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1. Executive summary

Arts and culture emerge as a particularly fruitful field for the development of social innovation and civic engagement. First, arts – by their own nature – are likely to establish meaningful forms of dialogue among different societal actors. Second, the remarkable changes experienced by such sectors during the last decade have paved the way for cultivating innovative (social) experimentations – in light of the deeply renewed roles of the pivotal actors involved.

The objective of this research is to elaborate a field description on social innovation in the nine ITSSOIN countries (i.e. Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom), with specific respect to arts and culture. Due to the vast array of social phenomena encompassed by this definition, the report prominently focuses on non-industrial sectors, which represent the very core of cultural occurrences – according to the definition proposed by KEA (2006).

Four major forces and trends have affected arts and culture in such countries during the last 10 years. These include the (generally diminished) public funding, the recent developments in information and communication technologies (ICTs), the organisational restructuring experienced by several cultural institutions and – most notably – the increase in social participation. Major attention is paid to the last trend, which indeed represents the specific focus of this work. Social participation consists in the engagement of multiple stakeholders in funding, delivering and also creating arts and cultural products/projects. For this reason, it is particularly interesting to investigate social participation as a particular form of social innovation.

The first part of the research is then dedicated to the four forces mentioned before. Notable developments in the ITSSOIN countries are traced on the basis of a literature review and of the country vignettes, previously elaborated by Project’s researchers. In this chapter, attention is also devoted to the main actors that intervene in the sector, as they are critical in steering and/or experiencing changes and – consequentially – social innovation. In a nutshell, these are governmental organisations (at the various territorial tiers), a great variety of third sector organisations, private firms and, very interestingly, social movements and informal groups of citizens. The latter ones present a remarkable potential for generating social innovation.

After this, the research focuses on four specific ITSSOIN countries (i.e. Italy, Spain, France and the Netherlands), selected on the basis of their particular status in the field of arts and culture. Even if in different extent and terms, all the countries are characterised by the increasing importance of non-governmental actors. The financial crisis has variously impacted on these national contexts, interestingly showing different results with respect to the state as traditional funder and supporter of arts and culture.

The following chapter is then divided in five sub-sections. In the first one, the research methods and design are explicated. Each of the four remaining sub-sections is instead focused on the four countries considered. The chapter aims to highlight various pivotal aspects in social innovation/participation for arts and culture in these country fields. In particular, the main (exogenous and endogenous) factors influencing social participation are examined; the most relevant pieces of legislation and public policies in this field are then presented, together with
the key actors involved. Eventually, the most prominent innovations in the realm of social participation are analysed, also providing meaningful examples.

To undertake the in-depth analysis of country fields and their main social innovation dynamics, various data collection strategies have been combined. These encompass a literature review, a legislation and policy analysis and a media analysis, conducted on national newspapers. Furthermore, 11 semi-structured interviews were conducted with key experts and practitioners from the four countries. This allowed to explore the most recent issues in field debates, to avoid possible conceptual and empirical lacuna and to “come full circle" in concluding the analysis.

The last chapter firstly stresses the major similarities and differences registered among the four countries. In particular, it is emphasized how the financial crisis has variously impacted on each national contexts. Italy and Spain were more influenced than France and the Netherlands, the work argues. The Italian context is interestingly characterised by the “marginalisation” of the state as central actor in cultural policies and the simultaneous emergence of non-conventional players (i.e. not just TSOs, but also social movements) as both funders and (micro-) policy makers. These often engage in radical forms of participation, which is sometimes political in nature and which generates a contamination between arts and other fields (social cohesion, multiculturalism, territoriality, education). Differently, Spain is still characterised by the crucial importance of governmental organisations (namely the 17 Autonomous Communities) and of TSOs, in mutual cooperation. France and the Netherlands – despite the overall reduction in public funding – have instead found a more stable support by traditional policy-makers. In the French case, this is consistent with a well-established administrative tradition in the field of arts and culture. The Netherlands are instead habitually characterised by the importance of private actors.

In conclusion, three major (common) trends in social innovation are identified in the four countries. First, multi-stakeholders governance models are impressively spreading. These include both institutionalised forms of public-private partnerships and non-conventional forms of governance, generally enacted by “state-free” local networks. Second, arts and cultures are progressively employed as means to strengthen social cohesion and integration, especially vis-à-vis disadvantaged societal groups. Third, ICTs (e.g. the Internet) are supporting field professionals not just in funding cultural initiatives, but also in engaging in continuative forms of collaboration with external stakeholders, then enlarging the traditional paradigms of crowdfunding and crowdsourcing.

This report will hopefully represent a meaningful basis to further explore social innovation in arts and culture in these four countries.
2. Introduction

The arts and cultural sector refers to a wide set of artistic and cultural phenomena in constant evolution and often difficult to define. According to the study prepared for the European Commission by the KEA European Affairs (2006), the cultural sector can be divided into two sub-sectors: the cultural sector and the creative sector.

The cultural sector consists of the fields of traditional art and cultural industries. It is characterised only by “cultural” results and can be further divided into the non-industrial sectors and the industrial sectors. The first “produces non-reproducible goods and services aimed at being consumed on the spot” (ibidem: 2), like visual arts (including paintings, sculpture, craft, photography), the arts and antique markets; performing arts, including opera, orchestra, theatre, dance, circus; heritage, including museums, heritage sites, archaeological sites, libraries and archives. Their output are prototypes and since they are characterised by a high density of creation they would be eligible to copyright. However, most of them are not copyrighted, such as some performing arts production, visual arts and craftwork. Differently, the industrial sectors generate cultural “products aimed at mass reproduction, mass-dissemination and exports” (ibidem: 2). It is the sector of the cultural industries including film and video, video games, broadcasting, music, book and press publishing. Their outputs are instead based on copyright. It is worth remarking how both non-industrial and industrial sectors are often described recurring to economic terms and paradigms (such as “goods”, “services” and “consumption”). Beyond the debate on the correctness or deceptiveness of such an approach, the recent trends in arts and culture that we will explore may be analysed also as a result of this policy attitude.

For the creative sector, the KEA report refers to activities such as design (fashion design, interior design, and product design), architecture and advertising, in which “culture becomes a creative input in the production of non-cultural goods and services” (ibidem: 37). Creativity is understood as the use of cultural resources as an intermediate consumption in the production process of non-cultural sectors, and thereby as a source of innovation. The use of creativity (creative skills and creative people originating in the arts field and in the cultural industries) is therefore the crucial element for the performances of such non-cultural sectors. Activities are not necessarily industrial, and may be also prototypes. Finally, although their outputs are based on copyright, they may include other intellectual property inputs (e.g. trademark).

This distinction can be read though a concentric approach (cf. Figure 1), in which the core of the art and cultural sector is represented by the non-industrial sector, the second cycle by the industrial sector, the third by the creative sector, to which is added a last cycle referred to the related industries. They do not belong to the cultural or creative sector but from one hand, they contribute to the development of cultural activities; from another hand, they bring new elements of creativity in the production process of the non-cultural goods (ibidem: 77).
Figure 1 Concentric framework of arts and culture sector (adapted from KEA 2006)

In this research we aim to focus only on the core of the arts and cultural sector (which is the non-industrial sectors) to narrow our focus of analysis. This area is populated by different actors (i.e. TSOs, governments, public agencies, business companies) and this differentiation supports our research and study. Grounding on this distinction, this report aims to identify the main trends that have characterized the arts and cultural sector (i.e. non-industrial sector) in the last 10 years in all the ITSSOIN countries. The overview will be the basis for pointing out the focus of the ITSSOIN investigation in four selected countries (i.e. Italy, France, Spain and the Netherlands), which stem as best settings for the research. This is due to the increasing importance of non-governmental actors in these countries, which are third-sector organisations (TSOs), private firms and even informal groups of citizens. The financial crisis has variously impacted on these national contexts, interestingly showing different results with respect to the state as traditional funder and supporter of arts and culture.

The report consists of different sections. In the following one we describe the general field of arts and culture highlighting the main social innovation trends occurring in different ITSSOIN countries. On the basis of a literature review and previous country vignette reviews, we will highlight the main object of interest of our analysis, i.e. social participation. We will focus on the rationale of the choice of this field, the structural characteristics (i.e. actors) influencing the object of interest and, at the same time, we will highlight the main differences among countries. In light of this overview, we will present the rationale for this focus and for the selection of our countries of investigation. The second part of the report will specifically analyse the field focus (i.e. social participation in the arts and culture), as it occurred in the countries we have chosen. As highlighted in previous ITSSOIN reports (e.g. Anheier et al. 2014), the field focus will be approached according to the strategic action field theory. Following the central assumption in field theory that actors construct a field around their
‘object of interest’ (ibidem), the field will be described in terms of resources, knowledge on the object of interest, type of cooperation between actors or conflicts between actors in the field.

3. General field description

3.1. General subjects and trends

In the last decade, the field of arts and culture has experienced remarkable changes, especially when observing the more restricted field of non-industrial arts activities. Across the nine ITSSOIN surveyed countries (i.e. Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom), this dynamism has been characterized by the following main four forces and trends (cf. Figure 2)

![Figure 2 The four forces affecting arts and culture in ITSSOIN countries](image)

3.1.1. Changes in public funding for the arts

The economic and financial crisis has pushed many central and local governments to revise the funding devoted to artistic institutions and arts initiatives, within the context of an overall shrinking of public expenditure across Europe. In several countries the arts have been experiencing both a decrease in public subventions (cf. Figure 3) and a change in the ways through which they are funded. With respect to this last aspect, it seems that the general trend has been a slow turn towards linking the amount of public funding to the results achieved by arts institutions. In Germany, for example, the distribution of subsidies for cultural projects is conditional to the fulfilment of specific criteria (e.g. Graf Strachwitz 2010). In the Czech
Republic, the need for restructuring public finances made the funding system more stable, enduring and predictable for recipients, i.e. grants and funds are transformed into long-lasting resources for cultural institutions.

**Figure 3** General government expenditure in recreation, culture and religion in ITSSOIN countries (Percentage of the GDP, 2004-2013)

Emerging mechanisms of funding the arts from the State are also fostering decentralization in decision-making. This is particularly important as other European research projects demonstrate how such processes may favour social innovation in various policy domains (e.g. LIPSE WP5 Research Report 2015). In Sweden, the government presented a new model for state-third sector cooperation, whose implementation started in 2010. *Kultursamverkan* aims to transfer the power of distributing public funds for TSOs from the central state towards
regional governments (Andersson 2014). Also in the UK, a vivid debate with respect to decision-making in cultural policies has taken place. More specifically, this regards the localisation and devolution of power in the field of arts, so to enable a proactive focus on outcomes and quality of life in local areas (e.g. addressing the marginalisation of regional cultural events).

Such shift in the role of government in patronizing the arts has raised severe concerns and consequences among field professionals. The legitimacy of arts and culture as public task is basically questioned in public policies. The UK is a notable example: discussions on the value of arts have emerged putting art projects under greater pressure to demonstrate how they generate social benefits. In Spain, the need to devise alternative ways of funding and to increase transparency and accountability led many organizations to improve their channels of communication with stakeholders and society. This is pursued by developing codes of conduct and more suitable evaluation mechanisms. Similarly to other countries, the government of Denmark emphasizes the business potential of culture and arts. Simultaneously, increasing attention is paid to the sources of funding from private foundations and commercial sponsors (Hjort-Andersen 2013). Finally, in Sweden conceptual tensions between philanthropists, state funding and firm donations to museums occurred, then affecting the means to form cultural understanding among the broader public (Gustavsson 2012).

3.1.2. Use of ICT for arts production and distribution

An additional trend that deeply revolutionized the field has been the advent of new technologies, especially the Internet, that have tackled arts and cultural institutions under various perspectives. The following graph shows an overall measure of ICT development across ITSSOIN countries (cf. Figure 4).

Figure 4 ICT Development Index\(^1\), Range 0-10

\(^1\) ICT Development Index, which is elaborated by the United Nations as a tool to benchmarking the degree of development of the information society. It is based on 11 ICT indicators, grouped in three clusters: access, use and skills.
In general, information and communication technologies can spread social innovation thanks to their capacity of processing large volumes of data and enabling communication across temporal, functional and geographical boundaries (Bekkers and Homburg 2005). This is particularly interesting in the field of social innovation, as ICTs can promote a more effective and transparent dialogue among the key stakeholders involved in such processes. For example, Backus (2001) refers to e-governance as the use of ICTs in the interaction between government, citizens and businesses for the improvement of democratic, government and business aspects of governance. This also introduces the issue of social participation, to which is however devoted a specific section in the following pages.

Herein it is worth noticing how the advent of new ICTs has influenced many aspect of the production and distribution of arts and culture. TSOs in the arts have been exploiting these technologies at the most. In Spain (similarly to other ITSSOIN countries) the introduction of ICTs has increased the online consumption of arts and cultural goods and services, digital catalogues, software applications, educational programs, virtual visits, web publications, new leisure-time alternatives and social networks. New online initiatives and digital platforms are emerging as promising tools to promote private investment in arts and culture, as they facilitate volunteer-based solutions and money donations, such as crowdfunding, crowdsourcing, micro-patronage and online fundraising.

It is worth noticing how such ICTs means to finance arts and culture are experiencing a broadening of their scope. In the first place, crowdfunding and crowdsourcing could be examined as mere forms of “micro-financing”, as a result of the diminished importance of public contribution. However, such paradigms are currently shifting from their status of “episodic practices” towards a more systemic and evolved form of stakeholders’ engagement, in a continuative way. The examples that will be analysed later will show how they can be considered as fully-fledge arrangements for inclusive and enlarged fundraising.

3.1.3. Restructuring of arts organizations

At an organizational level, the two prominent forces highlighted before have pushed arts institutions to severely reshape their organizational structures and their own internal culture. The need to gain efficiency has favoured a rationalization in the use of available resources. However, cost cutting has not only led to rationalize and reengineering processes, but it also had considerable impacts with respect to human resources. In France, the economic downturn caused a 100% increase of unsalaried workers in audiovisual and performing arts from 1991 to 2011, the spread of shorter-term contracts, less activities and a decrease in remuneration (cf. Vingt ans d’évolution de l’emploi dans professions culturelles 1991-2001). The only exception of this negative trend was the movie industry. In Denmark, this restructuring was leveraged by the central government to encourage mergers in the field of arts and culture (Hjort-Andersen 2013).

Institutions operating in most of the ITSSOIN countries have experienced an overall shift towards a greater market-oriented sensitivity. In Italy, this led museums and theatres to develop a “business-like” attitude, then increasing the attention paid to consumer tastes, promoting ticket sales through advertising, enacting managerial practices to gain efficiency, being more prone to attract private funds (Turrini 2009). In the Czech Republic and Germany, an extensive transformation occurred, as cultural institutions have largely shifted from the
direct management of public authorities towards more autonomous governance arrangements, such as LTD-type organizations (e.g. Balík et al. 2010; Graf Strachwitz 2010). In the UK and the Netherlands, a decreasing focus on 'high culture' and an increasing one on private and societal funding for culture has generated dynamism, but also harsh criticisms: the continuing rise of art as a commodity for conspicuous consumption and for window-dressing of private firms animated the policy debate in the field. A sort of hybrid model has arisen at different levels. Within organizations, hybrid professional cultures emerged as the culture of professionals (i.e. artists) has merged with the one of managers or administrative officers. Hybridity is indeed a critical issue with respect to the strategic goals of cultural institutions, which are coping with both cultural pressures and efficiency constraints. This affects their identity or even their governance systems (Turrini 2009).

