capability	0.0631	Professional Knowledge and Skills	0.0459	Crisis Response Capability	0.0594
8	Brand Image and Market Awareness	0.0519	Historical Performance	0.0438	Professional Knowledge and Skills	0.0456
9	Budget Reasonableness Analysis	0.0433	Professional Service Team Configuration	0.0344	Regular Progress Updates	0.0324
10	Regular Progress Updates	0.0298	Brand Image and Market Awareness	0.0318	Brand Image and Market Awareness	0.0311
11	Team Collaboration and Communication	0.0169	Crisis Response Capability	0.0297	Company Size and Resources	0.0248
12	Company Size and Resources	0.0111	Company Size and Resources	0.0219	Professional Service Team Configuration	0.0118

#### 4.1. Evaluation Criteria Importance

##### 4.1.1. Overall Evaluation for the First Category: Arts and Culture Activities

The evaluation shows that the weights for the top 12 criteria are as follows:

1. Comprehensiveness of the proposal (0.2418)
2. Feasibility of the project implementation (0.1301)
3. Professional knowledge and skills (0.1201)
4. Professional service team configuration (0.1085)
5. Historical performance (0.0947)

6. Efficiency of project execution (0.0887)
7. Crisis response capability (0.0631)
8. Brand image and market awareness (0.0519)
9. Budget rationality analysis (0.0433)
10. Regular updates on execution progress (0.0298)
11. Team collaboration and communication (0.0169)
12. Company size and resources (0.0111)

(1) High Importance Criteria:

- The comprehensiveness of the proposal (0.2418) is the highest-ranked criterion, indicating its importance for the success of the event. A comprehensive and detailed plan can effectively enhance predictability and reliability in execution.
- Next, the feasibility of project implementation (0.1301) emphasizes the necessity of ensuring that the plan can be implemented under realistic conditions, highlighting that a comprehensive plan must be feasible.
- Professional knowledge and skills (0.1201) rank third, showing the direct impact of the team's expertise on the quality of the event.

(2) Medium Importance Criteria:

- The professional service team configuration (0.1085) indicates that effective teamwork and resource allocation are crucial for the success of the event, ensuring proper execution and response to potential challenges.
- The historical performance (0.0947) shows the significance of past successes, enhancing trust and reliability in planning; previous successes can provide valuable references for future plans.
- Efficiency of project execution (0.0887) highlights that the effectiveness and efficiency during the implementation phase are critical. Even with a good plan, inadequate execution efficiency can affect overall outcomes.

(3) Low Importance Criteria:

- Crisis response capability (0.0631) indicates the necessity of adaptability in facing uncertainties and emergencies, which can mitigate potential risks and losses.
- Brand image and market awareness (0.0519) are increasingly recognized, reflecting public awareness of the event and brand; a good image can enhance the event's attractiveness.
- Budget rationality analysis (0.0433), although ranked lower, emphasizes the importance of effective fund utilization concerning economic benefits.
- The weight of regular updates on execution progress (0.0298) is relatively low, underscoring the importance of transparency and communication; timely updates can enhance participants' trust.
- Team collaboration and communication (0.0169) is ranked low, indicating its importance in the overall activity but a relatively lower priority.
- The company size and resources (0.0111) has the lowest weight among all criteria, suggesting that size is not a decisive factor for success; more critical are the company's professional knowledge, skills, and past experiences.

In summary, these rankings indicate that emphasizing high-importance criteria, such as the comprehensiveness of the proposal, feasibility, and professional knowledge, is key in event planning and execution. While medium to low-importance factors like costs and brand image also

have influence, ensuring the comprehensiveness and feasibility of the plan remains the primary objective, aiding in enhancing the likelihood of success and maintaining flexibility and responsiveness in a dynamic environment to better achieve expected goals.

