Inside and outside the boardroom: Collaborative practices in the performing arts sector

(Article begins on next page)

11 October 2022

Inside and outside the boardroom: Collaborative practices in the performing arts sector

Abstract

Collaboration is crucial in the arts sector, where forms of collaborative governance have been implemented in order to overcome scarcity of resources and to engage with stakeholders. The governance of performing arts organizations today needs to be based on constant collaboration between public and private entities in order to generate greater value.

This study aims to identify the drivers which foster collaborative governance in performing arts organizations. We use a case study of "I Teatri Foundation" of Reggio-Emilia, one of the first theatres in Italy to include private partners in governance, to explore collaborative governance. The methodology is based on both documentary analysis and interviews. Findings show that collaborative governance, the inclusion of private partners in the decision-making process, should be applied at *micro* and *meso* level (inside and outside the boardroom), as both levels contribute to the creation of value for the audience.

Introduction

Arts organizations all over the world today find themselves operating in a climate of change and uncertainty, which is compelling them to act more strategically, reinvent their governance structure and restructure their business model (Fanelli et al. 2020; Reid and Turbide 2012). The numerous initiatives for improving performance around the world have however resulted in very different forms of governance and organizational structure. These often feature prolific cooperation between public and private sectors, aligning their interests to carry out projects generating benefits for both (Borin 2016). These arrangements are built with the aim of enhancing synergic and complementary advantages, and also with the awareness of the risks of sharing benefits between partners. Individual organizations, however, often lack sufficient resources to provide high quality goods or services, and sharing resources, such as money, personnel, information, and experiences can facilitate the achievement of objectives, sharing risks, making investments, and/or solving social problems (Van Ham and Koppenjan 2001). The need to collaborate is urgent in the cultural sector, where multi-stakeholder partnerships and forms of collaborative governance (CG) have been implemented in order to overcome scarcity of resources and lessen the financial burden on the public sector (Andres and Chapain 2013; Borin 2016; Fanelli et al. 2020).

The winds of change in the cultural sector started to blow when the theory of New Public Management (NPM) appeared. In the performing arts, NPM meant achieving sustainability through broader funding diversity, new partnership models, innovative managerial models, and more adaptable forms of governance. For example, from the early 1980s, NPM promoted forms of governance based on vertical collaboration, through the delegation and decentralization of the decision-making process from public to private (Hood 1991). But it was the evolution of NPM into the paradigm of Public Governance (Belfiore 2004; Bonet and Donato 2011), in the mid-1990s, which increasingly stimulated forms of horizontal partnerships, where public and

private actors cooperate to provide public services (Osborne 2006). The new paradigm criticized NPM theory for excessive focus on internal performance of public organizations and not giving enough attention to external stakeholders such as community and users. Public Governance thus focuses on the concept of governance, which becomes the key element in rethinking the process of public management. Partnerships are intended as more elastic arrangements based on the flexibility of governance structures (Hodge and Greve 2007). The new concept of governance is underpinned by consensus, the involvement of a large number of public and private actors, greater consultation, and a focus on outcomes and public value.

In this view, the governance of performing arts organizations should thus be based on constant collaboration between public and private entities in order to generate greater value. In the literature, this new form of governance is known as "collaborative governance" (Ansell and Gash 2008; Emerson et al. 2012). The theory of CG was increasingly formalized as collaboration schemes implying wider governance rapidly became more frequent. In 2008, Ansell and Gash defined CG as "a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets" (p. 544). Doberstein (2016) later wrote that the aim of CG is to allow the creation of public value through a perspective in which public administration is no longer the sole player, but takes part in intensive collaboration with private firms and civil society. The traditional NPM approach, based on the 3Es (Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness), was thus expanded to the 5Es, including also Equity and Environment (Benington and Moore 2011).

The new formalizations of the theory led researchers and practitioners to shift focus towards more complex frameworks, arrangements, governance and management models. Growing

attention was given to how these new forms of collaboration generate public and social value (Skelcher 2010).

Previous studies on cooperative forms of governance in the cultural sector are characterized by three main approaches. The first stream of studies concerns the involvement of private actors at a very high level (*macro*), such as in developing cultural policies (Andres and Chapain 2013). The second one focuses on a *meso* level, such as the engagement of private partners to manage local cultural assets for promoting the territory (Bonet and Donato 2011; Holden 2015). The last stream focuses on single cultural organizations or projects (*micro*-level), and identifying the criteria and the drivers that lead to partnership success in a new model of governance (Ferri and Zan 2015; Thompson 2006). The main issues in this last stream today are: building governance systems based on strongly-shared cultural identity, engaging multiple stakeholders in CG schemes, and designing governance structures to ensure social and public value for citizens. The consideration of both public and social value is different from the traditional approach; in the new scenario, the economic dimension is still significant, but it is not the sole priority as it was in the past, and value generated for the community acquires new importance. Larsen (2014) writes that it is essential for state-funded cultural organizations to carry out their societal mission, and that they should show an open approach to society. In short, the topic of public and social value creation has captured the governance debate, and the traditional vision of public value creation needs to be developed along with innovative views on the role of private subjects. It is recognized that the significance of private actors is enhanced by their involvement in the public value creation process, and their viewpoint is considered with more interest in the development of collaborative projects (Kivleniece and Quelin 2012).

So, the development of successful CG forms is one of the biggest challenges facing performing arts organizations (Henisz 2006). Involving private partners in the decision-making process may in fact be complex and time consuming (Boukherroub et al. 2018). Stakeholders have different

interests and values, and conflicts can arise and compromise the success of collaboration. But it is important for innovative governance and management schemes to embrace collaborative approaches, expressing the social goals of the public-private agreement and overcoming fears of opportunistic behaviors which characterized previous governance and managerial arrangements (Chong et al. 2006). On the basis of Ansell and Gash's definition, Emerson et al. (2012) developed a logic model of CG based on collaborative dynamics and collaborative actions, which is discussed below in this paper. Together, two concepts shape the overall quality and extent to which CG produces impacts and adapts to different contexts. The concepts are first that Drivers either facilitate or discourage cooperation among stakeholders, and secondly that Collaborative Dynamics reflect interaction between principled engagement, shared motivation and capacity for joint action.