3.1.4. Increase in social participation in the arts

The last trend observed is an increase of social participation in the arts and culture (e.g. Graf Strachwitz 2010). In most of the ITSSOIN countries, the development of various forms of social participation enacted processes of social innovation, collaboration and shared decision-making in the arts and cultural sector. Such new experiences include the implementation of institutionalised forms of enlarged corporate governance (e.g. foundations), the sharing of decisional power on production and funding through online platforms (e.g. crowdfunding and crowdsourcing) and new forms of participative governance and self-government by socio-cultural movements. Therefore, not just collaborations between institutional and non-institutional actors may generate new governance models, but also social movements and informal groups alone. Such self-organized actors can generate local networks for the launch of cultural projects and initiatives – sometimes using an antagonist rhetoric vis-à-vis institutions. This would result in participation against institutions rather than with institutions (Hendriks 2006).

The literature on the public and third sector refers to such forms of social innovation and participation as co-creation. As suggested by Voorberg et al. (2014), three typologies of co-creation can be identified in the realm of public policies: (1) citizens as co-initiator; (2) citizens co-designer; (3) citizens as co-implementer. For example, Rossi (2004) examines an interesting example of co-initiation in the field of local cultural policy. The historical centre of Naples was indeed re-opened to the public and its monuments were restored thanks to a civil initiative. Such a form of social participation has established a fruitful collaboration among public and private actors for the achievement of the common good. In a nutshell, co-creation can be therefore defined as “the involvement of citizens in the initiation and/or the design process of public services in order to (co)create beneficial outcomes” (Voorberg et al. 2014).

Indeed, more and more cultural movements and informal groups of citizens are nowadays becoming a relevant interlocutor in the arts and cultural sector, able to attract media attention and to mobilize resources in the public debate. In Italy, for example, alternative forms of cultural organizations have been established for the production and distribution of arts. Social movements and informal groups have occupied abandoned building or cultural locations (e.g.
Teatro Valle in Rome\textsuperscript{3}), becoming the reference point for innovative and non-conventional forms of arts and culture and often elaborating radical criticisms to cultural and political élites. Even if such social phenomena occurred since the 1960s, nowadays they are particularly innovative because their large spread, the great media and institutional attention and, most of all, the capacity of functioning as fully-fledged “public service providers”, in light of the diminished role of the state in art and culture.

The inclusion of broad categories of actors and stakeholders in the production and distribution of arts has taken different forms in the various countries considered. In Italy and in the UK, arts and culture were also employed as means to integrate prisoners or former prisoners into society or to rehabilitate disadvantaged and sick people (e.g. Turrini 2009). In the UK, intensive discussions were carried out with respect to the target audience (e.g. whether arts should be accepted as a “niche issue” or whether organisations – such as the BBC – should instead achieve a larger, less middle-class audience). Such discussions led public agencies to handle this by more frequently offering funding to productions and projects that promote diversity and inclusion (e.g. Gilmore 2014). In Germany, an increase of volunteering activities for culture is observed, ostensibly as a response to cuts in public funding and as a claim for democratic participation in culture (Graf Strachwitz 2010: 50). Finally, it is worth noticing how – in the Dutch context – the audience and public of arts and culture are progressively changing. This is due to the increasingly ‘informal’ or ‘low art/popular culture’ tastes and to the emancipation of average cultural participants. Eventually, this resulted in controversial policy discussions (Van den Broek 2012).

As a general framework, three main forms of social participation in arts and culture can be identified.

- **Institutionalised forms of enlarged corporate governance.** Formal provisions to share decisional power among different stakeholders characterize such organizational settings. For example, their board of directors may gather together representatives from a variety of interest groups, such as financers, artists and public administrations. Philanthropic foundations are a typical example, which can be established by public or private actors (e.g. banks, other types of private companies). During times of economic downturn, such institutions may represent a crucial “lifeline” to keep on financing artistic and cultural activities. However, accountability concerns may arise vis-à-vis key stakeholders (e.g. Anheier and Leat 2013) since legislations generally do not oblige such TSOs to excessive transparency provisions.

- **Shared decisions on production and funding.** More informal forms of participation may be develop thanks to new ICTs which provide for the sharing of decisional power on production and funding. Crowdfunding, crowdsourcing and micro-patronage are notable and innovative examples. Such patterns of collaboration do not simply engage the public in financial terms. Single financers are likely to be committed to the cultural projects that they are supporting also from a symbolic point of view. Symbolic rewards (e.g. public acknowledgement of the donor act) then represent a strong incentive for crowdfunders (Boeuf \textit{et al.} 2014).

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. http://www.teatrovalleoccupato.it/
- **Non-institutional informal networks.** Through loose forms of participative governance and self-government, cultural movements and informal groups of citizens are increasingly becoming prominent players in the art and cultural sector – able to mobilize abundant and heterogeneous resources, as depicted by the traditional literature on social movements and civic activism (e.g. Verba *et al.* 1995). The pursuit of horizontal forms of decision-making is then interpreted as a form of participative democracy, practiced in “state-free enclaves”. Collective beliefs are critical incentives for developing cultural projects in such settings. These forms of social participation seem to be connected to the emergence of contemporary cities as “world’s urban hubs”, which generate extensive networks and innovative governance style and which severely impact on public cultural policies (Anheier and Isar 2012).

### 3.2. Main actors and structural characteristics across countries

A variety of actors play a pivotal role in shaping the structure of the arts and culture sector in ITSSOIN countries. As a general premise, governmental organizations keep on funding public cultural institutions – despite the remarkable cuts in public expenditure and the overall trend of privatization. Furthermore, also art projects implemented by TSOs may be eligible for public funding, sometimes channelled through public foundations. In light of this preliminary snapshot, a more detailed overview on the actors involved is now provided, so to appreciate their patterns and variety. Relevant country peculiarities are also presented.

#### 3.2.1. Governmental organizations

In addition to funding, governments intervene in the field of arts and culture in different ways. First, they formulate public cultural policies apt to steer the activities of other involved actors. This implies managing the national cultural heritage, preparing laws, dialoguing with interest groups and governing public cultural institutions, such as national museums and libraries. At the central level, the ministry of culture usually undertakes such tasks. For example, in Italy, the Ministry of Arts and Cultural Affairs has exclusive competence in protecting cultural goods and artefacts. In the Danish case, a similar executive body defines public policies, while the Agency for culture implements them. Also Sweden is provided with an *ad hoc* governmental agency (the Sweden Arts Council – *Kulturrådet*), which is responsible for the implementation of cultural policies.

However, sub-national governments are also likely to cover substantial roles. These may include the autonomous implementation of recommendations vis-à-vis local actors (e.g. regions of Czech Republic), the support for local theatre and museum (e.g. Danish municipalities), the promotion of integrative art projects and the enhancement of social capital (e.g. Italian municipalities). In some countries, such as Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands, municipalities are even more relevant than the supra-local levels of government in the realm of arts and culture, ostensibly in light of the importance of subsidiarity as a governance tradition in such national contexts. Analysing the Dutch case as an example, public policies are generally executed at the most decentralised level as possible. In addition, the last decades was characterized by a progressive shift of decisional powers towards municipalities in several policy areas, including welfare and employment. Also the Spanish context deserves the most attention. Because of the relevant degree of decentralization of the 17 Autonomous Communities vis-à-vis the central government, such institutions are largely independent in defining their cultural policies. This is particularly important for three of them (Galicia, Catalonia and the Basque Country), which have a distinct culture and their own languages.
They then dedicate relevant efforts in disseminating them through a variety of cultural institutions.

Such country characteristics may affect the potential for social innovation (e.g. Loughlin and Peters 1997; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). For instance, a long-established tradition of state decentralization and deep processes of public sector reform may facilitate its spread, while a relatively recent democratization may stymie it. In the Czech Republic state regulations in arts and culture is currently experiencing a transformation process from a post-socialist system towards a capitalist one. The function of the state is not yet defined, and public funding is not provided with a reliable normative basis.

3.2.2. Third sector organizations

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the overall role of TSOs in ITSSOIN countries with respect to arts and culture is particularly vast and heterogeneous. They range from highly institutionalised organizations to loose networks of local actors. First, the importance of cultural foundations has to be acknowledged. These usually operate at the national level providing art projects with financial resources. Philanthropic foundation is a consistent example that emerges from virtually all the countries analysed. In the Italian and Spanish cases, particular importance is attributed to banking foundations, which are peculiar and relatively new actors committed in funding several cultural projects, such as the restoration of artworks and cultural heritage and the organization of art exhibits. Also religious institutions are relevant in this sense, as they own important historical buildings and they organize numerous cultural events, such as concerts. Attention has to be moreover paid to interest organizations, which usually associate artists and professionals in their specific field of activity (e.g. musicians, etc.) and articulate their demands to protect them. They can encompass trade unions, professional organizations and similar entities.

However, as anticipated, also less institutionalised players are pivotal in such fields. Informal associations and cultural social movements usually operate at the local level. These may offer alternative art ‘products’ as theatres or museums. Another usual activity concerns cultural projects. They can be projects of inclusion – as described above – or projects for cultural education. Cultural social movements can sometimes operate “on the border” of legality, for example when they occupy abandoned buildings for their mission, as previously described for Italy. Such projects are understood as especially innovative. One notable example for these movements is street art. This form of art started up with the aim to redesign public space and now, quite contradictory, they can be found in art museums. The case of German Free Scene is particularly interesting for examining the role of non-institutional actors in the field of arts and culture. This notion refers to diverse groups that initiate cultural events, mainly in the area of fine arts, independent from (and alternative to) public cultural institutions. They are rooted in social movement tradition of 1970s and they usually express protest against sophisticated forms of culture. They are often organized in self-governing local networks that offer opportunities for artists and other professionals. This is very important in light of the focus of this research on social participation.

Both for institutional and non-institutional actors from civil society, the role of volunteers is becoming more and more critical, especially in light of the reduction in public funding. Nonetheless, self-governing entities may also act as antagonists of arts and culture. The UK is a notable example. The current debate on how to ensure independence for practitioners in the
field of arts and culture has fostered the emergence of anti-movements against them. Such pressures have even reached governmental bodies: the minister of education, for instance, has recommended to focus on science as a subject of study, rather than on arts.

3.2.3. Private companies

Minor importance is attributed to market actors in the examination of ITSSOIN countries. They can be members of the so-called ‘creative industry’, such as cinemas, theatre companies, recreational services, art galleries, or publishers of books and music. Further the described privatisation makes donations from business firms more and more important, to fill the financial gap that is left by the cuts in public funding. Moreover, initiatives portrayed as “best practices” are also likely to come from clubs organizing cultural events – making blur the boundary between the market and the third sector.

3.3. Rationale for country selection

The field research of this report focuses on four ITSSOIN countries that are Italy, Spain, France and the Netherlands. The underlying rationale of this choice is here explained. First, Italy represents a particularly fruitful area of investigation for social participation in arts and culture. Italian TSOs are progressively gaining a crucial role and this has somewhat encountered the support of governmental organizations, as demonstrated by the current elaboration of a reform for the third sector. Major changes are moreover occurring with respect to Italian cultural movements – which ostensibly present a remarkable potential for social innovation. Second, France was chosen as particularly apt for a comparison with Italy, as the French government strongly support structures and organizations in the field of arts and culture. Third, Spain was chosen since – similarly to Italy – this country has faced a severe reduction of public resources earmarked for cultural activities. However, divergent outcomes seem to emerge. Spanish government(s) have indeed pressured professionals of arts and culture to legitimize their social role, so to justify the possibility of public funding. This is also connected to the growing importance of a “creative economy”. Fourth, the Netherlands is currently carrying out a progressive privatization of the sector, while also representing a “normal case” with respect to the degree of state influence. This may be insightful for comparative purposes. The Dutch case indeed differs from the France one, as the latter is characterized by a strong public centralization in governing arts and culture. Moreover, the Netherlands differs from Italy and Spain in terms of minor importance of TSOs.

4. Description of country fields

4.1. Methods

To undertake the in-depth analysis of country fields and their main social innovation dynamics, the following data collection strategies have been combined:

- **A literature review** has been conducted, focused on the historical background of the field, its characteristics, the main exogenous and endogenous shocks, the pivotal actors, dynamics, and the remaining topics of interest. For this purpose, national databases of academic resources and academic search engines were used to generate a list of available resources and analyse the “state of art”.

- **Legislation and policy analysis.** We have collected and analysed (1) the relevant national legislation on Arts and Culture in the four countries to depict the
legal/political hierarchy of institutions, and (2) the main policy documents on the field
derived from the previous analysis of the policy discourse on (social) innovation and
the third sector.

- **Media analysis.** Leading national newspapers were analysed to identify relevant
articles related to the field of arts and culture in general. This enables the constitution
of a sample of articles that may provide the current perception of the sector by
mainstream media.

- **Semi-structured interviews.** We have conducted 11 semi-structured interviews with
key experts and practitioners in the field of arts and culture. This allowed (1) to derive
the most salient issues that are relevant in the current debate; (2) to avoid the risk of
not taking into account facts that may not emerge from the other sources employed;
(3) to “come full circle” and conclude the analysis. Interviews were mainly conducted
in person or via telephone. The interviewees are listed in Table 1.

For each trend of social innovation identified in the four countries, notable examples will be
described. These will be ostensibly analysed in-depth during the future months of research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ilaria Morganti</td>
<td>Graduated in arts management at Bocconi University, Milan. After some years spent as research in arts policy, she is now collaborating with MARE, a cultural compound developing different cultural and social activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Silvia Bottioli</td>
<td>Scholar, curator and organizer of cultural events. PhD in history of visual arts and theatre at the University of Pise. Among her numerous activities, she currently is the artistic director of Santarcangelo dei Teatri, an innovative project of “open theatre”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Pilar Gonzalo</td>
<td>Director of the Forum of Culture and Best Practices in Spain³ and collaborator at the Communication Department of the Reina Sofia Museum. Former Executive Director of the Institute of Contemporary Art (IAC) and collaborator at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) of New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Arnaud Burgot</td>
<td>CEO of Ulule, first crowdfunding platform in Europe, which has contributed to funding many cultural projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Valérié Senghor</td>
<td>Associate director of innovation and economic development at Cenquatre Paris. This organization provides space for residencies, production and performances for artists and audiences. It provides open access to a range of emerging arts through a decidedly popular, contemporary and ambitious program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Philippe Henry</td>
<td>Former lectures at the Theatre Department of the University Paris 8 (Vincenne-Saint-Denis). He is now pursuing research on the socio-economy of performing arts and the artistic movement linked to particular local contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Joost Roelofsen</td>
<td>Policy-advisor at the directorate of heritage and arts at the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. He has been involved with the publication ‘Culture in the picture’ (Cultuur in beeld).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Eugène van Erven</td>
<td>Senior lecturer in Theatre Studies at the Community Arts Lab, Utrecht University. Community arts represent his specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Egidio Memeo</td>
<td>Policy advisor for cultural education at the Council for Culture. He is the secretary of the committee ‘service for active cultural participation’ and co-ordinator of the monitoring of cultural institutions with an educational task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Sikko Cleveringa</td>
<td>Director of the Utrecht-based Community Arts Lab-XL, Laboratory for Arts and Society; owner and consultant in the field of cultural participation (Het Vertrek).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Floris Lieshout</td>
<td>Program secretary with The Art of Impact, a new fund that offers funding for art projects that fall outside the scope of well-established cultural funds, but that have the potential of having major societal impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ www.culturaybuenaspracticas.org
4.2. Social participation in the arts and culture in Italy

4.2.1. Introduction

The Italian context of social participation in arts and culture is here presented. This sector has experienced severe changes during the last decade – emerging from both the external and the internal environments. After reviewing the main influential factors, we then present the most relevant pieces of legislation and public policies in this field. The main actors involved are consequentially examined. Eventually, the most prominent innovations in the realm of social participation are analysed, also providing meaningful examples.