#### **4.1.2. Overall Evaluation for the Second Category: Industry and Community Development Activities**

The evaluation shows that the weights for the top 12 criteria are as follows:

1. Comprehensiveness of the proposal (0.2221)
2. Budget rationality analysis (0.1741)
3. Feasibility of project implementation (0.1262)
4. Efficiency of project execution (0.1094)
5. Team collaboration and communication (0.0941)
6. Regular updates on execution progress (0.0666)
7. Professional knowledge and skills (0.0459)
8. Historical performance (0.0438)
9. Professional service team configuration (0.0344)
10. Brand image and market awareness (0.0318)
11. Crisis response capability (0.0297)
12. Company size and resources (0.0219)

##### (1) High Importance Criteria:

- The comprehensiveness of the proposal (0.2221) is again the highest weight, indicating its significance for the success of industry and community development activities. A good proposal ensures that all resources and needs are fully considered, thus reducing uncertainties during execution.
- The budget rationality analysis (0.1741) further emphasizes the importance of budget control, which is crucial for the long-term development of the community and industry; rational budget allocation aids in the sustainability of activities.
- The feasibility of project implementation (0.1262) ranks third, reaffirming that ensuring feasibility under actual conditions is key to success.

##### (2) Medium Importance Criteria:

- The efficiency of project execution (0.1094) indicates that effectiveness and efficiency in execution remain crucial in the context of industry and community development.
- Team collaboration and communication (0.0941) highlight that collaborative capability among team members is crucial for the success of the activity, implying that good communication and cooperation will directly affect execution.
- The regular updates on execution progress (0.0666) are also significant in this category, stressing that transparency and timely communication enhance trust and collaboration.

##### (3) Low Importance Criteria:

- Professional knowledge and skills (0.0459) have relatively low weight, but still indicate that team expertise is indispensable in executing the activity.
- Historical performance (0.0438) suggests that while there is some value in referring to past cases, its impact is comparatively minor in this overall evaluation.



- The weights for professional service team configuration (0.0344) and brand image and market awareness (0.0318) indicate their lower importance in the current context.
- Crisis response capability (0.0297) and company size and resources (0.0219) are also considered less important factors, with the former still necessary when facing emergencies, but limited in overall evaluation impact, while the latter indicates that size is not a decisive factor for the success of industry and community development activities.

In summary, these rankings demonstrate that in the planning and execution of industry and community development activities, prioritizing high-importance criteria such as proposal comprehensiveness, cost rationality, and feasibility is crucial. Although medium and low-importance factors like execution efficiency and team cooperation also exert influence, ensuring comprehensive planning and rational resource utilization remains the top priority for enhancing the likelihood of success and sustainability.

#### **4.1.3. Overall Evaluation for the Third Category: Innovative Festival Activities**

The evaluation shows that the weights for the top 12 criteria are as follows:

1. Comprehensiveness of the proposal (0.1998)
2. Feasibility of project implementation (0.1687)
3. Historical performance (0.1348)
4. Efficiency of project execution (0.1078)
5. Team collaboration and communication (0.0995)
6. Budget rationality analysis (0.0843)
7. Crisis response capability (0.0594)
8. Professional knowledge and skills (0.0456)
9. Regular updates on execution progress (0.0324)
10. Brand image and market awareness (0.0311)
11. Company size and resources (0.0248)
12. Professional service team configuration (0.0118)

##### **(1) High Importance Criteria:**

- The comprehensiveness of the proposal (0.1998) again ranks highest among the evaluation criteria for innovative festival activities, emphasizing the crucial role of a complete and detailed event plan in ensuring success.
- The feasibility of project implementation (0.1687) is equally important, indicating that even innovative ideas need to find feasible pathways for practical execution.
- The historical performance (0.1348) shows the value of successful past cases, providing references for new activities and enhancing planners' confidence.

##### **(2) Medium Importance Criteria:**

- The efficiency of project execution (0.1078) ranks high, indicating that execution effectiveness and efficiency are crucial for realizing creativity in innovative festival activities.
- Team collaboration and communication (0.0995) illustrate the supporting role of teamwork in event success, especially in diverse festival activities where good team coordination enhances overall execution.

- The budget rationality analysis (0.0843) demonstrates the importance of funding control in this category, where a reasonable budget ensures the sustainability of the event.