The setting for this study is the cultural sector in Italy, which, like many other European countries, has seen widespread introduction of governance models and management systems reflecting NPM and CG paradigms (Dubini and Monti 2018; Fanelli et al. 2020). The study is part of the stream of studies on CG in the cultural sector, and discusses CG with reference to the initial phase of the logic model of CG by Emerson et al. (2012), briefly described above.

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. The first section describes CG in the cultural sector. The next section focuses on the Italian cultural scenario in order to frame the context of the case study, and a short paragraph on the Reggio-Emilia Theatre Foundation is followed by a description of the methodology and results. The paper ends with conclusions and describes some implications for management. The contribution to theory is discussed according to collaborative dynamics in the CG framework of Emerson et al. (2012).

Governance issues in the cultural sector: The need to collaborate

Governance has always played a key role for performing arts organizations. Turbide (2012) states that governance structures can absorb and avert financial crises, and Dubini and Monti (2018) argue that governance can act as mediator between stakeholders and management, orienting the organization's growth trajectory. Governance is also a determinant in addressing external shocks (Griffin 2003), looking for new approaches to fundraising and marketing (Besana 2012), balancing artistic and financial performance (Fanelli et al. 2020), and pursuing social and public goals (Hewison 2004). Several recent studies have in fact focused on the governance structure in performing arts organizations, and more precisely on the role of the board and its composition (Azmat and Rentschler 2017; Dubini and Monti 2018; Fanelli et al. 2020).

A board should be able to adapt in response to environmental changes, and many studies have shown that boards modify size and composition in response to external shocks (Gabrielsson and Huse 2004; Hau and Thum 2009; Pearce and Zahra 1992). Today, the external environment in which performing arts organizations operate is characterized by financial crisis, related to the reduction of public funds (Rubio Arostegui and Rius-Ulldemolins 2020), and by the need to continue fulfilling their mission of creating public and social value (Hewison 2004).

As a consequence, governance structure in performing arts organizations has changed significantly in recent years, shifting from a paternalistic to a community-focused approach (Rentschler 2015). Given the need to consider new approaches to cooperation in which culture is part of the broader socioeconomic environment (Borin 2016), the CG paradigm has also been applied to the cultural sector. A CG approach is in fact particularly relevant for sectors characterized by intangibles and the creation of value for the community.

In the majority of western countries, because "art" and "culture" are considered as "merit goods", the arts sector has traditionally been characterized by a strong presence of public

institutions, and publicly financed (Towse 2001). The financial crisis has however cut the flow of money to cultural organizations, in many cases compromising the achievement of their mission (Fanelli et al. 2020). As a consequence, performing arts organizations have been involved in the process of change affecting most public entities, and partnerships with the private sector have become widespread, which brings new potentially disruptive changes. Koppell (2006) classifies the forms of collaboration between public and private subjects along a continuum of hybrid arrangements, ranging from a total public ownership to complete privatization. Partnership arrangements in the cultural sector have often interpreted cultural cooperation in terms of the creation of a collaborative environment, rethinking the process of governance systems and management models (Borin 2016). In fact, although arts organizations have a primary focus on serving their diverse stakeholders, on whom they depend for donations, stakeholder trust is also crucial for their survival and sustainability (Azmat and Rentschler 2017).

Financial reasons are not the only driver for the involvement of private actors in performing arts organizations. Collaboration can in fact produce a wider societal impact as well as more efficient use of resources. There are positive externalities (public-sector benefits) of using the public-private partnership and CG model (Reeves 2002; Scott 2006). In other words, performing arts organizations not only increase sources of funding, but also gain artistic credibility and legitimacy when they are perceived as significant and inclusive by a wider community of citizens (Kann-Rasmussen 2019). It is essential for an organization to be able to show that it engages with society, because legitimacy derives from "crossing the borders" or having a public profile outside the organization.

With this in mind, many CG experiences are attempting to overcome the traditional dynamics of sponsorship relations between performing arts organization and private partners and are looking at more integrated forms of cooperation, such as the involvement of private

actors in governance and management. The CG framework set out by Ansell and Gash (2008) does not necessarily include the involvement of private players on the board of public institutions, but there have been many such initiatives recently (Ferkins et al. 2018; O'Boyle and Shilbury 2018; Van Oortmerssen et al. 2014), in the arts sector, as in others. The purpose of a more restrictive form of CG is to enhance the competencies of both public and private partners, and to encourage cooperation with other external stakeholders operating in the area. A multi-stakeholder partnership involving public entities, private firms and citizens, is perceived as a potentially successful model for generation of public and social value, although no detailed studies of the model have as yet been made. Different stakeholders can in fact create potential positive spillover effects on socio-economic growth and on the cultural identity of a territory, increasing the sense of belonging in local communities (Klein et al. 2010). Kivleniece and Quelin (2012) write that identification is an important value for public entities, private subjects and other external stakeholders, especially local communities who benefit from delivery of CG services.

Successful performing arts organizations can exploit partners to assure the quality of their performance and funding, and to further contacts. On the other hand, an organization with too few connections with external stakeholders can appear to be isolated and unattractive.

Research setting and method

Italian Theatres of Tradition, a stronghold of social and local values

The Italian performing arts sector, in spite of its undisputed importance, is characterized by certain weaknesses. It is recognized as being fertile and innovative, of high technical and artistic quality, and is widely admired and imitated abroad. At the same time, however, it suffers from bureaucratic governance processes and sometimes lacks managerial vision and financial stability (Trimarchi 2002).

The overall picture is varied as the sector is wide. Studies investigating management choice and institutional challenges tend to focus on the big opera houses (e.g. Dubini and Monti 2018; Fanelli et al. 2020; Sicca and Zan 2005), but institutionally there are many smaller theatres and local companies, which are often strongholds of local values and society, and operating under innovative governance systems.

The Italian Ministry of Culture classifies the types of institutions within the performing arts sector (Law 14 August 1967, No. 800):

- *Opera houses*, 14 organizations, mainly large theatres, like "La Scala" which has a permanent staff for the production and broadcast of opera, concerts and ballet.

- *Theatres of Tradition*, 29 organizations, deeply rooted in their local areas, which do not usually have permanent staff but where opera, concerts and ballet are performed regularly.

- *Concert and orchestral institutions* (Istituzioni concertistico-orchestrali), 14 organizations which promote, facilitate and coordinate musical activities in their area, and have a permanent staff including an orchestra, for example, the Fondazione Arturo Toscanini.