Despite the numerous challenges currently faced by the sector, arts and culture still cover a substantial role in the Italian context – both in economic and social terms. To understand the importance of the art and cultural sector in Italy, it is worth to underline how this country hosts the highest number in the world (50) included in the list of UNESCO World Heritage. In 2013, the public expenditure in arts and cultural was €1,692,159,782, representing the 0.1% of the Italian GDP and the 0.2% of the total annual budget of the state. With respect to the “human resources” involved, the Ministry of Arts and Cultural Affairs (MiBACT) employed 18,876 workers in 2014, including professional categories such as managers and people involved in welcome and security activities (MiBACT 2014).

A more comprehensive study (Bodo 2010) estimates that the total number of cultural workers in Italy is 585,000. Among these, 137,000 individuals have a cultural profession in a cultural sector, 249,000 have a cultural profession in a non-cultural sector and 199,000 have a non-cultural profession in a cultural sector. Moreover, the National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) reports that the production of good and services for the cultural and entertainment sector employed 1.7% of workforce in 2012.

Since such data do not significantly vary during the last years, the arts and culture sector presents stable temporal patterns with respect to employment. Finally, examining the “other side”, that is, users and consumers, Italian families have spent – on average – 7.3% of their overall budget in cultural goods and services in relation to the total expenditures for their final consumption.

---

5 In 2011, the Italian cultural sector was constituted by 4,588 cultural institutions, 3,847 museums, 240 archaeological areas and 501 monuments. 63.8% of cultural institutions are publicly owned. In the same year, the number of visitors was 103,888,764, of which 54,876,648 paid for the tickets – taking into account that the 49% of Italian cultural institutions are free entrance (MiBACT 2014).
4.2.2. Influential factors

Exogenous factors

In Italy, social participation in arts and culture sector increased during the last decade due to the confluence of various exogenous shocks directly or indirectly affecting the field.

Economic crisis

In a context of social insecurity and unrest caused by the economic downturn and the high public debt, cultural institutions have suffered a severe shrinking of public funding. The overall amount of public financial contribution (from both the central and local governments) between 2000 and 2012 was firstly characterized by a progressive increase, that reached its peak in 2009 – when € 7,971 million was earmarked for arts and culture. However, such a figure starts to constantly decrease from that year onwards. In 2012, public cultural expenditure indeed was € 5,971 million (-25% in comparison with 2009), which is approximately the same value earmarked in 2000 (cf. Figure 6).

Figure 6 Trends in public cultural expenditure by level of government, in € million, 2000-2012

Source: Elaboration by Associazione per l’Economia della Cultura on ISTAT data

7 Data by ISTAT.
Such a severely negative trend generates relevant tensions within the art and cultural sector – from both a financial and a social point of view. In order to cope with this shock, managers and professionals devised alternative forms of financing while advocating for a greater attention by the state in the field of arts and culture. Cuts in public expenditure indeed generate difficulties in terms of predictability, planning and quality of cultural activities (Turrini 2009) – and eventually foster the engagement of new actors from both private companies and civil society in seeking to maintain acceptable levels in service delivery. As stressed by one interviewee, dynamism in the field is a remarkable consequence of the diminished role of the state.

**Policy changes**

Although legislation and public cultural policies in Italy will be described in detail in Section 3.2.3, major changes arisen by policy-making are here introduced. First, the Decree Law 28/2010 has to be mentioned. This provision has supressed the ETI (Ente Teatrale Italiano), a non-profit organization founded in 1942 to promote and disseminate cultural activities concerning theatrical prose, music and dance. The valorisation of cultural heritage represented a key priority. The suppression of this institution has then caused strong and diffused protests among cultural professionals and, in certain cases, the experimentation of self-governing art projects and activities.

Also the Decree Law 367/1996 fostered the participation of private actors in the cultural sector. This law radically changed the governance framework of major opera houses, in order to pursuit an economic rationalization in the management of such institutions. These became private foundations, mostly run and funded by representatives of public administration, but with possibility of attracting – through fiscal instruments – private equity for a maximum of 40% of their total endowment. However, this provision resulted in a rather fragmented pattern of privatization: geographical heterogeneities were registered, as Southern foundations struggled in obtaining positive results (Bodo & Bodo 2014).

Finally, the Decree Law 41/2004 is another crucial piece of legislation. It is a code for cultural goods containing rules on their protection and establishing responsibilities among different levels of government. The Article 4 explicitly aims to overcome the long-lasting vertical concurrence among the various territorial tiers in the realm of cultural heritage. Even if the problem has not been completely solved, meaningful forms of cooperation can be now achieved between the central government and the regions (Cammelli 2003).

**Socio-demographic changes**

Cultural minorities nowadays represent a critical issue in the Italian political debate. The last 20-25 years were characterized by the incoming of relevant migration flows from various continents. Fondazione ISMU (2013) estimates a total number of legal immigrants of 4,900,000, which is the 8.2% of the Italian population. This has relevant repercussions also in terms of cultural policies and initiatives, which might aim to promote inter-cultural dialogue. However – as noticed by Bodo & Bodo 2014 – these were prevalently oriented to sensitize Italian-born citizens to different cultures, rather than to pursuit a fully-fledge integration among them.

**Endogenous factors**

Factors emerging inside the arts and cultural sector itself have affected its own structure and characteristics. These prevalently regard the reshaping of governance arrangement in cultural
institutions, the growing importance of private financing and the role of voluntarism. As it will be noticed, inter-connections exist between exogenous and endogenous factors.

**Institutional changes**

Art and cultural institutions have experienced various paths of re-organization in their governance arrangements. This is particularly interesting in light of the focus of this report, since the sharing of responsibilities is necessary in order to engage multiple actors in governing arts and culture. The *primum movens* of such shifts is represented by the role of government(s). Both in economic and administrative terms, the public sector has traditionally played a pivotal role in the field of culture, acting as the core of a complex network that provide financial and human resources. Institutions such as museums, theatres and libraries were generally financed and directly managed by the central or local governments. Nonetheless, this long-established role has been deeply challenged – especially during the last decade – both for economic and political reasons. The public sector has been less able to satisfy the cultural needs and demand of society. As stated by one interviewee, there is a lack of political willingness (and capacity) in re-establishing arts and culture as a political priority. This is also due to the role of artists in Italian society. Public opinion tends to perceive them not as central societal actors, but as individuals with scarce professional dignity. As a consequence, policy-makers do not provide them with adequate resources to develop their work.

As a result (and perhaps paradoxically), this led to experiment new forms of creativity and new forms of governance, which encompass the involvement of private companies, TSOs and even informal groups of citizens. One interviewee emphasized how artists are nowadays developing strong capacities as “project managers”. The relatively scarce public support (also in financial terms) requires them to create extra-institutional systems for arts and culture, often connected to territorial and/or educational issues.

It is worth noticing how basically every Italian national government (both right and left oriented) has pursued various forms of involvement of external stakeholders, then overstepping the traditional institutional boundaries of public decision-makers. Public-private partnerships, mixed-governed foundations, fiscal incentives for private funders, introduction of managerial practices and know-how within cultural institutions are among the most relevant trends of reforms pursued by national ministries during the last 20 years. With respect to informal groups, innovative forms of governance are interestingly experimented outside institutional boundaries, as a practice of “resilience”, also through the elaboration of political criticism towards the ruling class, perceived as scarcely interested in promoting arts and culture vis-à-vis the public.

As summed up by one interviewee, a critical change occurred. The state stopped being the central actor of cultural networks, and it is now relegated to an “accessorial” role. As a necessity, new paradigms emerged. Non-institutional actors develop “micro” cultural initiatives, which foster social innovation as they “hybridize” culture. Territoriality, society, innovation and technology are elements that are contaminating the sector through a “new entrepreneurship”.

**Private financing**

To tackle the diminished role of the states as funder of arts and culture, private actors (for autonomous initiative or incentivised by the public sector itself) play a critical role in devoting
financial resources to cultural projects. However, the current economic crisis affects private funding as well. Data from the MiBACT show how the overall private support provided through banking foundations, donations by companies and by individuals was € 574 million in 2008 and € 340 million in 2012. During this relatively short timespan, such contributions then impressively diminished (~41%). The art and cultural sector is recently suffering an austere shrinking of resources “on all fronts”. Within this context, the option of self-organizing cultural activities through bottom-up social participation becomes more realistic, even urgent, since it may represent an “alternative of last resort” to keep the sector alive.

Voluntarism

Voluntarism represents a relevant social phenomenon in the Italian context. As reported by ISTAT, the number of voluntary organizations increased by 152% between 1995 and 2003. 6'391 of these organizations operated in the field of arts and culture, and 1'057 of them had such activities as principal domain. As stressed by Bodo & Bodo (2014), several agreements were signed between the MiBACT and voluntary organizations from 1990s onwards, in order to jointly manage cultural public services, concerning museums, theatres, concerts, etc. Then, in addition to the various forms of financing by TSOs, such actors are critical also in terms of co-delivery (e.g. Fondo Ambiente Italiano – FAI) and advocacy (e.g. Italia Nostra).

4.2.3. Legislation and policy analysis

General legislation on arts and culture

The Italian Constitution (1947) devotes great emphasis to arts and culture as a civic principle. For example, it stresses the role of the state in encouraging the development of culture and in protecting the national artistic heritage (Article 9). Beside such general propositions, the national competences in this field are relatively narrow – also in light of the limited public resources allocated in comparison to other European countries (cf. Section 2.1.1). However, a deep reshaping in public functions and responsibilities has taken place from 1970s onwards. More specifically, national cultural policies started to be revisited in light of a renewed institutional framework. Before examining the major policy trends, key laws and regulations are examined below:

- **Legislative Decree 616/1977.** In light of the emerging political and institutional role of Italian regions as a tier of government (established in 1970), local governments were entitled relevant responsibilities in the realm of culture as well. In this sense, regions started to coordinate and integrate the activities of local institutions with respect to museums, libraries and civic theatres (Turrini 2009).

- **Decree Law 41/2004.** Despite the overall address of decentralisation, vertical conflicts of responsibilities emerged during the decades, especially with regard to the safeguard and valorisation of the national cultural heritage. As anticipated, Decree Law 41/2004 indeed aims to solve such controversies addressing cooperative – rather than conflicting – relationships among the central and local governments.

- **Presidential Decree 805/1975.** At the national level, the rather fragmented institutional framework inherited by the fascist regime was partly overcome in 1975 through a “reunification and rationalisation” (Bodo & Bodo 2014) of cultural responsibilities. The Ministry for Heritage and Environment was then established. Several shifts occurred from 1990s as well. For example, the Legislative Decree 368/1998 extended the tasks of this executive body, renamed Ministry for Heritage and
Cultural Activities. Tourism was successively inserted as an additional competence, then establishing the ministry in its current conformation (MiBACT).

- **Law 122/2013 and Law 106/2014.** Such recent laws both transversally deal with the safeguard, the valorisation of national cultural heritage, goods, activities and tourism – also connecting such activities with broader objectives of economic development. Fiscal instruments are also employed. The “Art Bonus” flagship initiative is particularly interesting, as it provides private actors investing in the arts with tax benefits.

Policy analysis

The institutional reshaping in the field of arts and culture from the 1970s onwards resulted in four main trends of reforms (Turrini 2009), that are: (1) the enlargement of cultural policy’s objectives; (2) the “managerialisation” of cultural institutions; (3) the emergence of regions and local governments as pivotal actors; (4) the increased importance of the private sector. Even if in different terms, such policy processes have fostered social participation in arts and culture, as they variously enact a multi-stakeholder governance model, i.e. “a governance structure that seeks to bring stakeholders together to participate in the dialogue, decision-making, and implementation of solutions to common problems or goals”.

I. Enlargement of cultural policy’s objectives

While the traditional task of the Italian state was the safeguard of cultural goods, a broader and broader set of priorities started to be covered by the MiBACT, in the attempt of valorising and promoting a wide range of cultural activities. Such an enlargement does not only regard the fields of intervention, but also the inherent objectives. For example, late 1990s were characterized by the simultaneous pursuit of both the preservation of cultural identities and the spread of cultural creativity.

II. “Managerialisation” of cultural institutions

In the wake of New Public Management reforms in Western democracies, also public sector organizations in the field of arts and culture renewed their managerial methods and instruments from the 1980s onward, in the attempt of realizing “business-like” organizational settings. This has prominently regarded museums, opera houses and music, since various legislative provisions have pushed cultural institutions towards a greater organizational, financial and decisional autonomy. Even more interestingly, a user-oriented service delivery model was also fostered. A variety of measures were concretely enacted, which include externalisations, privatisations and “agencifications”. The suppression of the ETI (Ente Teatrale Italiano) in 2010 and the transformation of opera houses in semi-private foundations in 1996 are among the most noteworthy examples. Moreover, innovative managerial practices have regarded museums and theatres, which have increasingly pushed ticket sales through advertising techniques.

---

III. Emergence of regions and local governments as pivotal actors

Within the overall context of decentralisation since the 1970s, regional and local governments have covered an increasingly important role also in the field of arts and culture, especially with respect to cultural goods and live performances. Although the central state has the major competences in the preservation and valorisation of the cultural heritage, forms of cooperation can be established with Regions in the definition and development of various connected activities (e.g. restoration, cataloguing) and in the “field management” of cultural activities. In order to favour such forms of collaborations and territorial cultural planning, every regional government include a commission (Commissione per i Beni e le Attività Culturali) to gather together a variety of stakeholders at various levels of government.

IV. Increased importance of the private sector

As anticipated, every national government (beside its political orientation) have sought to involve private actors (both firms and TSOs) in the financing and the delivery of cultural services during the last 25 years. This issue has been largely addressed in Section 3.2.2.

4.2.4. Main actors

Governmental organizations

Despite the diminished role of the Italian state in funding and managing arts and culture, governmental organizations still represent the pivotal actor in this field. As mentioned before, the various tiers of government vertically share competences and responsibilities:

- **Ministry of Arts and Cultural Affairs (MiBACT).** The MiBACT (originally established in 1975) is designed as a complex organization operating at two different levels. On the one hand, there is a central administrative structure, divided in different General Directions. On the other hand, there is a peripheral administrative structure, constituted by numerous organizational units (“Sopraintendenze”), diffused across the national territory. According to the Italian Constitution, the MiBACT has exclusive competences in protecting cultural goods and artefacts. However, other relevant tasks have been progressively inserted in its institutional mission, such as the promotion of a wide variety of cultural activities (e.g. theatre, music, cinema, dance, photography, design), the encouragement of reading and editorial projects, the diffusion of the Italian culture abroad. It moreover plays a crucial role in funding cultural institutions operating in visual and performing arts. Because of the impressive number of tasks and fields of activity, the Ministry has faced relevant challenges from an organizational point of view, which sometimes led to the “bureaucratisation” of the institution (Turrini 2009). For this reason, decentralisation has emerged as a viable support to diminish such complexity.

- **Regional governments.** Within the broader framework of progressive decentralisation and subsidiarity, Regions deal with two main tasks. First, they cooperate with the central government in formulating legislative provisions in the field of management, valorisation and promotion of arts and culture. Second, they establish relationships with sub-regional authorities and territorial actors in administrating local cultural policies. In light of these two tasks, Regions cover a critical role in programming and coordinating cultural activities. For this reason, cultural programming at the regional level is characterized by the abovementioned multi-stakeholders governance model, as they negotiate cultural interventions with local actors (including private companies
and TSOs). It is worth to notice how forms of shared responsibilities are generally launched within regional contexts, e.g. through the establishment of public-private partnerships.

- **Local governments (Provinces and Municipalities).** Such actors cooperate with the supra-local levels of government in the implementation of cultural policies and – even more importantly – they deal with the direct management of local museums, civic libraries and theatres, cultural events and festivals with a local dimension. Forms of mixed-governance have been experienced to improve the quality of these public services, e.g. through the development of inter-institutional cultural networks (Bagdadli 2001). Interestingly, local governments also aim to nurture social capital and to create integration opportunities.