(3) Low Importance Criteria:

- The weight of crisis response capability (0.0594) indicates that while adaptability in facing uncertainties and unexpected situations is still important, its influence is relatively smaller in this type of activity.
- Professional knowledge and skills (0.0456) are important, but their demand might not be as pronounced in highly innovative activities compared to other factors.
- The weights for regular updates on execution progress (0.0324) and brand image and market awareness (0.0311) show that transparency and a good brand image have influence, but their priority is lower in this type of activity.
- Company size and resources (0.0248) and professional service team configuration (0.0118) are also the least significant in this evaluation.

In summary, these rankings indicate that focusing on high-importance criteria, such as comprehensiveness of the proposal, feasibility, and historical performance, is vital in planning and executing innovative festival activities. While medium to low-importance factors like crisis response capability and team collaboration also play roles, ensuring a comprehensive plan and feasibility remains paramount for successful innovation and execution.

## 4.2. Analysis of Similarities and Differences

### 4.2.1. Common Points

- (1) Importance of the Comprehensiveness of the Proposal: In all three categories of activities—arts and culture, industry and community development, and innovative festival activities—the comprehensiveness of the proposal ranks as the highest-weight criterion, indicating its critical role in the success of the event. This suggests that regardless of the type of activity, a comprehensive and detailed plan is fundamental to enhancing predictability and reliability in execution.
- (2) Feasibility of Project Implementation: All three categories emphasize the feasibility of the proposed plan, indicating that even with a well-crafted proposal, it is essential to ensure that it can be executed under actual conditions. This is a necessary condition for success.
- (3) Historical Performance: In these three categories, past performance results are regarded as a criterion of medium to high importance, showing that experiences from previous successful cases can enhance confidence in future planning.

### 4.2.2. Differences

(1) Differences in Weight Ranking:

- Arts and Culture:
  - ◆ Professional Knowledge and Skills (0.1201) are highly valued, indicating that the team's expertise significantly impacts the quality of the event.
  - ◆ Professional Service Team Configuration (0.1085) is also emphasized, suggesting that the professionalism and collaborative ability of the team are crucial to ensuring the event's success.

- Industry and Community Development:
  - ◆ Budget Rationality Analysis (0.1741) ranks higher, highlighting the importance of budget control in community and industry activities.
  - ◆ The position of Efficiency of Project Execution (0.1094) also reflects this category's emphasis on execution efficiency.
- Innovative Festival Activities: Efficiency of Project Execution (0.1078) ranks higher in this category, indicating that in highly innovative activities, the effectiveness and efficiency of implementation are crucial.

(2) Low Importance Criteria:

- In the arts and culture category, Company Size (0.0111) is considered the least important, suggesting that size is not a key factor for success.
- In the industry and community development category, the low importance criteria include Professional Knowledge and Skills (0.0459) and Historical Performance (0.0438), indicating that the emphasis on team expertise and past experience is lower than other factors in this category.
- In the innovative festival activities category, the weight of Professional Service Team Configuration (0.0118) is the lowest, emphasizing that the specificity of a particular team is not a primary consideration in innovative activities.

### 4.3. Evaluation Scoring Table

These three categories, while sharing commonalities in high-importance criteria—especially regarding the comprehensiveness and feasibility of proposals—demonstrate different emphases in the weight rankings of medium and low-importance criteria. For instance, arts and culture prioritize professional knowledge and skills, while industry and community development focus more on cost control, and innovative festival activities emphasize the effectiveness of execution. These differences reflect the unique challenges and demands faced in the planning and execution of different types of activities.

To further understand the impact of these criteria in practical applications, a sensitivity analysis of weight parameters was conducted. This analysis assesses how changes in the weight of various criteria affect the final scoring results. Specifically, when the weight of a certain criterion is adjusted, the degree of its impact on overall scoring can change significantly. For example, if the weight of Professional Knowledge and Skills is increased from 7% to 10%, this could potentially enhance the scoring of activities in the arts and culture category, influencing the final selection of vendors. Similarly, if the weight of Budget Rationality Analysis increases, vendor scores in industry and community development activities may be reordered due to a greater emphasis on cost control.