The Italian performing arts system has always been characterized by "management by decree" (Marcon and Panozzo 1998), with important organizational and management reforms enforced by law. There have been a series of laws impacting on governance and aiming to raise overall performance levels by way of support from the private sector in terms of skills, knowledge and finance.

The most important reform was enacted in 1996 and implemented in 1999 (Legislative Decree 367/1996). It transformed what were state-run bodies into private entities, with boards of directors, budget autonomy, and responsibility for hiring and firing. Theatres and opera houses had to have their own statues specifying mission, board composition and criteria for private

members sitting in the board, which are usually related to commitment to donate. They went from being completely public organizations to organizations which are still publicly financed and managed, but which are private foundations collaborating with numerous public and private actors. They now include private stakeholders in their governance processes, with the aim of lowering levels of uncertainty and dependence on public subsidies (Donelli et al. 2017), as well as representatives from the public sphere, such as the mayor of the city, who is usually the chairperson. Governance of the sector is thus horizontal and vertical. Horizontally it includes private stakeholders, and vertically it includes different levels of public government, ranging from ministerial delegates from national government to delegates from lower levels of regional and local government (Fanelli et al. 2020).

The Theatres of Tradition (TT), the focus of this study, tend to be closely linked to a particular environment. They are usually located in medium-sized cities and are active in the local area. The main stakeholders are the local municipality and local community. Along with Concert and orchestral institutions, TTs are responsible for "promoting, facilitating and coordinating musical activities which take place in the territories of the respective provinces" (Art. 28, Law 14 August 1967, No. 800). Under Article 28, the status of Theater of Tradition is issued by decree of the Italian Ministry of Culture "to theaters that prove to have given impetus to local artistic and cultural traditions". They are mainly locally financed; on average 23% of their income is from the municipality and they also have a high percentage of earned income.

Theatres of Tradition are important for promoting the careers of emerging artists and operate within the international opera circuit in terms of voices, conductors and hired artists. TTs have increasingly taken on the role of multi-purpose cultural production centers in the entertainment sector, gaining a name for opera, musical, stage and dance productions. As specified in the law,

TTs must maintain a close connection with their area, which entails including different private partners in their governance process. TTs contribute to the cultural heritage of Italian cities through their productions and through their very presence. Although collaboration enables them to further contribute to social values, there are factors which prevent this. This research identifies the main drivers of, and obstacles to, stakeholder participation in a CG process.

Methodology

The main approach in the field of CG is to use single-case studies (Ansell and Gash 2008). Case study analysis is considered suitable for interpreting change in strategic directions (Eisenhardt 1989), and this case study focuses on the case of an Italian TT: "I Teatri Foundation" of Reggio-Emilia. In addition, Yin (2009) argues that multiple sources should be used when building the "case". Thus, setting up the framework of our methodological strategy, we use both documentary analysis and interviews. Research data were triangulated, as is usual in case study research, in order to ensure validity (Yin 1984). Yin (1994) and Bowen et al. (2010) find that multiple methods are useful in qualitative research in order to triangulate results and reduce the impact of possible biases. According to Lincoln and Guba's (1985) framework, methodology in a multi-source study is more likely to be trustworthy when data from inside and outside the organization is triangulated.

This study is based on a recognized framework of CG, and findings can be transferred to other TT in Italy. At, at the same time, it provides insights and descriptions of the Italian scenario.

A case study was thus selected in order to address the following research question: *How can collaborative governance be implemented inside and outside the boardroom in the performing arts sector?*

The perspective of the case study was exploratory, sharing the viewpoint that we live in a world that is socially constructed (Yanow 2006). The case study was conducted using an interpretive approach with abductive reasoning (Yanow 2006), working iteratively, back and forth, from theory to data.

Document analysis

Different types of documents of "I Teatri Foundation" from the period 2016-2020 were analyzed. These included:

- Foundation statutes, including those related to board composition (three documents entitled: "Holders of political, administrative, management or government offices") and organizational charts;

- Six public calls for collaboration and contracts with third parties ("*Atti delle amministrazioni aggiudicatrici e degli enti aggiudicatori distintamente per ogni procedura*" n.6);

- Four annual reports (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020) The documents revealed the different types of collaboration, terms and conditions and activities undertaken;

- Websites of the "I Teatri Foundation" and of the stakeholders interviewed

Documentary analysis is in fact particularly useful for case studies, as it provides a rich description of phenomena (Yin 1994). In the second step, the publicly available documents and websites of external partners were analyzed.

Interviews

The first interview with the CEO of "I Teatri Foundation" was conducted to triangulate evidence provided by the documents, and to identify key stakeholders to interview. Three board members were selected for interview on the basis of duration of service on the board, and three

external organizations were selected for interview as partners in planning theatre activity 2019 - 2020. Interviewing both internal and external stakeholders was useful in order to capture different points of view on the topic and reduce any distortions stemming from a univocal vision of the phenomenon (Crilly et al. 2012). Semi-structured, in-depth interviews were carried out during the period February-March 2020. The interviews (20-45 minutes) were conducted by phone with the exception of the interview with the CEO, which was conducted face to face. It lasted three hours, provided important detailed insights, and was followed by informal emails and phone calls on certain specific themes.

The interviewees are involved in various ways in the processes of CG of the theatre, as summarized in Table 1. The three main topics discussed in the interviews were: the reasons for the collaboration, the evolution of the collaboration, and interaction, including any problems arising during the collaboration process. Interview transcripts and documents were open coded, and similar themes were categorised together.

[Table 1 about here]

The Case- study: "I Teatri Foundation": Three theatres within one foundation

The TT are regulated by Art. 28, Law 14 August 1967, No. 800 and have the aim of promoting, facilitating and coordinating musical activities in their province. Under this law, after discussion with the Consultative Commission for the Music Sector, the Minister can confer the status of "traditional theater" by decree to theaters which have demonstrably provided impetus to local artistic and musical traditions, usually counting on a network of stakeholders and partners to achieve their mission. There are thus numerous co-productions in opera, aiming at optimizing production processes, curbing costs and circulating productions. TT collaborate with other TT and with other local music and culture institutions in order to enhance their own activities.