**Third sector organizations**

In Italy, TSOs are nowadays a fundamental actor – rather than a residual one – in the field of arts and culture. In light of their great variety, differentiations can be elaborated to effectively categorize them:

- **“Incumbents" versus “challengers".** With “incumbents” we refer to traditional typologies of TSOs, such as foundations provided with both public and private equity. In the Italian case, semi-private lyric foundations are a typical example. The partial privatization of opera houses has been pursued since late 1990s (Decree Law 367/1996) in order to gain efficiency in managing such institutions. Nonetheless, geographical heterogeneities have been registered in terms of successful transition. “Challengers” instead are innovative forms of TSOs – such as open foundations (“fondazioni aperte”) – which are jointly led by communities of artists and citizens. Two facts need to be emphasized. First, the boundary between such institutions and informal groups (which are analysed later) is rather blurry, as they are both characterised by loose organizational settings. Second, “challengers” are interesting cases of study as they have a great potential for social innovation.

- **Funding, co-creation and advocacy.** Italian TSOs in arts and culture can be moreover distinguished in terms of missions pursued. First, organizations may be funders of cultural projects and activities. Banking foundations are a notable and relatively new example. They are indeed committed in funding arts and culture, e.g. the restoration of artworks and heritage. Second, TSOs may be involved in co-creating cultural services, jointly with public institutions and/or other private actors. For example, foundations may take care of landscapes or historical buildings and make them available for the public. Third, TSOs may act as advocacy coalition to pressure public institutions and to sensitize public opinion with respect to relevant art and cultural issues.

**Social movements and informal groups**

Among the actors here considered, social movements and informal groups ostensibly represent the most innovative example of social participation in arts and culture. This is due to several reasons. First, these actors cannot be considered as organizations. Instead, they generally act through informal local networks that mobilize resources to implement experimental forms of art and cultural productions. Second, and as a consequence, they indeed are forms of civic engagement of multi-stakeholders governance – but they do not involve public institutions, although they may be considered as “public service providers”. Third, they sometimes operate on the border of legality, e.g. occupying empty building to host their activities. This is generally
connected to an antagonistic attitude, as they also engage in forms of political (not only social) participation to criticize cultural and political élites.

4.2.5. Social innovations and social participation in arts and culture

Building upon the previous literature review, legislation, policy and media analysis, and expert interviews, four main social innovations related to social participation in arts and culture have been identified for Italy.

Social Innovation 1

Mixed-governance models involving governmental organizations, TSOs and private firms, which share responsibilities and decisional power with respect to art and cultural activities (e.g. budget, artistic production, performance planning).

The so-called multi-stakeholders governance model represents a well-established paradigm for arts and culture in Italy. A relatively traditional form of such a governance arrangement is represented by public-private partnerships (PPPs), whose diffusion has been firmly encouraged by the Italian governments during the last 20 years. One interesting trend regards an emerging shift from non-profit organizations to “low-profit” ones, as the necessity of staying on the market is increasingly perceived. As stressed before, banking foundations are among the most peculiar examples. Such TSOs spread during the 1990s, when various pieces of legislation at the national level obliged banks to pursue the patronage of arts (which actually was a traditional activity of Italian financial institutions) through ad hoc non-profit organisations. Banking foundations usually establish cooperative relationships with governmental organizations to either fund (i.e. grant-making) or implement (i.e. operating) cultural initiatives, e.g. preservation of the cultural heritage, art exhibitions. Foundations are more and more engaged in drafting public calls and monitoring the funded projects, then enhancing the complexity of their activities.

Nonetheless, it is worth noticing how PPPs and other forms of multi-stakeholders governance may represent risky or inadequate solutions to fund and steer cultural projects. As mentioned before, Italian opera houses were transformed in semi-private foundations from the 1990s onwards. As affirmed by Bodo & Bodo (2014: 75),

Examples Box

The Milan-based “Cariplo Foundation” (http://www.fondazionecariplo.it/) represents a notable and successful example of banking foundation. This TSO deals with a wide variety of fields of intervention, such as arts and culture (50% of the total in terms of financial resources), environment, welfare, science and research. Its assets are approximately worth €7 billion and €143 million was allocated for its activities in 2015. However, this experience is particularly interesting since the Cariplo Foundation does not merely operate as a funding institution. Instead, it prevalently covers the role of “policy-maker”. Vis-à-vis the public sector, it can be indeed defined as a subsidiary, pioneering and accelerator player.

In the realm of arts and culture, the “Cultural Districts” (Distretti Culturali, http://www.fondazionecariplo.it/it/progetti/arte/distretti-culturali/distretti-culturali.html) represent a remarkably innovative example of this banking foundation. The underlying belief of the project is that meaningful interconnections exist between cultural heritage and their socio-cultural contexts. These may generate development opportunities, which require the coordination of large networks among public institutions, private actors and local communities. Six cultural districts have been develop during the last 10 years in the Lombardy territory (i.e. Vallecamonica, Oltrepò Mantovano, Regge dei Gonzaga, Cremona,
“No wonder that, for the time being, only two of the lyric foundations have been able to attain in 2012 such, much yearned for, autonomous status: the Santa Cecilia Academy of Rome (the only Italian national orchestra), subsequently followed by La Scala. Most of the other theatres are in more or less bad shape, so much so that many of them have been put, one after the other, under the administration of external commissioners: in recent years this has been the case, among other, with Teatro Carlo Felice (Genoa), Teatro S. Carlo (Naples), the Rome Opera, Maggio Fiorentino (Florence) and Teatro Petruzzelli (Bari)”.

In general, PPPs seem to need a strong core actor (typically a governmental organisation) that steers the cooperative relationship through the establishment of responsibilities and policy priorities, as a sort of “primum inter pares”. The restoration of Rome’s Coliseum is a notable example. The private firms “Tod’s” – owned by Diego Della Valle – has funded such works with € 25 million. However, a harsh debate has taken place with respect to such a sponsorship, since portions of the public opinion have judged this operation as excessively invasive.

Social innovation 2

Informal groups and social movements involved in the self-government of alternative art and cultural projects through social participation.

As a response to the diminished role of the state as funder and policy-maker in the field of arts and culture, numerous experiences of informal groups of citizens – prevalently operating at the urban level through local networks – have been registered. On the one hand, such experiments can be seen as the most radical forms of multi-stakeholders governance model, as the share of responsibility for co-creating arts and culture is extremely horizontal. On the other hand, these networks operate as loosely organized “state-free enclaves”, which are then scarcely examinable under the traditional lenses of civic engagement in public policies. Because of the radical form of social participation enacted by such groups, their artistic production itself is characterized by strong elements of innovativeness. Participatory and experimental theatre is a notable example. Several experiences are also characterized by the occupation of abandoned buildings, as cultural production goes hand in hand with the emerging principle of “common goods”.
Examples Box

“Teatro Valle Occupato” (Rome, http://www.teatrovalleoccupato.it/) represents a well-known experience in Italy. In 2011, a group of activists and cultural professionals occupied an 18th century abandoned theatre to express both innovative forms of arts and political dissent through participative practices of direct democracy. A variety of activities are carried out, which includes theatre and art exhibitions, concerts, cultural trainings, conferences and demonstrations.

A similar experience is “Macao” (Milan, http://www.macaomilano.org/), a project developed by the so-called “Workers of Arts and Entertainment” (Lavoratori dell’Arte e dello Spettacolo) together with various social movements of the city of Milan. Similarly to “Teatro Valle Occupato”, the argument of culture as a common good is among the founding principle. Torre Galfa (an abandoned skyscraper in the city center) was firstly occupied in 2012 as symbolic gesture to criticize property speculations. Few days after, the police oblige occupants to leave the building. Macao is currently established at the Ex Borsa del Macello, another abandoned building. It proposes the practice of arts and culture as a form of civic activism. Art trainings and exhibitions are among its main fields of activity. Such experiments of cultural self-government are impressively spreading across Italy.

Social innovation 3
Art initiatives promoting inter-cultural dialogue and social cohesion.

The study of social innovation in arts and culture is particularly interesting with respect to the growing importance of cultural minorities. In light of the marginal role of cultural policy in fostering the integration of immigrants in local communities (at least at the national level), the role of TSOs appears as crucial. Such organizations then implement art initiative as a mean to foster multiculturalism. Also social cohesion represents a key priority in such contexts, especially after the social unrest caused by the economic crisis. Bodo & Bodo (2014) recognize

Examples Box

“Teatro dell’Argine” (Bologna, http://teatrodellargine.org/site/index.php) is a social cooperative operating since early 1990s and engaged in the promotion of inter-cultural dialogue and equal opportunities on both the supply-side (actors and directors) and the demand-side (public). “Teatro dell’Angolo” (Turin, http://www.fondazionetrg.it/index.php) instead focuses on the spread of theatre cultural among young people, especially the ones suffering social and economic exclusion. “Teatro di Nascosto” (Volterra, http://teatrodinascosto.com/) is another important experience. Its mission is to “tell the stories of the people without voice: those who live war, oppression, big poverty, gender issues, or other problems that isolate them”. Not just theatre, but also other forms of cultural expression are used for such purposes. For example, the artist Michelangelo
New online initiatives and digital mechanisms that facilitate social participation in culture, particularly through volunteer-based solutions and money donations (e.g. crowdfunding) are emerging as promising tools to promote private investment in arts and culture.

Even if relatively late in comparison to other European countries, the employment of ICTs (mainly the Internet) to promote the participatory funding of arts and culture is spreading in Italy as well. The interesting feature of such platforms is that they are not limited to engagement in financing, but they rather propose a long-term commitment with stakeholders to engage them in art and cultural projects.

**Examples Box**

“*Innamorati della Cultura*” (http://www.innamoratidellacultura.it/) is an example of culture-focused online platform to finance and promote art projects. This Turin-based social start-up aims to pool bottom-up donations from citizens and firms. However, donations are not necessarily “non-repayable”, as the platform works through a reward-based crowdfunding system, i.e. donators can receive a reward as long as the resources collected exceed the costs for financing cultural projects and the platform itself. A very similar experience is “*Fund for Culture*” (http://www.fundforculture.org/), a non-profit organization based in Naples.
4.3. Social participation in the arts and culture in Spain

4.3.1. Introduction
The field of arts and culture in Spain has experienced a drastic change in its economic, technological, institutional, and political environment during the last years, then provoking a serious crisis in the sector and a profound reflection by the actors involved. Overall, the main figures show a situation characterised by a clear decline of the sector. Thus, the consumption of cultural goods has diminished by 27.7% in six years, from €17'000 million in 2008 to €12'000 million in 2013. Each Spaniard spends annually €107 less on average, reducing from €372 to €265 in 2014 (a fall of 24%). The number of companies has decreased from 112'643 in 2008 to 108'546 in 2013 (Bustamante & Rueda 2014). Despite such relatively negative figures, the expert interviewed has however pointed out how “culture is a very powerful sector financially speaking in contrast to public perception. In terms of gross domestic product (GDP) is wealthiest than automotive or communications sectors”.

4.3.2. Influential factors

Exogenous factors

Economic and financial crisis
The international financial crisis has had negative repercussions on the field of arts and culture through several means:

- Occasioning a significant decrease of family income and the perception about arts and culture as a luxury and dispensable activity in face of emerging and urgent social needs.
- Causing important budget cuts to culture that affected remarkably a sector traditionally dependent of public administration and policy through subsidies.
- Generating a contraction of credit granted by financial institutions to cultural companies in the context of a traditionally highly fragmented offer structure, as most of business actors in the field are SMEs.
- Emerging a restructuring of private cultural foundations process controlled by former savings banks. Until their recent dismantling to guarantee the viability of the sector (Ley de Cajas de Ahorros y Fundaciones Bancarias, Law 26/2013, of December, 27), Spanish savings banks used to be a pillar of the third sector, as financial entities of foundational nature often with their own instrumental foundations dedicated to manage social action, including culture as one of their preferred areas of activity. Most of the over 40 foundations controlled by savings banks prior to the restructuring of the sector used to manage or substantially fund museums, theatres, auditoriums, libraries, art collections or exhibition galleries. The few banking foundations resulting from the restructuring have experienced dramatic reductions of their general budgets, and particularly in the cultural field due to pressures to devote their scarcer resources to social assistance.
- Reducing companies’ resources devoted to cultural action and patronage.
Public policy change in the cultural field

This element is clearly related to the financial crisis. Analysis conducted by Bustamante Ramírez (2013) on the evolution of public policy in the cultural field in Spain shows a trend towards a reduction of public support across all administrations (central, autonomic and local), including grants, cross subsidies, tax treatment and international projection of Spanish support to culture, while new models based on private patronage have not yet become a reality. Thus, the cultural budget in 2013 decreased 19.6% compared to 2012, from € 897.52 million to € 721.71 million. Consecutive cuts since 2008 shows a balance of € 460 million lost thenceforward. Additionally, the decentralization and the structure of public funding in Spain have traditionally assigned a lower role to central government, in face of autonomous communities and local administration. Culture cuts have impacted up to 60% and 70% in several regions, falling to zero in many large and small towns and villages. Nevertheless culture budgets in 2015 have increased 4.3% on average in regards to 2014.

In the field of public policy the increase of the VAT on cultural goods and services stands out significantly, turning Spain into a unique case in the European context. VAT increased from 8% to 21% since September 2012 on cultural activities, such as attendance to music concerts or cinema, art galleries and exhibitions. Only a tax of 4% on books and 4% on press has been maintained, both sectors being where editorial and multimedia main groups converge.

Transition to the Digital World

This major structural change is transforming the habits of consumption and questioning traditional business models. Even though an official estimation of the economic significance of digital culture in Spain does not exist, whole invoicing is considered € 10 570 million (Informe eEspaña 2014). In addition, and closely connected, are the negative effects of piracy. According to the Observatorio de la Piratería y Hábitos de Consumo de Productos Digitales [Piracy Observatory and Digital Contents Consumption Habits] (2014) illegal downloads in Spain (including music, films, video games, books, football and television series) reached a number of 4 455 million of contents, equivalent to a value of € 23 265 million. Studies anticipate that cultural consumption will be mostly digital in developed countries, including Spain, in the next ten years. This trend is even stronger in the youngest population, since they have integrated the Internet in their everyday lives beyond the entertainment functions (among other activities, to access the cultural industry and to develop youth cultural and social movements through the Internet) (Rubio Gil, 2010).

Endogenous factors

Ideological debate around the role of the state and the public sphere in culture and the role of culture in society.

On the one hand, ideology plays a – probably too much – influential role in the debate about cultural policies in the country. The “ideologization” of the cultural debate is compounded with political equilibriums demanded by the existence of three Autonomous Communities with their own language, history and differentiated culture – Catalonia, Galicia and The Basque Country. On the other hand, as it has happened in other countries, there is a strong controversy surrounding the transition from the “idea of culture as vital ingredient of integration, social cohesion and democratic participation to the economic priority, or in terms coined by the international literature, from culture as a “right” to culture as a “resource”” (Bustamente Ramírez 2013: 34). According to the interviewee, this is highly connected to public
administration and policy, as “either you are institutional or you are alternative”. This sector has not been able to sell itself, neither autonomous, becoming from a public based dependent position to being neglected in economic crisis context during the last five-year period. Relating to this, the interviewee remarks that cultural patronage is almost non-existent, in the sense that “cultural sponsorship and patronage is negligible in relation to other social fields”.