Furthermore, this analysis also indicates that certain criteria exhibit higher sensitivity when faced with uncertainty. Notably, criteria such as Efficiency of Project Execution and Crisis Response Capability are often influenced by external factors during the execution of activities, meaning that even minor changes in their weights can lead to significant shifts in outcomes. Therefore, it is advisable to dynamically adjust weights based on the characteristics of different activities to ensure the accuracy and reliability of evaluation results.

Based on the assessment criteria and their weights across the three categories (arts and culture, industry and community development, innovative festival activities), Table 4 presents a

suggested scoring table for vendor selection applicable to all three categories after conducting sensitivity analysis on weight parameters:

Table 4: Evaluation Scoring Table for Event Vendors (Using Three Vendors as Examples)

Scoring Criteria	Max Points	Vendor A	Vendor B	VendorC
1. Comprehensiveness of Proposal	23			
2. Feasibility of Project Implementation	14			
3. Efficiency of Project Execution	11			
4. Historical Performance	10			
5. Team Collaboration and Communication	9			
6. Professional Knowledge and Skills	7			
7. Budget Rationality Analysis	7			
8. Regular Updates on Execution Progress	5			
9. Crisis Response Capability	5			
10. Brand Image and Market Awareness	4			
11. Professional Service Team Configuration	3			
12. Company Size and Resources	2			
Total	100			

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study explores the selection model for event contracting companies, leading to several important conclusions. First, there are significant differences in evaluation criteria among various types of events (such as arts and culture, industry and community development, and innovative festival activities). For example, arts and culture events place the highest emphasis on the comprehensiveness of the proposal (weight 0.2418), indicating that successful event planning requires a thorough and detailed design to meet audience needs. In contrast, industry and community development activities emphasize the professional knowledge and skills of the contracting company (weight 0.1201) and past performance, reflecting the complexity of these events that necessitate practical experience from the contractors.

Secondly, aside from the comprehensiveness of the proposal, the feasibility of project implementation (weight 0.1301) is also regarded as a high-importance criterion, underscoring the crucial role of practical feasibility in ensuring event success. Notably, the importance of company size and resources (weight 0.0111) was rated as the lowest in the selection process, indicating that even smaller companies can successfully handle events as long as they possess the requisite professional knowledge, skills, and a solid track record of execution. This finding emphasizes the need to prioritize professional expertise and successful past cases over mere company size when selecting contractors.

Finally, the selection model and specific weight distribution proposed in this study provide concrete and objective reference points for businesses or government agencies in choosing event contracting companies. This enhances the success rate of event planning and execution while achieving greater efficiency in resource allocation. Future research could incorporate more case analyses or empirical studies to validate the effectiveness and applicability of the selection model, as well as explore how to expand this selection model to other industries to improve the quality and efficacy of event contracting.