The case of "I Teatri Foundation", a TT of Reggio Emilia in northern Italy, was chosen as it was a forerunner in including private partners in governance and their activities; its first co-productions date back to 1956. "I Teatri Foundation" also moved from being a completely public structure to a private foundation with external partners in the governance with its own board in 1990, ten years before most TTs. The Foundation is active in the fields of music and theatre as well as opera and is characterized by close and long-lasting partnership between public and private partners at different levels, including governance.

"I Teatri Foundation", located in Reggio Emilia in the north of Italy, has a theatre system which is unique in the country: three theatres standing around a square in the heart of the city, which are run by a single foundation based in a TT.

The main theatre is the Valli Municipal Theatre, a classic Italian opera house, inaugurated in 1857, which hosts mainly opera, concert and musical seasons. The Ariosto Theatre was built in 1878. Since restoration and inclusion in the theatre system in 1981, it mainly hosts stage plays. The third theatre, the Cavallerizza resulted from the conversion of a former horse stables (*Cavallerizza),* and is used for contemporary musical theatre, music, dance and stage productions. The activity of the theatres is enriched by numerous exhibitions and installations, outreach activities for schools, opera for young people and two contemporary festivals.

Findings

The findings are discussed using the framework developed by Emerson et at (2012), based on Ansell and Gash (2008). The Emerson et al. (2012) logic model shows different drivers and collaborative dynamics which shape the overall quality and extent to which CG is developed and effective. In the model, collaborative dynamics include three interactive components. The first is Principled Engagement, which may include different stakeholders at different points as well as a cross organisational network. The second is Shared Motivation, a self-reinforcing

cycle based on mutual trust, understanding, internal legitimacy and commitment. The third is Capacity for Joint action which includes procedures, protocols or informal agreements which define procedural and institutional arrangements, knowledge and resources. The findings reflect the collaborative governance process at the *micro* level, inside the organization (inside the boardroom), and at the *meso* level (outside the boardroom). Both types of collaboration contribute to the fulfilment of the organizational mission and the creation of value for the public.

Collaborative governance inside the boardroom

The primary meaning of governance is the exercise of authority and control by the board within the organization (Radbourne 2003). CG in this case study is similar to that of the traditional structure of medium-sized performing arts organizations in Italy, many of which in the last decade changed from being public to being hybrid organizations (Dubini and Monti 2018; Ferri and Zan 2015). As noted above, TTs are a stronghold of different social and cultural values in their community, which means that management is complex and requires the involvement of numerous actors, as they strive to demonstrate their capacity for joint action. The strategy of including different stakeholders on boards, adopting high levels of collaboration, is crucial. CG inside the boardroom of "I Teatri Foundation" thus follows the theory of the CG framework of Ansell and Gash, as applied to a performing arts organization (Fanelli et al. 2020).

Drivers

Drivers are the conditions present at the outset, which can either facilitate or discourage cooperation. CG on the board is prescribed by law and is written into the statutes of "I Teatri Foundation". The board is composed of five members representing both private and public sectors. Two members come from the public sector, one from the municipality and another from the province authority. The appointment process of the two public members is internally

managed by the public organisations, and aims to "create a board which is composed by different skills and competencies". Two are appointed by the main sponsors or private organizations which are committed to financing the theatres consistently for at least three years. At the time of this study, one was a representative of the main founding sponsor (a big utilities company) and the other was appointed by the three main sponsors of the theatre. The Chair of the Board is the mayor of the city. The CEO corresponds to the typical dual executive of a performing arts organization (Chong 2009), as managing director and artistic director, and can be assisted where necessary by external consultants.

Interviews revealed that board members are appointed by the different organizations to ensure diversity of views in supporting theatre management according to expertise, such as their skills and competencies in strategy and networking, as well as their interests in the arts. Board members for example stated:

"I contribute the vision of my organization, which provides significant levels of support for the theatre, and support is not only from a financial perspective but also means providing expertise, networks and spaces to help the realization of projects".

(Board Member 2)

"I was appointed thanks to my professionalism and that in top and management bodies, the plurality of skills, experiences and methods of approaching problems is positive: in short, diversity is crucial".

(Board Member 1)

The reasons for individual board member collaborating, in addition to the requirements of their company, is the prestige of belonging and "to contribute to something [they] value as important" (CEO and Board Member 1).

The data reveled that collaborative dynamics are influenced by the mix of skills on the board. Board members have a balanced combination of skills; they include "controllers" who understand finances; cultural managers who bring knowledge of the arts ecology to the boardroom; "influential people" with wide networks in government, business and the arts who help raise funds; and other specialists, according to the taxonomy of opera house board members (Dubini and Monti 2018). Although no artists sit on the board, the CEO of the foundation reports that all board members have a keen interest in the arts, and they are first and foremost holders of regular season tickets.

"I am representative of the public sector, we are all representatives of other organizations which give a great deal of support—financially—to the theatre, but I am free to bring my own views to each decision"

(Board Member 2)

"I obviously take an active part in the board of directors and I have also been involved, more than other directors, in specific matters because of my expertise"

(Board Member 1)

Despite the presence of different "external members" contributing professional experience from other sectors, the board relies on the CEO's opinion and proposals for artistic matters and for the majority of strategic decisions.

Collaborative governance outside the boardroom

CG covers decisions that are taken outside the boardroom. In "I Teatri Foundation," new vertical and horizontal partnerships are replacing the traditional model of contracting out and

externalization. All board members noted that their role is most important in relation to CG outside the boardroom. Partly because board members are not paid, with the number of board meetings held monthly and lasting an average of 2.5 hours, board member's main input, as well as overseeing activities, tends to be promoting the existing vision and social values of "I Teatri Foundation" to private entities and stakeholders in wider society.

Although board members are knowledgeable and interested in the arts, our interviews show that they perceive their role to be mainly on the financial side. They always refer to financial collaboration first, and to different types of collaboration second.

Drivers

CG operates outside the boardroom thanks to a collaborative network, which can be *ad hoc for specific project*s or ongoing for specific festivals such as the *Aperto* Contemporary Festival. Festivals can be held in collaboration with others (e.g., dance companies, independent theatres,) and organized at the beginning of the theater season, to give space and visibility to independent and innovative productions. Drivers that incentivize collaboration at various levels are different, although one of the universally recognized drivers is the opportunity to reduce costs and share risks. *OperaStreaming,* for example, is a digital streaming platform developed by seven TT and an opera house in the area. The first fully digital season was created before the pandemic, and turned out to be extremely strategic during lockdown.