**Good governance and professionalization deficits**

Experts in the field highlight that the arts and culture field in Spain is behind in professionalization of organizational management, in respect of the Third Sector. It is not usual for cultural organizations to precisely define their mission statement or their strategic planning. As underlined by the interviewee, "every single organizational structure needs to be done”. At the same time, the “culture sector has a great media impact but not enough is known about managing". Indeed, there are serious limitations coexisting in terms of good governance, responsible funding, measurement and assessment of results or transparency and accountability (Gonzalo, 2015a, 2015b; Martín Cavanna, 2013). Few museums and art centres have autonomy in management and government bodies depoliticized enough in Spain, constituting one of the main impediments to advance best practices (Vozmediano, 2014b). In fact, questionable management practices and decision making have lately appeared, as Court of Audits brings to light.

**Deficit of civic participation and citizens’ commitment with the sector**

Political interference in governance of cultural institutions, traditional dependence on public funding, and the aforementioned deficit of accountability have resulted in an estrangement between most cultural institutions and citizens. On the other hand, this is a sector where there is not a profound affiliation and civic engagement (Gonzalo, 2015a, 2015b) because of the absence of effective communication strategies in addition to positioning politicians as natural interlocutors in place of citizens, among other reasons. As stressed by the interviewee, there are no civic networks working on the culture and art field in Spain: “the lack of cultural affiliation is caused by multiple factors such as inadequate information or place mistakenly politicians as natural interlocutors instead of citizens”. Culture and art are thus perceived as a political favouritism-based and subsidized sector, without autonomy and independence. “This sector is perceived as an outlay, not as pillar of society. No one takes it seriously”.

**Isomorphic emulation between public administrations**

Additionally, the “cultural real estate bubble” that encouraged an accelerated growth in the number of infrastructures and cultural activities before the financial crisis, has generated an oversized and scarcely diversified offer, limited in terms of social impact (Rey, 2012). Thus, the arts and culture field is generally perceived as grant-maintained, political favouritism-based, and lacking of independence and autonomy.

---

9 The so-called “Guggenheim effect” after the urban renewal following the installation of a Guggenheim franchise in Bilbao thanks to public subsidies.
However, the Arts and Culture field is currently immersed in full transformation with the objective of overcoming the weaknesses evidenced previously. In particular, the interviewee notices that this sector is “certainly more mature, having passed a point of no return with respect to previous states, actually testing new and also risky methods”.

4.3.3. Legislation and policy analysis

**General legislation on arts and culture**

The state and the Autonomous Communities share the competences on culture in Spain, territorial organization being divided into these two levels (Fernàndez Ramos 2014). The Spanish Constitution entitles the Autonomous Communities to take full competences over legislation and management of museums, libraries and music conservatories of interest to the Autonomous Community (i.e. over those that are of autonomic, local or private ownership and excluding those that are of state ownership); monumental heritage of interest to the Autonomous Community; and the promotion of culture. The state is granted full competences over legislation and management of the protection of the Spanish cultural, artistic and monumental heritage against appropriation and theft, as well as over museums, libraries and archives of state ownership. However, the constitutional text recalls that management responsibilities over the mentioned subjects may be delegated to the Autonomous Communities where they are located; in all cases legislative competence is the full responsibility of the state.

As far as local administration is concerned, following the reform of the Ley Básica de Régimen Local de 1985 by Ley 27/2013, of December 27, on the rationalization and sustainability of local administration, their competences are as follows:

- **Own competences of municipalities:** Protection and management of historic heritage, and promotion of culture and cultural equipment.
- **Compulsory municipal services:** Public library, in the case of municipalities with more than 5'000 inhabitants.
- **Delegation of competences:** The state and the Autonomous Communities may delegate, respecting homogeneous criteria, the “management of cultural facilities of state or Autonomous Communities’ ownership, strictly subject to the extent and the conditions resulting of Art. 149.1.28 of the Spanish Constitution”.

In contrast to what happens in other fields, such as education, a general state-law on culture does not exist in Spain. The most general legal rule is the LPHE (Ley 16/1985, of June, on the Spanish Historic Heritage). In addition, there is a preliminary draft law for the safeguard of immaterial cultural heritage. Likewise, the overwhelming majority of the Autonomous Communities have passed their own laws of historic or cultural heritage. It is worth mentioning that most of the Autonomous Communities have established a Culture Council, as a transversal organ for the participation of civil society.
Basic state-level legislation in the field of arts and culture is available on the website of the Ministry in charge of education, culture and sports\textsuperscript{10}. As regards the different cultural industries it is worth mentioning that in Spain there is not a general law of museums; the legal system being included in the provisions of the LPHE and of multiple regulations. The most distinguishing feature of state-level legislation on museums is a trend to single them out through the adoption of statutes in each institution, as well as a few laws for the largest national museums. The book industry is regulated by Ley 10/2007, of June 22 (of basic character) on books and libraries. A state-law of archives does not exist; neither of performing arts or music. Basic legislation on the film and audio-visual industry is included in Ley 55/2007, of December 28, of cinema (further developed by the Royal Decree 2062/2008, of December 12, revised by the Royal Decree 490/2010, of April 23). Finally, the Spanish state has granted cultural heritage status to bullfighting thus, guaranteeing its protection and promotion. However, in the Autonomous Community of Catalonia bullfighting has been forbidden on the reasons of attempting against animal wellbeing.

In addition to all state- and autonomic-level legislation, other set of legal rules is of particular relevance to the ‘social participation in the Arts and Culture field’. First, those related to the basic legal forms –association or foundation- that private, non-profit cultural entities can adopt:

- Ley Orgánica 1/2002, of March 22, regulating the right of association.
- Ley 50/2002, of December 26, of foundations.

Secondly, basic legal rules related to funding and the tax system of cultural activities:
- Ley 49/2002, of December 23, of the tax regime of non-profit organizations and financial incentives to patronage. New revision, which came into force as of January 1, 2015, includes a series of measures and tax incentives to favour patronage and money donations (Ley 27/2014, of November 27, of Corporate Tax).
- Ley 5/2015, of April 27, on the promotion of business funding, which regulates participatory financing platforms (crowdfunding), amongst other issues.

\textit{Policy analysis}

In the previous analysis of the policy discourse on (social) innovation and the third sector we have identified and analysed the most relevant policy documents addressing (social) innovation and the third sector. All the key documents refer to the general field of arts and culture. However, references are generally made in a context of broader objectives of increasing the quality of education, contributing to social, cultural and work integration of vulnerable societal groups (e.g. immigrants, unemployed), or protecting cultural heritage; the specific field of social participation in arts and culture being generally left out of the key documents framing social innovation policies in Spain.

The only references that can be identified keeping a somehow connection to the field appear in the National Plan for Inclusion of the Kingdom of Spain 2013-2016 (MSSI, 2013). The document refers to the field of social participation in arts and culture in connection to the

\textsuperscript{10} http://www.mecd.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/normativa/vigente/cultura.html
national objective of promoting social inclusion of vulnerable societal groups. Although the
document is scarce on details and the focus is not in the field itself but connected fields
instead, it refers to the concrete objective of promoting cooperation between public authorities
and agencies and the third sector in order to promote: Street education and youth work
programmes, counting with the participation of the youth, and Intercultural understanding and
integration of immigrant population.

In addition, the document specifically refers to the objective “to adopt and implement a plan
on the social function of museums, which integrates actions directed at socially vulnerable
groups, in order to facilitate access to culture, social inclusion and employability.” (MSSSI,
2013:63). Yet and again, no further details are provided. In that context the social participation
in arts and culture is reflected in policy documents as a state field where nevertheless the third
sector participates by cooperating with the public sector in the provision of cultural
programmes and actions. Furthermore it is described as intimately connected to and dependent
from the fields of education, social inclusion and work integration, by serving as a tool to
further advance in those fields.

Beyond the above mentioned policy documents that as we have previously mentioned,
constitute the framework for (social) innovation in Spain, we include in our analysis the
General Strategic Plan for the sector for 2012-2015 produced by the Ministry in charge of
education, culture and sports Secretaría de Estado de Cultura (2012). The document reflects the
political will of introducing a strategic, effective, and more efficient and transparent
management of the field, which is seen of uttermost importance given the contribution of
culture to social cohesion and furthest in times of crisis. A key tool to achieve this purpose will
be the establishment of a mechanism of self-regulation, evaluation and transparency in
cultural policies. Furthermore, the objective of increasing participation and the leading role of
civil society in culture is explicitly identified in the document. Within this objective the key
issues are to increase social participation in cultural production and programming, and to
promote private funding of arts and culture, namely by promoting a culture of patronage, tax
benefits for donors or online crowdfunding.

4.3.4. Main actors

**Governmental organisations**

At the central level responsibility lies with the Ministry in charge of education, culture and
sports. There are several state-level museums, theatres, concert halls, festivals, dance, music,
art schools, audio-visual activities, etc. Regional governments (17). Competencies in the
cultural field are largely decentralized to the autonomous communities, three of them (Galicia,
Catalonia, Basque Country) with a distinct culture and own language they wish to promote. In
addition to their own cultural services they may manage state-level entities such as museums.
Local authorities are relevant actors in the cultural field. They manage their own museums,
cultural centres, festivals, dance, music, art schools, leisure-time activities, etc.

**Third sector organisations**

Among the vast array of TSOs, the following are the most important:
• Cultural, leisure-time and artistic non-profits (e.g. a vast network of alternative theatres, plastic artists, or leisure-time associations in particular oriented to children and youth).
• Private cultural foundations (with a relevant role not only in providing cultural services but also funding cultural activities and projects by third parties).
• Banking foundations derived from restructured savings banks, their social action initiatives and their foundations.
• Public foundations are often created to manage specific facilities and services such as festivals, cultural centres, etc.

Private firms
For-profit actors in the arts & culture industry (cinemas, theatre companies, recreational services, art galleries, leisure-time activities).

The media picture the field of arts and culture participated mostly by public and third sector organizations (TSOs) where the first regulate and fund, and the latter provide arts and cultural goods and advocate the interests of organizations in the field. The field is mediated as a state-field (government funds, regulates and also delivers) in which non-state actors are active members (mostly third sector providers and advocates), and an independent field, in spite of occasional references to the links of arts and culture to education.

Within the public sector the focus goes to the state and the Autonomous Communities, namely when it comes to funding the field. In addition, the central government is mediated as the key regulator and the Autonomous Communities as collaborators with TSOs in the promotion of own culture and language. The decrease in public funding is referred to with both concern and criticism. Concern because it is damaging the provision of (quality) cultural goods and services; criticism because it is understood as the government failing to assume its duties.

TSOs are mediated as both service providers and advocates. Examples of industries in the field where TSOs operate are music, theatre, museums, photography, leisure-time activities. As regards their advocacy agenda, the focus goes to recent cuts in public funding and to improving regulation and transparency in the field. The third sector is thus, mediated as having both a complementary role—when it organizes activities in cooperation with or funding by public organizations—and an adversary role—when it acts as advocate for the field interests— as regards the state and the Autonomous Communities. The decrease in public funding is mediated as transversal issue affecting different industries but mostly the audio-visual industry, art galleries, museums, and leisure-time activities.

Within this context media refer to a few key innovations that are taking place, which have an effect in the governance of the field as a whole and of the participant organizations. These governance innovations mostly relate to changes in (communicating and managing) the relationships with stakeholders. At the same time, they represent either demands or initiatives that reveal an increased desire of social participation in the field:

• Cooperation between TSOs, namely with the purpose of either providing cultural services, or increasing their advocacy capacity and professionalization
• Demands for increased transparency, namely third sector initiatives to promote transparency in public funding of arts and culture organizations, and good
Examples Box

*Foro de Cultura y Buenas Prácticas* is a citizen, independent, voluntary, non-profit and non-legal initiative, which mission is “transforming the cultural professionals and organizations in Spain, strengthening the sector leadership through the promotion of best practices in transparency, good governance, impact measurement and responsible financing”. To this end, and through the celebration of meeting and debates, training workshops and study cases, this initiative expects (1) to generate confidence in cultural field through the standardization of transparency, good governance and economic sustainability processes, (2) to promote the knowledge creation and exchange directed to the search of improvements and the development of best practices, (3) to promote a broad view of cultural sector causing internal reflection and discussion with other social and professional environments, and (4) to contribute to the consolidation of a professional, recognized and leading cultural community. Its main resources relates to social capital (networking) and sector knowledge (actors, weaknesses, threats, etc.).
Social Innovation 2

Mixed-governance models involving governmental organizations, TSOs and private firms, which share responsibilities and decisional power with respect to art and cultural activities (e.g. budget, artistic production, performance planning).

In general terms, Spain does not have a consolidated tradition of citizens’ cultural involvement supported by institutions (Gonzalo 2015a; Rubio, Rius & Martinez, 2014). It remains a sector where public administrations at national, regional and local levels play a key role in governance systems (in line with the Mediterranean model), despite the cutbacks in public spending on culture.

Thus, we find that there are numerous professional associations in the field of Arts and Culture in Spain, traditionally organised territorially. However, as Gonzalo (2015b) highlights, “the model of professional associations, as interlocutors in the cultural sectors, seems to show some exhaustion and, at least, serious dysfunctions.” There is a clear fragmentation of culture professionals, which limits their power and impairs their capability of joint action in a sector characterized by a low sense of citizens’ affiliation (and even a clear citizen antipathy and rejection towards some of these entities, as it has happened with the Sociedad General de Autores y Editores (SGAE), a private organization dedicated to the collective management and defence of the intellectual property rights of its members).

In fact, in recent years there has been an overlap of different initiatives advocating for culture support in Spain that highlights the lack of dialogue between the different actors. However, professional associations are beginning to consider new ways of action, different from the traditional and institutional territorial organization. In that sense, the recent Pacto por la Cultura 2015 (Pact for Culture 2015), promoted by the Federación Española de Asociaciones de Gestores Culturales (FEAGC) (Spanish Federation of Associations of Cultural Managers) stresses the importance of giving culture a more central position, promoting, among other actions, greater stakeholders’ involvement (professionals, citizens, public administration, companies and organizations). This proposal is in line with the European program “The Voice of Culture – Structured Dialogue between the European Commission and the cultural sector”11, which provides a framework for discussions between EU civil society stakeholders and the European Commission12 with regard to culture, aimed at strengthening the advocacy capacity of the cultural sector in policy debates on culture at European level, while encouraging it to work in a more collaborative way.

At the institutional level, the traditional systems of participation in the cultural sphere that have been used in Spain are both sectoral (Strategic Plans for Culture, Sectoral Working Groups, Councils) and territorial, the latter focused on associative management of equipment – the traditional Centros Cívicos (Civic Centres) (Rubio, Rius, & Martinez, 2014). As Vozmediano (2014b) notes, different Autonomous Regions and local governments have laws or regulations

---

11 http://www.voiceofculture.eu/
12 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/index_en.htm
of citizen participation. The most widespread formula is the "Council", whose final objective is to encourage the intervention of the representatives of associations and professional organisations in cultural policies.

**Examples Box**

An example at a national level is the *Consejo Estatal de las Artes Escénicas y de la Música* (State Council of Performing Arts and Music), the highest collegiate body of advice and participation of the Instituto Nacional de las Artes Escénicas y de la Música (INAEM) (National Institute of Performing Arts and Music).

A further way of participation is the possibility that professionals and associations do not only provide advice but also participate in decision-making and manage budgets similarly to the British or Canadian Art Council.