In summary, this research successfully establishes a selection model for contracting companies that aligns with the needs of different event types, providing specific evaluation criteria and weightings. It is hoped that this will offer substantial guidance and assistance to professionals in related fields.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study references the work presented by Yu-Tong Jian, Han-Chen Huang, Cheng-I Hou, Ping-Chang Lin, and Yun-Zou Fanjiang at the 19th Conference on Technology and Society in June 2023 [7]. Building upon their research, this study refined the selection criteria, engaged a broader group of experts, and adopted the Analytic Network Process (ANP) for analysis. Appreciation is extended for their foundational contributions to this research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Li, J. H. (2015). Selection of event contracting companies for festivals: Application of the Delphi method and analytic hierarchy process (Master's thesis, Department of Leisure Management, Yu Da University of Science and Technology, Taiwan).
- [2] Chen, B. F. (2006). A study on the incorporation of cultural tourism into festival event evaluation: A case study of the Dajia Mazu Cultural Festival (Master's thesis, Graduate Institute of Land Management, Feng Chia University, Taiwan).
- [3] Wang, Y. Q. (1999). Festivals and folk customs: Creating new tourism resources. Taipei: Yang-Chih Cultural.
- [4] Liu, Z. J., Liu, Y. H., & Meng, X. R. (2008). Constructing a cognitive model of the benefits of local festival activities for participants. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 141-162.
- [5] Lee, Y., Lee, C., Lee, S., & Babin, B. J. (2008). Festival scapes and patrons' emotions, satisfaction, and loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(1), 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.05.011>
- [6] Quinn, B. (2003). Symbols, practices, and myth-making: Cultural perspectives on the Wexford Festival Opera. *Tourism Geographies*, 5(3), 329-349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461668032000133295>
- [7] Jian, Y. T., Huang, H. C., Hou, C. I., Lin, P. C., & Fanjiang, Y. Z. (2023). Streamlining and differentiating the selection model for event contracting companies. In *Proceedings of the 19th Conference on Technology and Society* (pp. 1-9). Hsinchu City, Taiwan.
- [8] Huang, D. S. (2003). Festivals in Taiwan. Taipei: Yuan-Tsao Publishing.
- [9] Swift, C. O. (1995). Preferences for single sourcing and supplier selection criteria. *Journal of Business Research*, 32(2), 105-111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(94\)00059-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(94)00059-W)
- [10] Chen, W. L., & Chen, T. L. (2018). Applying Importance-Performance Analysis to improve the service quality of semiconductor quartz material suppliers. *Management Information Computing*, 7(S1), 90-100. [https://doi.org/10.6285/MIC.201808\\_7\(S1\).0010](https://doi.org/10.6285/MIC.201808_7(S1).0010)
- [11] Wu, M. Y., & Jiang, J. L. (2011). Development of a green supplier selection scale for electrical and electronic industries. *Journal of Data Analysis*, 6(2), 19-48. [https://doi.org/10.6338/JDA.201104\\_6\(2\).0002](https://doi.org/10.6338/JDA.201104_6(2).0002)
- [12] Zhang, S. X. (2012). Fuzzy multi-criteria evaluation methods and statistics. Taipei: Wunan Publishing.
- [13] Dickson, G. W. (1966). An analysis of vendor selection systems and decisions. *Journal of Purchasing*, 2(4), 563-588.
- [14] Murry, J. W., & Hammons, J. O. (1995). Delphi: A versatile methodology for conducting qualitative research. *The Review of Higher Education*, 4(18), 423-436.
- [15] Saaty, T. L. (1996). Decisions with the analytic network process (ANP). University of Pittsburgh (USA), ISAHP.
- [16] Saaty, T. L. (2004). Decision making—the analytic hierarchy and network processes (AHP/ANP). *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering*, 13(1), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11518-006-0151-5>

- [17] Wen, P., & Huang, H. H. (2009). The application of fuzzy analytic hierarchy process on service quality and perceived value of promotion evaluation of chain drugstores. *Chung Yuan Management Review*, 7(2), 85-102. <https://doi.org/10.30104/CYMR.200912.0004>
- [18] Hou, C. I., Lin, P. C., & Chueh, C. Y. (2020). Study on key factors of preventing internet addiction among primary school children. *Journal of Tourism and Leisure Management*, 8(1), 187-201. [https://doi.org/10.6510/JTLM.202006\\_8\(1\).0015](https://doi.org/10.6510/JTLM.202006_8(1).0015)
- [19] Hou, C. I., Lin, P. C., & Lin, Y. L. (2020). A study on the selection of field trips for the public kindergartens in Miaoli County. *Journal of Chinese Management Development*, 9(1), 23-35. [https://doi.org/10.6631/JCMD.202006\\_9\(1\).0002](https://doi.org/10.6631/JCMD.202006_9(1).0002)
- [20] Wu, C. F., Lin, Y. J., & Hou, C. I. (2019). Research on key affecting factors of oral health care for the students of elementary schools. *Journal of Chinese Management Development*, 8(2), 30-44. <https://www.airitilibrary.com/Article/Detail?DocID=P20160310001-201912-202007020013-202007020013-30-44>