One of the main features of CG formed inside the theatre is an association which is an interface with the outside. The "Friends of the Theatre" are a group of individuals who make donations and act as ambassadors of the theater in the public sphere, encouraging "participation of the community" and stimulating "cultural growth of the city". There is also a Steering Committee of ten individuals nominated by the CEO and board as representative of the theatre community. The Steering Committee takes an active part in publicizing theatre activities,

communicating informally with the governance of the theater and informing governance of audience perceptions.

The main drivers for collaboration outside the boardroom are not related to regulations but start with the willingness of both parties to innovate, share expertise, and create a link with society.

The inclusion of a private partner in the decision-making process at a *meso* level reflects the aim of creating higher value and a plurality of vision. It lowers levels of uncertainty and helps to solve problems or challenges that cannot be fully resolved by a single organization. This type of collaboration, local or from outside the area, can be either project-oriented, specific and limited in time, or it can be informal and ongoing with close partners.

Collaboration starts with the aim of bringing into the theater contributions which can create innovative audience experiences, and especially promote networking opportunities and sharing of good practice in exchange schemes and communications. For example, *Crossing the sea* is an international project, a live show which creates and consolidates long-term collaboration between Italy, the Middle East and Asia. It promotes networking opportunities in different countries, encouraging participation in international platforms and meetings and enhancing capacity for joint action. The project *Bruxelles en Piste* is similar; it aims to boost Belgian contemporary circus in Italy, and establish a solid network for future exchange.

Collaboration is considered prestigious as it contributes to the theatre by "creating synergies" with other organizations and centres of excellence around the regions.

"[collaboration] guarantees support and visibility to the artistic processes and artistic creations, it creates the conditions for good synergies. Sharing human and non-human tools enriches institutions thanks to concrete collaboration and exchange on several levels, and helps to reduce costs".

(Executive Director, Multidisciplinary theatre)

Collaborative arrangements reveal the power of external stakeholders to influence strategy.

"In a wide and differentiated sector like performing arts, diversity in skills and perception can be opportunities and not obstacles; they nurture fruitful dialogue rather than barriers."

(Project Manager, Multidisciplinary theatre)

Permanent or ongoing collaboration, on the other hand, has more long-term and visionary goals affecting the local area as well as the theatre itself. For example, the collaboration with the *Aterballetto*, one of the main contemporary dance production centers in Italy, aims to create an international hub for dance.

"I trust in a model which sees a constant exchange between the organization. There is continuous and fruitful collaboration, and I hope it will continue to flourish."

(Board Member, 2)

This collaboration takes place at a higher level of governance and started with informal contacts with the two CEOs. The official collaboration began with a formal meeting, which included the staff of both organizations, and evolved to create direct links between the different departments at the different levels, not necessarily through formal meetings. The CEO of the dance company noted, "If our technical office is searching for a solution, they might just call the other technical office to ask for their ideas without going through me or the board".

Collaborative dynamics

The Steering Committee and Friends of the Theatre have similar roles, working with a "mediating role between theater management and society needs" (CEO). They have a role as advocates, and networking capabilities are the main assets.

At both micro and *meso* levels, collaboration is fruitful as there is an "ongoing sharing of strategy and artistic language" (Dance company, Executive director).

Activities are scheduled in order to avoid overlapping, and to fully exploit opportunities for any international guest companies. This benefits the community and the dance sector, as well as audiences and primary stakeholders of the organization.

"For years we have been talking about the supply chain. In my opinion the term ecosystem is more interesting because it makes us think of Nature (a system par excellence functional on every level, as long as it is not brutally interfered with), but also a place in which every part (no matter if large or small) has a very specific function, the purpose of which is to thrive (and not survive!)" (Project Manager, Multidisciplinary theatre)

Collaboration dynamics, such as principled engagement, occur in different contexts and sectors. The process attracts different audiences and enhances cross-fertilization between visual arts, education, innovative learning, and literature.

"The three factors of success for collaboration are: knowledge of the actors, dialogue and respect for diversity."

(Project Manager, dance company)

Table 2 summarizes the opportunities and challenges in collaborative dynamics for CG revealed by interviews and documents, according to the level of governance. All interviewees agree that in order for collaboration to be effective, final objectives should be clear and shared. And as one board member noted, collaboration should not be imposed as a necessity, but all actors must be willing to share their knowledge and set boundaries of action clearly.

[Table 2 about here]

Although at both micro and *meso* levels the opportunities outweigh the challenges, for CG to be truly successful, attention needs to be paid to all aspects, particularly to potential threats to the collaborative process at *meso* level. One of these is asymmetric information, where not all

the parties have the same information, and which results in opportunistic behaviors, and another is asymmetry in power where objectives of the collaboration are not clearly defined.

At *meso* level, collaboration benefits all partners in that it can potentially reduce costs and risks, set up multidisciplinary projects and provide a wider set of skills and points of view. Collaboration in governance can thus take place between organizations operating in different sectors, provided that differences are respected and enhanced in the exchange process. Boards and organizations are required to limit opportunistic behaviors.

Implications for management

The inclusion of private partners in the decision-making process is beneficial for cultural organizations, and it is particularly important for organizations deeply rooted in local areas such as TT and performing arts in general.

Private sector members bring a different vision and perspective, which helps the theatre to be more innovative and more financially stable and to create more value for the community (Fanelli et al. 2020). Collaboration with private partners in the decision-making process both inside and outside the board should be encouraged, as the coexistence of these two types allows the theatre to effectively manage different opportunities. Managers should consider that the values upheld by the theatre are crucial for collaboration, and sharing these values encourages wider engagement both internally and externally. With specific reference to governance inside the boardroom, managers and directors should be aware that even where there is willingness to collaborate, board meetings need to be efficiently organized and chaired so that the topic and area of the collaboration is clearly assessed. This is because members are typically under time constraints, and organizations may also wish to limit their potential liabilities in decisions taken. On the other hand, managers also need to prevent empty rhetoric on collaboration from

undermining democratic processes. This requires participation in governance to be carefully managed, particularly with regard to negotiation, operation and supervision.