**Examples Box**

In the Spanish case, there is a pilot initiative in this sense: the *Consell Nacional de la Cultura i de les Arts (CoNCA) de Cataluña* (National Council of Culture and Arts of Catalonia), created in 2009, although according to the opinion of different experts this Council has faced problems due to political interference. The uniqueness of CoNCA is that it is not a state-level agency and is the first similar experience in southern Europe. There are other Councils focused on particular groups of individuals whose responsibilities include, among other matters, issues related to culture. This is the case of the *Consejo Estatal del Pueblo Gitano* (State Council of Romani), an inter-ministerial consultative and advisory collegial body of

In addition to these systems of institutional participation, two types of particular experiences of social innovation are noteworthy. The first type of initiatives consists of a set of structures of participation in form of "friendship", which have a long tradition in Spain. These associations of "friends" share three traits (Vozmediano, 2014b): (1) commitment to the cultural project and capability to defend its mission, (2) they act as an interlocutor with the governing bodies of the institution, and (3) their influence in media. Furthermore, some associations of friends have representation on foundation boards and they are directly involved in decision making.

**Examples Box**

- "Friends of Museums" (assembled in Spain by the *Federación Española de Amigos de los Museos, FEAM* (Spanish Federation of Friends of Museums), which integrates 127 Spanish associations and/or foundations of Friends of Museums, representing over 35,000 citizens).
- Associations of "Friends of the Opera" ("Amics del Liceu", "Asociación de amigos de la Opera de Madrid", "Asociación de Amigos de la Opera de Oviedo", etc.).
- *Book clubs.*
Secondly, it is particularly worthy of note the location in public spaces or buildings of socio-cultural centres characterised by community management, emerging as a result of social platforms of collective action claiming for the management of certain services and community facilities, in such a way that they become social actors with a certain capacity to influence governments. Basically, they have a social-based power. These centres go beyond the traditional Civic Centres in terms of associations’ and citizens’ involvement and participation.

**Examples Box**

*Centros Sociales Autogestionados* (Self-managed Social Centres) represent innovative experiences of civic engagement. Notable examples are *La Tabacalera* in Madrid⁴, *Esta es una Plaza* in Madrid⁵, the neighboring centre *El Pumarejo* in Seville, the social and cultural centre *La Casa Invisible* in Malaga⁶, or the socio-cultural centre *Can Batló* in Barcelona, among others.

---

**Social Innovation 3**

New online initiatives and digital mechanisms that facilitate social participation in culture, particularly through volunteer-based solutions and money donations (e.g. crowdfunding) are emerging as promising tools to promote private investment in arts and culture.

Crowdfunding Platforms (CFPs) are intensively spreading in Spain as a result of the incursion of social media and ICTs, in addition to the great financial difficulties that the sector of Arts and Culture (and many other sectors) is going through as a result of the decline of its traditional funding sources. As premised is Section 2.1.2, crowdfunding and crowdsourcing can be analysed as innovative means to better meet societal needs. In fact, they nowadays represent not just alternative ways of financing, but also innovative experimentations for a continuative stakeholders’ engagement.

According to The European Alternative Finance Benchmarking Report (2015), the total Spanish alternative finance market size (defined in terms of this report) was € 10 million in 2012, € 29 million in 2013, and € 62 million in 2014.

Crowdfunding is specifically playing an essential role in the current economic crisis context in particular for arts and culture field. Public spending cuts in addition to the approval of an important increase on the VAT have forced this sector to find alternative sources of funding in order to be competitive, replacing the traditional forms of production of cultural products and services. Spanish artists and designers are mainly using reward-based crowdfunding digital platforms in the country in order to launch their cultural projects with favourable results. Hence, cultural projects are obtaining the best reception in terms of funding (42%). In the same way, reward-based crowdfunding digital platforms fostering cultural projects are obtaining the highest volume of contributions, 71% in the cases of Verkami¹³ and Goteo¹⁴ digital platforms,

¹⁴ [https://goteo.org/](https://goteo.org/)
Examples Box

Particularly Verkami is standing out as the digital platform with the highest success rate (70%) in the Spanish crowdfunding market (Ramos, 2014). Founded in Mataró (Barcelona) in 2010 had successfully promoted till 2015 a number of 2,674 projects, obtaining €13 million funding. Music projects are majority in Verkami, in particular 1,188, followed by film projects (879) and editorial projects (682). Music therefore obtained the highest volume of funding (€3,1m), followed by film (€3,1m) and editorial projects (€2m). As a result and according to the data, music category contains the projects with the highest success rate, 78%.

Also related to art and culture sector, different projects are pointed to protect and restore the art, historic and cultural heritage in Spain. These are starting to be promoted through crowdfunding digital platforms as well although to a lesser extent. Serve as an example Todos a una (http://todosaunacrowdfunding.es/), a reward-based crowdfunding digital platform launched by the Hispania Nostra association.

A remarkable agent in this field is the Asociación Española de Crowdfunding (AEC) – Spanish Association of Crowdfunding, member of the World Crowdfunding Federation (WCF). AEC main strength lies in the ability to join platforms and professionals (social power) in addition to the knowledge of the crowdfunding sector. Law 5/2015, of April 27, on business financing promotion have been recently approved in Spain, regulating - solely - financial platforms in the Spanish crowdfunding market.
Social Innovation 4

Projects focused on co-creation processes, e.g. conversion and reinterpretation of old industrial sites for cultural events.

Different projects are currently being developed in Spain in the area of co-creation in the arts and culture field.

Examples Box

The Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona (CCCB) is a public consortium created by the County Council and Municipality of Barcelona. One of the co-creation initiatives is “CCCBLAB-Investigación e innovación en cultura”, which is a department of CCCB working on innovation in the fields of culture, digital and cultural changes, design and management of projects, as well as on dissemination of research and praxis on cultural innovation, creation and consolidation of learning networks, and design of participation processes. A second initiative of CCCB is CCCB educacio.org, a community or network of educational proposals and content that is open to the participation of schools, cultural centres, institutions, collectives and artists.

It is also worthy of note Medialab-Prado, a program of the Department of Arts, Sports and Tourism of the Madrid City Council. It is conceived as a citizen laboratory for the production, research and dissemination of cultural projects that explore collaborative forms of experimentation and learning that have emerged from digital networks. Its main objectives are: (1) To enable an open platform that invites and allows users to configure, alter and modify research and production processes, (2) to sustain an active community of users with the development of these collaborative projects, and (3) to offer multiple forms of participation that allow people with different profiles (artistic, scientific, technique), levels of specialization (experts and beginners) and degrees of implication, to collaborate.

Another set of co-creation initiatives relate to Audiovisual Development Parks. Although Vivar, Albuín, & Vinader (2013) say that in the majority of the image parks and cities that have been established usually include the industrial sector and training and research/innovation are absent, we can find a few cases of models that have been implemented to facilitate the participation of citizens in the creative processes. An example is the Parc Audiovisual de Catalunya and its ALT-Audiovisual Living Lab Tarrasa, included in the European Network of Living Labs-ENoLL. ALT is a project backed financially by the Ministry in charge of science and innovation.

In addition, as a tool of the Parc Audiovisual, was awarded the European Commission’s recognition as “Best Practice in Innovation” in 2009. By means of a methodology so-called The Game, ALT turns the final consumer – in this case the audience – on a key agent of the creative chain. Other projects to highlight are Intermediae, a laboratory run by the Área de las Artes, Deportes y Turismo from Madrid City Council; Matadero Madrid, created in 2006 by Madrid City Council; and Andalucía TECH Lab, the Digital Arts and Culture Laboratory of the International Campus of Excellence-Andalucía TECH. Finally we should refer that we can also find business actors involved in co-creation processes within the cultural field, such as La Mandarina de Newton. Amongst other projects, it has been selected by Telefonica I+D and elBullifoundation for designing, produce and manage the HackingBullipedia Global Challenge, an international context inviting the best world-level universities and the most creative minds to help building Bullipedia.
4.4. **Social participation in the arts and culture in France**

4.4.1. **Introduction**

The artistic and cultural life in France is particularly rich and diversified, with a strong intervention by the government. 55% of French people think that the state has to provide equal access to culture and art (Donat 2015). The state has long played a critical role in the preservation of the artistic and cultural heritage of the country as well as in the diffusion of creation, but for several years the public budget for art and culture is decreasing. Combined with others changes unrelated to the economic downturn, such as the digital turn, the whole field of arts and culture is deeply transforming. It notably engages into several social innovations to address external pressures, new challenges and new opportunities.

4.4.2. **Influential factors**

**Exogenous factors**

*The economic and financial crisis*

It is generally admitted that the cultural sector in France has been preserved from the economic downturn. As stated earlier, the consumption of cultural goods has not varied in recent years, and the national and local public support for arts and culture is a strong tradition in policy making.

Yet, in 2012, for the first time in 30 years the French government voted to lower the budget for culture, as part of a global effort to straighten the finances of the state. The budget was also cut in 2013 and finally stabilized in 2014 (*Ministère de la Culture*, 2015). The general cuts in public funding have had the most impact on local governments, responsible for 75% of the public funding for arts and culture, resulting for example in the cancellation of 150 festivals in the summer of 2015 (Interview Clément Lavault).

Apart from the State, private companies are still largely sponsoring the cultural sector: culture represents 13% of the total private sponsorship spending in 2014, reaching € 364 million, to be compared to € 494 million in 2012 (26%) (ADMICAL, 2015). Among the actions sponsored through private companies, the cultural heritage and conservation dominates (47% of sponsorship), followed by the diffusion of arts and cultural goods (37%) and then the promotion of access to culture (29%) (ADMICAL, 2015). However, the financial crisis has made it harder for small enterprises to engage in sponsorship. Hence, the private support of the cultural field is precarious.

*The digital turn*

The digital turn has impacted greatly both the music industry (with illegal downloading) and the publishing sector (with online retailing – and more and more: digital books; a free access to the news on the Internet). Reports (Médiamétrie, 2014) show that about one third of the French “digitally active” population visits websites dedicated to illegal downloading. This phenomenon has created massive losses (Tera Consultants, 2008) though the actions taken by the government has slowed the trend (HADOPI, 2012). More generally, the digital revolution triggered a wide array of societal change such as access to and diffusion of knowledge and information, media, e-commerce, etc. It has imposed a very deep transformation of the cultural industry in every way possible. It has changed consumer behavior, perception of cultural goods,
production, diffusion, administration, legislation, individual participation in the creation process, general access to culture and information.

On the other hand the digital turn has not impacted visits to French cultural institutions. These visits have suffered considerably less from the rise of the numerical age than other leisure activities such as television or books. In fact, the behavior of the French population regarding cultural institutions has been relatively stable for the past 15 years (Donat, 2008), while it to note that the access to culture is still strongly correlated to the social background and level of education of individuals (Crédoc, 2012). However, this digital turn has considerably changed social participation in arts and culture, allowing for the emergence of new forms of expression and diffusion of arts or cultural goods. Self-productions of amateur art, video, writing or pictures, have risen and given way to new forms of creation (Donat, 2008) and participation to collective artistic projects.

**Endogenous factors**

**Competition in sector**

In 2013, in France, the cultural sector represented 2.3% of GDP, amounting to € 44 billion. Audiovisual media is the main activity of the cultural sector in terms of added value (28% of the money generated by the sector as a whole). It includes radio, television, cinema, video and music. Its weight has been increasing for four years though that growth has stopped in 2013 due notably to the difficulties of video, music edition, and cinema (Jauneau Niel, 2014). More generally, because of increasing competition within subfields such as architecture, advertising, audiovisual media, press and publishing, the growth of the cultural sector is slowing down (Jauneau, Niel, 2014). Specifically, one of the main changes worthy of note is the decline of the publishing industry over the past 15 years. In 1995, reading books, magazines and newspapers constituted the first cultural activity of the French people, generating 50% of the economic added value of the sector. It now represents 19%. In 2013, the publishing sector recorded its highest fall with a 3% decrease in net income. In parallel the total revenue of the digital publishing sector increased by 28.6%.

**Artists**

The ‘intermittent’ (“quasi-employed”) status is a very specific form of employment and social protection in France for artists and workers of the entertainment industry. There are more than 250'000 "intermittents" in France15, a number steadily increasing – they were less than 100'000 in 1998. *Intermittents* can be employed for temporary projects and by numerous employers at the same time; that is, they benefit from a specific and more flexible labour legislation. The main advantage of the status is that they are entitled to unemployment allowances for the time during which they don’t work provided that they have worked for a certain period of time – currently 507 hours – during the year (Government, L7121-2 to L7121-8). This legislation has allowed more and more artists and cultural workers to escape economic insecurity but, because of the financial opportunity it represents for employers, it has also maintained some others in
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See also: http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/14/rap-info/i0941.asp
it, who would have been regularly employed without the law. The intermittent status is more and more questioned as it costs about a billion euros a year\textsuperscript{16}.

**Volunteers & Associations**

3’135’000 volunteers work in the field of culture and arts in France (Henry, 2014). They mostly participate in cultural and artistic life through associations. In 2011, one in five associations in France had a cultural activity, and at least half of them totally relied on volunteering. Each volunteer work, on average, between 63 and 86 hours per year in his/her association (Henry, 2014).

### 4.4.3. Legislation and policy analysis

**General legislation on arts and culture**

As stated earlier, the French government has put in place a complex legislation on arts and culture. First of all, it is important to note that, in France, the equal access to culture is a Constitutional right. The State has to ensure for every citizen the possibility to participate in the cultural life. The Ministry of Culture and communication is responsible for implementing and controlling compliance to regulations on culture. Its mission includes setting the technical and scientific standards for the conservation of archives and art collections, taking care of the social welfare system for artists, collecting taxes from and supporting in return the fields of performing arts, music, cinema and TV. The Ministry is also responsible for more direct intervention, namely, the management of public cultural institutions.

The legislation on arts and culture includes jurisdiction on working conditions and welfare for author and artist, fiscal and regulation of cultural industries. We will focus specifically on fiscal rights and the regulation of cultural industries. The fiscal legislation is an important part of the legislation on arts and culture notably through:

- An adaptive income tax regime (Code Général des impôts, article 93-1 quater, article 100 bis, CGI, article 84 A, article 5 de l’annexe IV);
- A lower or exonerated VAT. Museum entries have a deduced VAT rate of 10% (CGI, article 278bis and following), books, performing arts and delivery of work of arts by the artist or its beneficiary have a deduced rate of 5.5% (CGI, article 278-0 bis);
- An exoneration of professional taxes for painters, sculptors, engravers, and drawers selling their work of art (CGI, article 1460-2°), lyric artists and dramatists (CGI, article 1460-4°);
- A favourable tax deduction system for corporate sponsorship that includes a 60% deduction rate on income or corporate taxes for donations to a work of general interest, a 90% deduction rate on corporate taxes for payments supporting a public acquisition of a cultural good considered as national treasure or of major interest for the national heritage, a 40% deduction rate on income or corporate taxes for the acquisition of cultural goods considered as “national treasure”.

\textsuperscript{16} See Report of the *Cour des Comptes* cited in *Le Monde* article.
Early 2012, a large debate was engaged regarding the fiscal law on corporate sponsorship as the government intended to lower the 60% tax deduction rate on donations but the project was abandoned. The regulation of cultural industries in France is very specific, there is no global legislation, each sub-sector of culture has its own legislation and regulation. The sub-sectors are: Archives, fine arts, audiovisual, cultural goods, cinema, regional government, dance, artistic education, books and reading, multimedia, museum, intellectual property and performing arts.

In addition to those elements, the legislation on arts and culture in France is particularly interesting regarding copyrights. Copyrights are funded on the creator and not the creative work, the rights are independent from the ownership of the object, the moral right of the creator is perpetual, it cannot be yielded nor sold (laws n° 57-298 of march, 11th, 1957 on artistic and literary property and n° 85-660 of July, 3rd, 1985 on copyrights and rights of artist-interpreter). This definition of copyright is linked with the French conception of art works, work that cannot be considered as merchandise. Equally, the creation process cannot be limited to the economic act of good production. The rise of the digital age required the adaptation of the legislation regarding copyright. The code of intellectual property, created in 1992, was completed in 2006, with the law “DADVSI” and in 2009 with the laws “HADOPI” dedicated to the protection of rights and the regulation of the diffusion of creative work on the Internet.