CG outside the boardroom relies on organizations sharing the expertise, vision and know-how of their staff to create higher value for the community, which can be more feasible with multidisciplinary programs. Through governance outside the boardroom, theaters can better support more artists, create more varied programs for the community and interpret audience needs. Directly or indirectly, the local community determines the board and evaluates the outputs of the TT by attending performances, and through numerous channels including local newspapers, social media, letters, meetings, reports. Managers need to take into account that in order to avoid tensions which can affect collaboration, areas of operation must be clearly specified for partners; it must be clear "who is expert in what" and "what they are willing to share".

Challenges for the collaboration process are in fact mainly related to the asymmetry of information and different partners' expectations of "the rules of the game".

Theatres also need credibility and reliability to attract private investment and legitimate collaboration with citizens and communities operating in the surrounding environment.

Implications for theory and future research

The urgency and scale of problems facing the public sector in today's world entail the pragmatic recognition that a single organization cannot effectively address many of them alone (Voss and Voss, 2000; Emerson et al. 2012). Thus, traditional paradigms where governance is entirely institution-based are no longer efficient (Amsler and O'Leary 2017).

Different frameworks and perspectives contribute to governance theory, including external relations, social systems and human behavior, and these in turn are underpinned by different theories, as noted by Rentschler (2015) and Reid and Turbide (2012). We contribute to the

discussion on governance by suggesting a framework that integrates the two levels of CG, discussing the main drivers and the collaborative dynamics that take place. Although the potential of the CG process in the arts in terms of positive financial and artistic outcome has been identified in previous research (Fanelli et al. 2020), studies on collaboration in the cultural sector have focused on either the *macro*, *meso* or *micro* level separately.

The contribution of our research is that for the first time it studies two levels together (*micro* and *meso*), both inside and outside the boardroom, investigating how they interact, identifying the implications for performing arts organizations in collaborating with external parties. An integrative theoretical framework should better reflect the real world and overcome the theoretical weakness of using a purely organizational *micro* approach.

Table 3 categorizes the items emerging from interviews into the traditional framework for collaborative governance (Emerson et al. 2012). *Micro* and *meso* levels are characterized by factors that drive the success of the collaboration. As noted by Shilbury et al. (2013) there are research areas which require further examination to uncover how barriers to collaboration can be overcome.

[Table 3 about here]

The framework suggests that participants at different levels of the collaborative process should be assessed in different ways. The *macro* level concerning policymakers and cultural policies lies outside the scope of this study, except in so far as the macro environment mandates the framework in which CG takes place.

The micro-level of governance today is required to identify the criteria and drivers that lead to partnership success (Ferri and Zan 2015; Thompson 2006) and effective interaction with board members has become a necessity. As specified by law and by the Foundation Statutes, in the

case of "I Teatri Foundation", a traditional form of collaboration takes place at board level, with private partners on the board representing both public government (municipality, region) and the private sector (corporate philanthropists). The first driver of collaboration at board level is legal requirement, and CG, like other recent changes in public administration in Italy is still characterized by *Management by Decree* (Marcon and Panozzo 1998). Legal requirements then give way to other drivers, such as the prestige of belonging and the necessity to differentiate competences. Inside the boardroom, collaboration is thus based on formal procedures, which help to access different skills and competencies. But limitations in terms of time and expertise, for example the fact that there is no artist representation on the board, mean that the role of private board members potentially remains exclusively that of oversight, without their exerting influence on strategy or finding innovative solutions. CG can thus be perceived as an opportunity from both inside and outside the boardroom. Where it is effectively implemented it can be more successful.

Although previous studies (Fanelli et al., 2020) mainly describes CG in the cultural sector in terms of internal processes inside the boardroom, our analysis suggests that the private and public sectors have different interests inside and outside the boardroom. The role of the board as "controller" and "facilitator" is thus to prevent obstacles to collaboration, act as ambassador for the theater by publicizing activities, and facilitate collaborative processes outside the boardroom.

Outside the board, collaboration starts with different drivers such as economic incentives and the necessity to reduce costs and lower uncertainty. It then evolves into consequential incentives for both partners, such as the creation of innovative solutions.

The *meso* level entails collaboration with external stakeholders, and dialogue with external partners, in enhancing the image of the local area, creating positive externalities for both partners and allowing access to different forms of knowledge (Bonet and Donato 2011; Holden

2015), as well as risk sharing and cost reduction. Collaborative dynamics outside the boardroom do not start because of legal requirements, but with the willingness of both partners to capitalize through collaboration. Principled engagement enables individuals with differing areas of interest, relational, and identity goals, working across their prospective institutional, sectoral, or jurisdictional boundaries, to solve problems and resolve conflicts. The shared motivation based on trust and engagement at *meso* level is characterized by the commitment of all levels of the organization, not only management, which has important implications for trust, mutual understanding and internal legitimacy.

The capacity for joint action in collaborative dynamics differs inside and outside the boardroom. Inside the boardroom, it is based on formal meetings and legal requirements for collaboration, which means it has more impact on strategy than on innovative solutions. Outside the boardroom, on the other hand, collaboration starts more informally and can promote more innovative solutions.

Further research should investigate the inner workings inside and outside the boardroom. It might consider observation and focus groups to better understand the dynamics of decision-making processes where CG is present. Further studies should also focus on other levels, such as the *macro* level, where actions and policy can boost effective collaborative practice in the cultural sector.

Conclusions and limitations

Our study confirms that through collaborative forms of governance "I Teatri Foundation" has established different types of collaboration which enrich its activities and create more value for the community. CG is not a question of limiting the creative freedom or capacity to plan of single organizations. It is a question of taking full advantage of different types of knowledge and technology in order to combine financial resources on the one hand, and real and potential

26

value for the public on the other. Values such as trust, reciprocity, mutual gains are the basis of common goals that need to be identified (O'Toole 1997). As a preliminary exploration of CG in the performing arts, the perspective of this research goes behind the traditional model of CG, which mainly focuses on collaboration at board level. Different motivations and dynamics occur in the collaborative process in relation to where the collaboration takes place, and the research takes account of these.

The collaboration process within the organization reflects the formal requirements of theatre statutes. Stakeholders also aim at influencing organizational strategy favorable to integrated projects and consistent with the policies of the entities they are nominated by.