Finally the legislation on arts and culture determines the role of regional governments regarding cultural policy. The law on the decentralization of power, established in 1983, transferred the management of departmental archives and libraries to departmental council and established that the cultural policy should be built in full collaboration between the State and the regional governments. In the past 30 years, specific governmental agencies have been created to coordinate the cultural policy at regional and local level.

Policy analysis

Although its longstanding tradition of intervention in arts and culture, the State intervention is theoretically open to all artistic and cultural genres, all aesthetics, without will of controlling, or directing creation. This openness is historically, and regularly, criticised (Fumaroli, 1991), and the State’s choices are often subject of much debates. Nevertheless, the artistic and cultural life in France is particularly rich, and in some ways considered as an international model (Dubois, 2010). The Public Intervention is articulated between the conservation and the valorisation of artistic and cultural heritage on the one hand, and on the other hand the support and the diffusion of the cultural and artistic creation.

As said before, the equal access to culture is a Constitutional right. The State in France has to ensure for every citizen the possibility to participate in the cultural life. Public policies are supposed to promote an access at cultural heritage, at artistic creation and even at the artistic amateur practices for every citizen. The movement of decentralisation of public policies is supposed to ensure an access adapted to specific local population. The creation of multiples public institutions and the large funding of associations are means to encourage social participation.

People are more and more active in creating and appropriating cultural and artistic movements, or in promoting local and regional cultures. The public action have to find an
equilibrium between a ‘one and indivisible nation’, and the coexistence and melting of various culture, which is source of richness.

4.4.4. Main actors

**Governmental organisations**

At the central level, the State and the Ministry of Culture and Sports are responsible for the overall policy and legislation on arts and culture. In 2014, the budget for the French Ministry of Culture amounted to € 7.26 billion, half of which was dedicated to audiovisual media (Ministry of Culture, 2014). The ministry of culture is responsible for the management of public cultural institutions, the conservation and promotion of the national heritage, the delegation or distribution of subsidies to cultural institutions or actors and to regional governments for their cultural actions. Numerous government bodies, either independent or related to the Ministry of culture, were created with specific mandates which includes the control and evaluation of spending (whether from the State or the regional governments) by the General Inspection of Cultural Affairs (IGAC), or branch coordination notably in cinema by the National Centre of Cinema and motion picture. There is also a multitude of networks, often branch-specific and labelled by the Ministry of Culture, that are based on the partnership between the Ministry, the regional government and the local governments.

At regional level, the regional governments play a very important part in cultural policy. The regional government, the local governments and the he Regional Direction of Cultural Affairs are the main actors of the decentralized power in policy for arts and culture. Created in 1977, the Regional Directions of Cultural Affairs (DRAC) are the representative bodies of the Ministry of Culture in all the French regions. The DRACs are responsible for the implementation of the cultural policy defined by the State. They are also advisors for local and regional partners in the cultural sector as well as local governments with respect to all the sectors related to the Ministry of Culture e.g. heritage, museums, archives, book and reading, music, dance, theatre, performing arts, scientific and technical culture, visual arts, cinema and audiovisual. About 40% of the overall budget for culture is decentralized and allocated to Regions. The regional support of the cultural sector has three main objectives (IGAC, 2014):

- Make culture a vehicle of local development.
- The economic support focuses on three themes: the support to cultural industries (cinema, audiovisual media and publishing), professional training and employment, the drawing power of cities and regions
- The access of youth to culture.

The DRACs and regional governments are separate bodies. Both play a very important role in financing the support and development of the sector. Performing arts are the main beneficiary of regional government subsidies, amounting to 262M€ in 2014, followed by cultural heritage (€ 125 million), fine arts (€ 43 million) and book and reading (€ 33 million) (IGAC, 2014). The DRAC also subsidizes performing arts (€ 296 million in 2014), but mostly through labelled networks whereas regional government are much more focus on local actors. The DRAC also subsidizes largely the cultural heritage (€ 287 million) but is much less prominent in the support of cultural industries. In spite of the effort of the State to decentralize subsidies for cultural activities and industries, Paris and its Region still 2/3 of the total State regional subsidies.
Third sector organisations

The cultural sector in France also has a strong non-profit segment representing 18% of the cultural production in 2013, concentrated into three sectors: cultural heritage, cultural education and performing arts (Jauneau, Niel, 2014). In 2011, 20% of associations had a cultural activity (Deroin, 2014). This represents 267,000 cultural associations, employing over 169,000 people, which is 9.4% of the employment in TSOs. The TSOs in culture work on a very large community of volunteers. The cultural associations have an equivalent of 189,000 full time volunteers. The number of volunteers in a cultural association is about 18. In 2011, the cumulated budget of all cultural association was estimated to €8.3 billion. TSOs in arts and culture globally less dependent of public funding than TSOs in other sectors, still public funding finances 40% of their overall budget, this funding, as mentioned earlier, often come from local and regional public subsidies. Interestingly, half of those cultural associations organize or host art performance, as primary or secondary activity (Deroin, 2014).

Private companies

The private sector is a major provider of cultural goods. The sector is largely concentrated with 1,000 companies of the sector with 20 or more employees that represent 4% of the number of companies yet 81% of the total turnover of the sector (Deroin, 2008). Thus, we have a cultural sector strong with 157,000 companies, 60% of which have only 1 to 3 employees. 9 out of 10 cultural companies have less than 10 employees (excluding cultural heritage, architecture, advertising and professional training). The sector has known a growing professionalization but the lack of financing and credibility are holding back entrepreneurs of the sector (Hearn, 2014). As mentioned earlier, private sponsors also play an important part in funding cultural organizations and activities.

4.4.5. Social innovations and social participation in arts and culture

Social Innovation 1

New online initiatives and digital mechanisms that facilitate social participation in culture, particularly through volunteer-based solutions and money donations (e.g. crowdfunding) are emerging as promising tools to promote private investment in arts and culture.

In France, in 2014, cultural projects represented 73% of the projects funded through rewarded donations on crowdfunding platforms. With €154 billion collected in 2014, France is the second most important country in Europe in terms of volume of crowdfunding (FPF, 2014). Due to the decrease in public subsidies, and the evolution of practices with the digital revolution, the actors of the cultural sector have developed a great interest in crowdfunding. From local association to great cultural institutions such as Le Louvre, a wide range of actors is using crowdfunding platforms to finance cultural projects or acquisitions (Jeannin, 2013). On the other side, the number of crowdfunding platforms is growing. The leading American platform Kickstarter has announced its launch in France early May 2015.

Few global statistics exist to get a better understanding of the phenomenon. It seems that small
association, individuals and major cultural institutions, all type of actors have started using crowdfunding platforms to develop their projects. On the platform “Ulule”, first crowdfunding site in Europe, the first five most funded categories of projects include: film and video, music, publishing and press, and performing arts. The film and video category only has collected more than 7 million euros in 4 years. In France, in 2013, € 60 million were raised via crowdfunding for cultural projects.

Examples Box

In October 2012, the National Monuments Agency and the crowdfunding platform “MyMajorCompany” partnered on four crowdfunding projects to fund renovation works at the Pantheon, the Mont St. Michel, the National Park of Saint-Cloud and the Cité de Carcassonne. A total of € 120’000 were raised. The Musée d’Orsay and The Louvre have also launched crowdfunding campaigns. The Louvre has launched its fifth crowdfunding campaign since 2010 to fund the acquisition of the “Table of Teschen”. € 1 million have been raised within a month thanks to 2.200 donators (Robert, 2014).

The French government is supporting the structuration and development of crowdfunding. Launched in 2013, through the Public Bank for Investment, the platform “tousnosprojet.bpifrance.fr” helps project leaders find the right platform and creates statistics in collaboration with the main French crowdfunding platforms. So far, cultural projects represent 69% of the total projects funded through donations on the platform. Furthermore, a decree was passed by the French Ministry of Economy, in September 2014, to facilitate the creation and development of crowdfunding platforms, creating notably a special status for equity crowdfunding platforms.

Social innovation 2

Projects focused on co-creation processes, e.g. conversion and reinterpretation of old industrial sites for cultural events.

In France, there is a very strong tradition of public engagement in the cultural sector. Still today, cultural associations are among the most subsidized even in context of scarcity in public funding (Tchernonog 2013). At the level of the city, of the department and of the Region, there are a multitude of public organizations that are still considered as strategic partners and support for independent cultural associations (Sibertin-Blanc, 2012). The commitment of French cities and regional government to the Agenda 21 is yet another proof; one of the focuses of the Agenda 21 is to create a joint responsibility of citizens, civil society, cultural actors/organizations and governments in the development of cultural projects that will shape the future of the cities (Agenda 21 for culture, 2008).

Globally, cooperation between cultural organizations has strengthened since the years 2000. However there is not one particular form of cooperation, the range of structures and forms of cooperation is extremely wide. The actors partnering range from small sized local associations to local/regional government and nation-wide organizations. The actions they carry out are also extremely diverse, including performing arts, visual arts, publishing, museum and heritage, cinema, music, and training (Henry, 2014). Many organizations of the same type (association, cooperative, companies) or that belong to the same sub-sector (publishing, music editing) get into national federations or union (UFISC, SCOP, FNCC, etc.).
Many legal statuses in France allow for cooperative and democratic governance, including traditional companies or third sector organizations such as cooperatives. Cultural cooperatives represent a small part of the cooperative sector, which is very important in France (CoopFR, 2014). However, there is a growing trend in the development of artistic/cultural cooperatives, partly aiming at creating a link between artists, inhabitants or public who often belong to underprivileged populations that lack recognition (Henry, 2014).

The development of “artistic wasteland” is a particularly interesting example. It started in Europe in the 1970s and arrived 10 years later in France. It consists in a group of artists/citizens/cultural associations, taking over abandoned factories to create a new space dedicated to collective creation and open to everybody. Artistic wastelands are cultural projects based on logic of exchange, cooperation, mobilization of the local population and the promotion of new form of artistic expression. They often work in cooperation with other production and communication organizations, through national and international independent networks. If some occupation of factories used to be illegal, national and local government has got more inclined to allow for the occupation by artistic/cultural movements and the preservation of their independence (Thorion, 2005). Many experimentations have occurred since the creation of the “Friche de la Belle de Mai” in Marseille in the early 90’s, often strongly correlated to the local context and, as many cultural organizations, functioning under a fragile economic model. Innovative, adaptive and continuously transforming, those “spaces” function on collegial decision making processes. Their main challenge now is to secure their economic model and preserve their independence while creating strategic partnership including local governments (Henry, 2009).

Social innovation 3

Improvement of cultural organizations’ channels of communication with stakeholders and society.

Some interesting social innovations are linked with communication. Artistic and cultural organizations are reinventing the way to communicate with their public. For example, Arnaud Lavault, the director of MJC (House for Culture and Young people) underlined on interview the need of creating new forms of information about events that take place in MJC. For a part, the local buzz is sufficient, but for certain events, he estimates that a better communication is needed, but this suppose people competent to do this, and in particular to use social media.

The expected benefit is also to increase social cohesion in local contexts through the multilateral engagement of stakeholders.

As mentioned previously, crowdfunding represent a social innovation in the field of culture and art. But we were very interested by some side effects revealed by Arnaud Burgot during his interview. In effect crowdfunding is mainly based on community. The project carrier has to
Examples Box

Ulule represents an interesting example. It trains people of those institutions in this. That transforms the link between people interested and those institutions. The link is more direct, personalised, by social medias, newsletter and sometimes privileged access to performance, exhibits, professionals, backstage, etc. This transform the way people live the cultural and artistic experience, but also the relation between these institution and their public, they...
Exogenous factors

Financial crisis

The financial crisis had a major impact on the cultural sector. This is apparent when we open the Council for Culture’s Cultural exploration for the year 2014. The second line of the report reads: ‘Despite the economic crisis and the considerable austerity measures, the cultural sector still stands proudly’ (Raad voor Cultuur 2014: 7). The Council points out that cultural participation in the Netherlands is still above the European average and that are still many renowned cultural institutions and performers. Nevertheless, this is no guarantee for the future, as the report continues. The cuts of about half a billion euros in public expenditure is not (yet) compensated by alternative funding. This had led to closing institutions and lay-offs in the sector.

Digital society

On top of that, the internet has had a major impact on the manner in which cultural institutions communicated with their audience. When discussing innovation in the cultural sector in 2007, the Council for Culture mainly addressed experiments and new connections between the arts and digital media (Raad voor Cultuur 2007). The latest Cultural explorations of the Council (2014) described digitalization as a ‘game changer’. Art production changed because of copyright issues for digital content. Not only does digital technology change the way art is produced, it also affects its ‘consumption’. It has been a means of opening up existing collections to new audiences.

Changing audiences

The audience for arts and culture is changing. This is mainly due to increasingly ‘informal’ or ‘low art/popular culture’ tastes among the public, a by-product of the emancipation of the cultural participant. This leads to fading demarcations between cultural and leisurely activities (Van den Broek 2012).

Urbanization

Cities are increasingly popular places to live, compared to rural areas. Within the urban sprawl, many different city-profiles may be identified, however. The cosmopolitan orientation of cities like Amsterdam and Rotterdam cannot quite be compared to rural capitals like Groningen. Cultural institutions respond to these different profiles with a variety of programming. Moreover, they tend to emphasize the place of the institution in the urban design; museums, for instance, are more and more integrated in the urban experience by seeking striking architecture that lends characteristic value to city marketing. The Council (2014) does not quite go into the effects of urbanization for cultural offering in rural areas.

Internationalization

Internationalization is a trend similar to urbanization. The Council argues: ‘the city is the home base, the world the playing field’ (2014: 17). This does not only apply to renowned orchestras or individual artists, but also, or perhaps especially, to performers of popular culture (music, games, dance, etc.). This internationalization goes hand in hand with new sources of financing, particularly for popular culture.

Endogenous factors
Tighter regulation in subsidy schemes

The system of deciding on public funding (see the following section) has formalized over the past decade. Subsidy regulations are ever more detailed with clearly delineated categories and strict performance indicators. Economic rationality is increasingly prevalent in cultural policy, rather than taking cultural-political considerations as a starting-point, according to the Council (2014). This is in marked contrast with the networked manner in which the sector organizes. This contrast often leads to collision.

New Connections in the arts

Public opinion regarding the arts has deteriorated over the past years. Culture is increasingly perceived as an elitist affair, which has been suspect with the rise of populist parties since the turn of the century. According to the Council, the cultural sector and performers respond to this by seeking new connections with society. Social media, networks of 'friends', popular culture and connections with other societal domains are key terms in this regard.

Disappearing craftsmanship

The Council (2014) notes the disappearance of specific knowledge and craftsmanship within the sector and questions the responsibility of government to maintain it. The situation is apparently particularly pressing in the cultural heritage sector.

4.5.3. Legislation and policy analysis

General legislation on arts and culture

In 2010, the national government decided to cut the budget for culture with about € 200 million (Schuyt et al. 2013). These measures were accompanied with an increasing political emphasis on patronage and the 'earning capacity' of the sector. The slogan for this is: 'returning culture to society', which is meant to voice the notion of social participation in the sense of financing. Nevertheless, many regard it as a euphemism for austerity measures.

The basic regulatory framework for the cultural sector has been the same for over 20 years, within which there is room for change with each four-yearly 'culture plan period'. The most recent policy document, 'More than quality' (TK 2010/2011), provides the framework for the (most recent) budget cuts, and an emphasis on private initiative and patronage. The document makes mention of promoting 'renewal and innovation' in the cultural sector, by three fairly general provisions: art education to train new professionals, stimulating major arts institutions to foster new talent and using culture funds to support small-scale initiatives that are supposed to create new dynamism in the field. The objective is to foster an 'entrepreneurial and innovative' cultural sector. Bringing new talent and players into the field seems to be the overarching theme here.