As noted by Rentschler (2015), at micro level, board members interested in the arts are repaid by the perception of contributing to something important with their skills and competence when they commit to the creation of value for the community, and by social prestige. The presence of official stakeholders on the board does not necessarily mean that they take an active role in making decisions or that leadership is effective; administrative and bureaucratic aspects can hinder the ability of board members to play an effective role. Their effectiveness depends on their ability to participate in the planning and on their knowledge of the mechanisms of the various organizations.

Effective collaboration thus entails revising the role of governance and recognizing the strong position of private partners in terms of technology, capital, and information (Jamali 2004; Scharle 2002) especially outside the boardroom. The effectiveness of collaboration relies on the "people" involved, as shown by our interviews. Board members and external partners should not be seen simply as representatives of other institutions; in reality, they are experts who contribute in terms of personal knowledge, interests and skills.

At *meso* level, private partners are attracted to taking part in governance and the decision-making process or collaboration with performing arts organizations for the benefit their own

organization which can gain from it. This starts as financial benefit, for both organizations, in terms of sharing costs, and evolves into knowledge and competence spillover between partners, which allows innovations. Finally, the ability to develop coordinated projects is linked to the identification of common objectives, and to shared organizational methods. As one of the stakeholders remarked, the governance process should be seen as an "ecosystem", where small organizations contribute like larger ones to enable all components to generate energy for other partnerships, and to flourish, rather than simply survive.

Clearly the findings of a single case study cannot be generalized, but can be useful in developing theory. Hence, future research might consider multiple case studies and/or surveys. A further limitation is that although interviews from different perspectives would reveal the dynamics of decision-making processes more clearly, any interview may be subject to bias inherent in personal relations.

References

Andres, L., and C. Chapain. 2013. The integration of cultural and creative industries into local and regional development strategies in Birmingham and Marseille: towards an inclusive and collaborative governance?. *Regional Studies* 47(2), 161-182.

Ansell, C., and A. Gash. 2008. Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(4), 543-571.

Amsler, L. B., and R. O'Leary. 2017. Collaborative public management and systems thinking. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 30(6-7), 626-639.

Azmat, F., and R. Rentschler. 2017. Gender and ethnic diversity on boards and corporate responsibility: The case of the arts sector. *Journal of Business Ethics* 141(2), 317-336.

Belfiore, E. 2004. Auditing culture: The subsidised cultural sector in the New Public Management. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2), 183-202.

Benington, J., and M. H. Moore. 2011. Public value in complex and changing times. *Public value: Theory and Practice*, 1-30.

Besana, A. 2012. Alternative resources: Revenue diversification in the not-for-profit USA symphony orchestra. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 42(2), 79-89.

Bonet, L., and F. Donato. 2011. The financial crisis and its impact on the current models of governance and management of the cultural sector in Europe. *ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy* 1(1), 4-11.

Borin, E. 2016. Public-Private Partnership in the Cultural Sector: a comparative analysis of European models. *ENCATC Book Series, Cultural Management and Cultural Policy Education*, Vol.4.

Boukherroub, T., S. D'amours, and M. Rönnqvist. 2018. Sustainable forest management using decision theatres: Rethinking participatory planning. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 179, 567-580.

Bowen, F., A. Newenham-Kahindi, A. and I. Herremans. 2010. When suits meet roots: The antecedents and consequences of community engagement strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics* 95(2), 297-318.

Chong, E., F. Huet, S. Saussier, S. and F. Steiner. 2006. Public-private partnerships and prices: Evidence from water distribution in France. *Review of Industrial Organization* 29(1-2), 149-159.

Chong, D. 2009. *Arts management*. Routledge.

Crilly, D., M. Zollo and M. T. Hansen. 2012. Faking it or muddling through? Understanding decoupling in response to stakeholder pressures. *Academy of Management Journal* 55(6), 1429-1448.

Doberstein, C. 2016. Designing collaborative governance decision-making in search of a 'collaborative advantage'. *Public Management Review* 18(6), 819-841.

Donelli C. C., S. Fanelli, I. Mozzoni and F. Badia. 2017, Managerial opportunities for cultural organizations: the Italian patronage system in international perspective, *AIMAC International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management 2017*, University of Beijing, China; 21 -24 June 2017. Conference Proceedings ISBN 978-7-900845-18-4.

Dubini, P., and A. Monti. 2018. Board composition and organizational performance in the cultural sector: the case of Italian opera houses. *International Journal of Arts Management* 20(2), 56-70.

Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review* 14(4), 532-550.

Emerson, K., T. Nabatchi and S. Balogh. 2012. An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22(1), 1-29.

Fanelli, S., C. C. Donelli, A. Zangrandi and I. Mozzoni.2020. Balancing artistic and financial performance: is collaborative governance the answer?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 33(1), 78-93.

Ferkins, L., D. Shilbury and I. O'Boyle. 2018. Leadership in governance: Exploring collective board leadership in sport governance systems. *Sport Management Review* 21(3), 221-231.

Ferri, P., and L. Zan. 2015. Arts organizations and the transformation of the public sector. In *Managing cultural heritage: An international research perspective*, L. Zan, S. B. Baraldi, M. Lusiani, D. Shoup, P. Ferri and F. Onofri, F. eds. (pp. 13 -18), London: Routledge.

Gabrielsson, J. and M. Huse. 2004. Context, behavior, and evolution: Challenges in research on boards and governance. *International Studies of Management & Organization* 34(2), 11-36.

Griffin, D. 2003. Leaders in museums: Entrepreneurs or role models?. *International Journal of Arts Management* 5(2), 4-14.

Hau, H. and M. Thum. 2009. Subprime crisis and board incompetence: Private versus public banks in Germany. *Working paper 2460. Fontainebleau*: INSEAD.

Henisz, W. V. J. 2006. Governance issues in public private partnerships. *International Journal of Project Management* 7(24), 537-538.

Hewison, R. 2004. The crisis of cultural leadership in Britain. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2), 157-166.

Hodge, G. A., and C. Greve. 2007. Public–private partnerships: an international performance review. *Public administration review* 67(3), 545-558.

Holden, J. 2015, "The Ecology of Culture", A Report commissioned by the Arts and Humanities Research Council's Cultural Value Project. *Art's & Humanities Research Council*.

Hood, C. 1991. A public management for all seasons?. *Public administration* 69(1), 3-19.

Kann-Rasmussen, N. 2019. The collaborating cultural organization: legitimation through partnerships. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 49(5), 307-323.

Kivleniece, I. and B. V. Quelin. 2012. Creating and capturing value in public-private ties: A private actor's perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 37(2), 272-299.

Klein, P. G., J. T. Mahoney, A. M. McGahan and C. N.Pitelis. 2010. Toward a theory of public entrepreneurship. *European Management Review* 7(1), 1-15.

Koppell, J. G. 2006. *The politics of quasi-government: Hybrid organizations and the dynamics of bureaucratic control*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jamali, D. 2004. Success and failure mechanisms of public private partnerships (PPPs) in developing countries: Insights from the Lebanese context. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 17(5), 414-430.

Larsen, H. 2014. Legitimation work in state cultural organizations: the case of Norway. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 20(4), 456-470.

Lincoln, Y., and Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Marcon, G. and F. Panozzo. 1998. Reforming the reform: changing roles for accounting and management in the Italian health care sector. *European Accounting Review* 7(2), 185-208

O'Boyle, I., and D. Shilbury. 2018. Identifying enablers and barriers: shaping collaborative sport governance theory. *World Leisure Journal* 60(4), 330-352.

O'Toole Jr, L. J. 1997. Treating networks seriously: Practical and research- based agendas in public administration. *Public administration review*, XX(x), 45-52.

Osborne, S. P. 2006. The new public governance?. *Public Management Review* 8(3), 377–387.

Pearce, J. A., and S. A. Zahra. 1992. Board composition from a strategic contingency perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(4), 411-438.

Radbourne, J. 2003. Performing on boards: The link between governance and corporate reputation in nonprofit arts boards. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(3), 212-222.

Reid, W., and J. Turbide. 2012. Board/staff relationships in a growth crisis: Implications for non-profit governance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(1), 82–99

Reeves, M. 2002. *Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts: a review*. London: Arts Council of England.

Rentschler, R. 2015. *Arts Governance: People, Passion, Performance*. London: Routledge.

Rubio Arostegui, J. A., and J. Rius-Ulldemolins. 2020. Cultural policies in the South of Europe after the global economic crisis: is there a Southern model within the framework of European convergence?. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 26(1), 16-30.

Scott, C. 2006. Museums: impact and value. *Cultural Trends* 15(1), 45-75.

Scharle, P. 2002. Public-private partnership (PPP) as a social game. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 15(3), 227-252.

Shilbury, D., L. Ferkins, and L. Smythe. 2013. Sport governance encounters: Insights from lived experiences. *Sport management review* 16(3), 349-363.

Sicca, L. M., and L. Zan. 2005. Much ado about management: managerial rhetoric in the transformation of Italian opera houses. *International journal of arts management*, 46-64.

Skelcher, C. 2010. "Governing partnerships", in *International Handbook on Public- Private Partnerships*, G. Hodge, C. Greve and A. Boardman, eds., pp. 292-304, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Thompson, J. 2006. Conservation and management challenges in a public/private partnership for a large archaeological site (Herculaneum, Italy). *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 8(4), 191-204.

Towse, R. 2001. Quis custodiet? or managing the management: the case of the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden. *International Journal of Arts Management* 3(3), 38-50.

Trimarchi, M. 2002. Lo spettacolo dal vivo tra responsabilità istituzionali e opportunità economiche. *Aedon, 2*.

Turbide, J. 2012. Can good governance prevent financial crises in arts organizations?. *International Journal of Arts Management* 14(2), 4-16.

Van Oortmerssen, L. A., C. M. van Woerkum, and N. Aarts. 2014. The visibility of trust: Exploring the connection between trust and interaction in a Dutch collaborative governance boardroom. *Public Management Review* 16(5), 666-685.

Van Ham, H. and J. Koppenjan. 2001. Building public-private partnerships: Assessing and managing risks in port development. *Public management review* 3(4), 593-616.

Voss, G. B., and Z. G. Voss. 2000.. Strategic orientation and firm performance in an artistic environment. *Journal of marketing* 64(1), 67-83.

Yanow, D. 2006. *Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences*, in D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea (eds). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharpe. Pp 5–26.

Yin, R. K. 1994. Discovering the future of the case study. Method in evaluation research. *Evaluation Practice* 15(3), 283-290.

Yin, R. K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Table 1. Demographics of interviewees

	Role	Organization	Gender	Education	Years in the organization with the role
Internal	CEO	I Teatri Foundation	Male	Tertiary	3
	Board Member 1	I Teatri Foundation	Male	Tertiary	8
	Board Member 2	I Teatri Foundation	Female	Tertiary	8
	Board Member 3	I Teatri Foundation	Male	Tertiary	6
External	Project Manager	Multidisciplinary theatre	Female	Tertiary	5
	CEO	Dance company	Male	Tertiary	3
	Executive director	Multidisciplinary theatre	Female	Tertiary	6

Table 2. Opportunities and challenges of Collaborative dynamics for performing arts organizations

	Opportunities	**Challenges**
Micro **level**	Diverse perspective and skills Financial contribution Visibility Contribution with personal network	Lack of time Committed but on a voluntary basis ==Participation is seen as economic transaction==
Meso **level**	Access to different types of knowledge Access to different technology Cost sharing Sharing risk Innovation Synergy: wider offer for the community	Asymmetric information in the collaborative process Potential opportunistic behaviors Asymmetry in power Benefits accrue only long-term

Table 3: Integrative framework for Collaborative governance in the arts

	Drivers	Principled engagement	Shared motivation	Capacity for joint action
		Collaborative Dynamics		
Common	Recognition of expertise	Shared values and interests	Trust	Risk assessment
	Mix and complementarity of skills	Skill Mix	Engagement and commitment in the cultural life	
			Knowledge spillover	
Solely at *micro*	Prescription from the law and the Statutes	Formal procedures		Formal meeting
	Prestige of belonging/ contribute to something important	Oversee activities of the CEO		Time challenges
Solely at *meso* **level**	Technical expertise of the partners	Informal procedures	Promoting mutual learning	Informal meeting
	Sharing cost		Commitment of all the levels of the organization and not only the CEOs	Clarifying responsibilities
	Innovation	Shared power		Staff support
				Sharing of resources

source: Adapted from Emerson et al (2012)