The period preceding the most recent document created the basis for a new Fund for Cultural Participation, which is supposed to focus on the amateur arts. The then-minister took over the advice to form such a fund from the Council for Culture. It is part of a larger development to reconsider the financing of the public sector, in line with the notion of 'returning culture to society'. Obviously, this fund is only one of the players in the financing of the cultural field. Nevertheless, it is relevant here with regard to our focus on social participation. The most recent four-year plan mentions a subsidy scheme for innovation in the amateur arts, which is
to be administered by the new fund. The Fund’s policy plan for 2013-2016 includes three ‘renewal’ programs in this scheme, which involve the organization of the amateur arts, the cultural supply for the elderly and the community arts (Fonds voor Cultuurparticipatie 2012).

In 2011, further regulations were implemented to promote participatory funding of cultural institutions. The so-called ‘Giving act’ was introduced, that allows for tax benefits when donating to, or volunteering for cultural organizations (Staatscourant 2012). This is a national regulation, applying to the national tax regime. Nevertheless, donations to local or regional institutions may also be deducted. This act particularly aimed at the cultural sector, as it allowed individuals to deduct 125% of their donations (up to a certain maximum amount) (Schuyt et al. 2013). The national government created the campaign ‘caring for culture’ (Cultuur, daar geef je om) to support the new legislation. Nevertheless, culture is still a relatively unpopular domain when it comes to donations. There are many other initiatives relating to notions like crowdfunding and patronage, but these generally do not have a basis in a particular regulation or policy. We discuss examples in the section on ‘main actors’ below.

A 2014 policy document, finally, positioned the cultural sector as a domain well-suited to establish connections with other societal sectors, such as the creative industry, health, seniors, social cohesion and sports (TK 2013/2014a). The ministry launched a website to accompany the document with numerous examples of concrete projects.17

Policy analysis

The notion of participation in arts and culture can denote many different things. The term ‘cultural participation’ refers to public attendance of cultural events and other cultural phenomena. This, in itself is not a new development. Social research has a long history of monitoring the differences in which societal groups are able to take part in cultural events. Moreover, cultural participation has been on the political agenda since the 1970s (IJdens en Van Rensen 2010), as a means of assuring the accessibility of cultural programming, of fostering societal emancipation and of addressing societal issues by means of the arts. Nevertheless, it makes sense to argue that there has been a resurgence of interest in the issue over the past few years. The founding of a ‘cultural participation fund’ and the slogan to ‘return culture to society’ point in this direction. These developments imply a shift from policies to increase the ‘reach’ of the cultural field to policies targeting ‘active’ participation (IJdens en Van Rensen 2010). At the same time, we need to be aware that these measures were accompanied by major cuts in public expenditure and are, therefore, often perceived as euphemisms for covering up austerity measures.

Social participation would refer to attempts to use culture and arts as a means of fostering the general societal participation of particular target groups. Cultural policy is supposed to contribute to social cohesion and a sense of community (IJdens en Van Rensen 2010). Participatory projects have quite a history in the Netherlands, as in other countries. The Utrecht-based Stut Theatre18 was allegedly the first (1977) neighbourhood theatre with an activist orientation to involving people in a vulnerable position in society. The focus on

---

17 http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ocw/cultuur-verbindt
18 http://www.stut.nl/stut/index.php
activism has now shifted toward social support, as the website explains. This shift fits well with emphases of the current policy environment. Social participation is generally rather high on the Dutch political agenda, and is strongly connected to social support. Policy developments of the past 10-15 years have placed great emphasis on liveable neighbourhoods, self-organized communities and the active societal participation of people with an impairment (TK 2004/2005; VROM 2007). A major political ambition of the past couple of years has been to transform Dutch society into a 'participation society' (TK 2013/2014b). This political discourse aims to foster bottom-up solutions to major societal challenges (healthcare, environmental sustainability, etc.). The arts and culture-sector also plays a role in this respect, by looking for linkages with other societal domains.

Participatory governance of cultural institutions is again a different way of talking about participation, referring to the influence of cultural ‘consumers’ on the institutions’ programming, for instance. When it comes to the governance of the cultural sector as a whole, many things have changed. This is largely due to the earlier-mentioned austerity measures and the delegation of policy execution to private funds, patrons and donating individuals (cf. Section 3.5.2). There are also examples of new governance structures of cultural institutions and art projects, as we highlight in Section 3.5.3. Nevertheless, we might argue that social participation is probably higher on the political agenda than participatory governance.

4.5.4. Main actors

In this section, we both describe actors that are generally important in the cultural field, as well as those that are particularly relevant with respect to social participation. Social innovation with respect to social participation in culture and arts also brought a number of new players onto the field. We highlight them separately in the following section, in which we discuss innovations.

As the above highlighted, the role of citizens changed considerably of late. They are increasingly positioned as ‘cultural consumers’. Moreover, due to budget cuts and new programs and regulations that stimulate donation and patronage, they are also conceived of as co-financers of cultural institutions.

The cultural sector is a particularly difficult one when it comes to describing where the public sector ends and where the third sector begins. As in other countries, providers of cultural and pastime programming can be both public and private organizations, and can either be for-profit or non-profit. Obvious examples of public organizations are the national museums, but, given the focus on patronage, they will have to find more participatory forms of funding as well. Former municipal music schools, for instance, are often not subsidized anymore and instead transformed into clusters of freelance teachers. At the same time, foundations may be third sector organizations, with varying degrees of funding by public subsidies.

Municipalities are clearly public sector actors. Collectively, they provide more funding for culture and arts than the total amount of state funding, e.g. for local museums, theatres,
creative centres (such as music schools) and amateur art. Nevertheless, also municipalities had to implement drastic budget cuts over the past years.

Another obvious public sector actor is the responsible ministry: the Ministry of Education, Culture & Science\textsuperscript{19}. As highlighted before, it decides on policies and funding frameworks for national museums and other national cultural organizations. The main role is to set directions for the following four year period.

Another prominent player in setting trends for cultural policy is the Council for Culture\textsuperscript{20}. It is an independent council that advises government and parliament about cultural issues. Amongst others, it publishes advice about the four-year policy documents and the state-funded cultural institutions. It was founded in 1995, as a merger of previous councils that focused on libraries, media, arts and culture.

A part from subsidies for major national cultural institutions (the cultural 'basic infrastructure'), the execution of national cultural policies is delegated to a number of private foundations, which are fully funded by the state. This is part of the notion of 'returning culture to society'. At the same time, it shows the strong hybridity of the public sector and the third sector. Examples are the Cultural participation fund\textsuperscript{21}, the Performing Arts Fund\textsuperscript{22}, the Netherlands Film Fund\textsuperscript{23} and the Creative Industry Fund NL\textsuperscript{24}.

The Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds is an example of a third sector fund, which is fully privately funded. The VSBfonds and the Fonds21 are hybrids of the third sector and the market, considering that they are connected to Dutch banks and/or insurance providers. All three funds supported the founding of a crowdfunding platform for the cultural sector in 2011, called Koers Kunst. This is largely in reaction to the earlier-mentioned budget cuts and the focus on patronage and donations. Voor de Kunst is another example of a crowdfunding platform, and so is the state-induced organization 'Cultuur, daar geef je om'. The latter was largely set up to promote tax-deductible donations (cf. the aforementioned Giving act). Culture Entrepreneurship is a hybrid of all three sectors: it is foundation with major public funding that seeks to foster entrepreneurship in the arts, introducing a business logic to the field. In addition to this, patronage organizations for specific cultural institutions (e.g. museums, orchestras, etc.) are also increasingly important as a source of financing. Again, this is regarded as a way of generating societal responsibility for the arts.

Another interesting development in terms of new actors, is the founding of online communities for the cultural sector. Some of these are local or regional, such as MEST for the Noord-Brabant region, or a platform catered by Plein C for culture educators.

\textsuperscript{19} http://www.government.nl/ministries/ocw
\textsuperscript{20} http://www.cultuur.nl/english/item138
\textsuperscript{21} http://www.cultuurparticipatie.nl/english/
\textsuperscript{22} http://www.dutchperformingarts.nl/
\textsuperscript{23} http://www.filmfonds.nl/international
\textsuperscript{24} http://www.stimuleringsfonds.nl/en/the_fund/organization/about_the_fund/
Social innovations and social participation in arts and culture

Social innovation 1

New online initiatives and digital mechanisms that facilitate social participation in culture, particularly through volunteer-based solutions and money donations (e.g. crowdfunding) are emerging as promising tools to promote private investment in arts and culture.

As described above, this is definitely an important trend in the cultural sector. This also turned up in the consultation with Joost Roelofsen. We mentioned examples in the previous section on ‘main actors’. Here, we might argue that particularly those funds dealing with crowdfunding (Koers kunst, Voor de Kunst), tax-reduction for donations (Cultuur, daar geef je om!) and cultural entrepreneurship (Cultuur ondernemen) could be considered innovative. However, considering that it is inextricably connected to austerity measures, it is not self-evident whether these ‘new’ forms of financing ought to be considered socially innovative. Apart from being novel/solutions, one would probably need to argue that these ways of financing provide a better means of fostering the impact of the cultural sector, as they may establish long-term relationships with multiple stakeholders. At this stage, however, these measures are to a certain degree simply a means of survival.

Social innovation 2

New developments in the community arts

As said, the community arts have a history that dates back to the 1970s. Community arts is a very broad title that combines many types of practices. The most basic premise is that cultural institutions adopt ‘innovative’ diversity policies, to attract new audiences to their performance (e.g. the Rotterdam-based Zuidplein Theatre25). This might be regarded as passive cultural participation, and does not quite fall under the heading of community arts. Other projects are dedicated to actively involving particular target-audiences, such as seniors (Egideo Memeo named Long Live the Arts26 and Celebrate Life27) or inhabitants of disadvantaged neighbourhoods (e.g. the Amsterdam-based Bookstore Project28 that offers affordable housing and workspaces for artists, in return for which they run neighbourhood art projects). In such contexts, art acquires a social function, and artists often fulfil certain societal services.

Social innovation 3

Mixed-governance models involving governmental organizations, TSOs and private firms, which share responsibilities and decisional power with respect to art and cultural activities (e.g. budget, artistic production, performance planning).

Our interviews (e.g. Eugene van Erpen) pointed toward the importance of co-operative forms of organizing. Often, these new organizational forms are related to community arts projects.

25 http://www.theaterzuidplein.nl/about/
26 http://www.langlevekunst.nl/
27 http://www.4hetleven.nl/
28 http://www.bookstoreproject.nl/
A rather different approach to addressing organizational forms in the cultural sector is the recently developed Governance Code Culture\(^{29}\). This tool provides cultural institutions with guidelines for reassessing their governance approach, given the increasingly complex context of reducing public funds, requests to prove societal impact, etc.

### Social innovation 4

**New business models for the arts**

Particularly given the aforementioned austerity measures in the cultural sectors, and the focus on entrepreneurship, many artists are looking into new business models in order to make a living, according to Sikko Cleveringa. One of such business models is the notion that 'cultural interventions' in neighbourhoods would allegedly increase the value of local properties (Sikko Cleveringa named the Delft Prinsenkwartier\(^{30}\) district). Currently, collaborative projects with researchers are underway to find ways of having the financial gains of such value surplus flow back the local community, rather than to large-scale housing estates, for instance.

### Social innovation 5

**'Informalisation' of the amateur arts**

The field of amateur arts has a long history of self-organisation. More recently, there seems to be a movement away from traditional to more fluid types of organization, such as informal groups in real life and internet communities in virtual life (Van den Berg 2011; Van den Broek 2010).

### 5. Summary

#### 5.1. Highlighting similarities and differences in country-fields

Arts and culture emerge as a particularly fruitful field to develop social innovation and civic engagement. This is firstly due to the "communicative nature" of arts that, by *their own nature*, establish meaningful forms of dialogue between different actors. Moreover, the major trends affecting arts and culture during the last decade have created a remarkable potential for (social)

---

\(^{29}\) [http://www.governancecodecultuur.nl/](http://www.governancecodecultuur.nl/)

\(^{30}\) [http://www.prinsenkwartier.nl/](http://www.prinsenkwartier.nl/)
innovativeness, as the traditional roles of involved actors have been severely reshaped. Even if in different extent and terms, this has been registered in all the countries considered.

The financial crisis has substantially impacted the cultural sector. However, differences are clearly recognizable through the cross-country comparison. Italy and Spain have both experienced a significant reduction in public funding during the last years, more relevant if compared to the French and Dutch cases. Yet, the Italian case has underlined the emergence of non-conventional players in the production and distribution of arts and culture. For example, TSOs are not the only relevant actor in this field, since less structured, more informal groups are autonomously steering their own cultural “micro-policies” at the territorial level. Therefore, state is becoming marginal not just in funding, but also in fixing political priorities. Social cohesion, multiculturalism and even political activism are then introduced into cultural processes, generating a cross-sector contamination and eventually the engagement of multiple stakeholders. It can be even stated that, in Italy, the public sector is no more the central actor of cultural networks, as non-institutional subjects are now assuming this role. The Spanish case is different. First, the central government has never been the pivotal actor in arts and culture. Autonomous Communities are instead largely independent in devising their cultural policies, in light of the strong decentralisation that characterises this country. Second, private actors (such as TSOs and private firms) are increasingly important for funding and promoting culture through cooperation with – rather than in substitution of – the public sector.

France and the Netherlands – despite the overall re-orientation of cultural policies following to the financial crisis and a diminished public funding – have instead found a more stable support by traditional policy-makers. In the French case, this is consistent with the long-lasting role of the central state as critical actor in managing arts and culture. This political modus operandi has not been affected, as it is rooted in a well-established administrative tradition. Despite this, TSOs are increasingly supporting the state in providing cultural products as public services. As a national peculiarity, the Netherlands are instead characterised by the importance of local governments (namely municipalities) in governing certain policies in the field of art and culture. This role has not been sensibly challenged by exogenous or endogenous factors. Yet, the Dutch public opinion has progressively developed criticisms vis-à-vis cultural professionals in light of an alleged elitism. As a response, policy-makers are seeking to develop new connections with the public and to enact tighter regulations in subsiding arts.

Beside such cross-country differences, some common features can be identified. First, the engagement of TSOs and private firms in arts and culture seems a rather consolidated phenomenon. Public-private partnerships are the most recurrent form of cooperation with the public sector. Consequentially, volunteers (as human resources) and voluntary organizations (as partners) have reached a key position within this framework. Second, ICTs and the “digital society” are affecting the sector in both negative and positive terms. On the one hand, the abatement of physical, temporal and also economic barriers has facilitated the consumption of cultural products, to the detriment of economic profitability. For example, online piracy appears as a very difficult habit to be eradicated. On the other hand, ICTs provides producers and distributors of cultural contents with extremely pervasive instruments to communicate with the public and other key stakeholders. In light of such differences and similarities, common innovative trends can be described.

5.2. Identification of innovation trends present in all countries
Following to the examination of Italy, Spain, France and the Netherlands as country-fields for social innovation in arts and culture, the following common trends can be recognized.

- **Multi-stakeholders governance models**\(^{31}\): The long-lasting role of the state as central decision-maker appears as definitely challenged. TSOs, social entrepreneurs, volunteers, private firms and also social movements are increasingly important in funding, delivering, managing and even producing arts and culture. This trend may result in mixed-governance models (such as PPPs), through which the state establishes politico-cultural priorities while external actors concretely enact them in light of economic advantages (e.g. fiscal incentives) or common objectives (e.g. socio-cultural progress). Also vertical relationships between different tiers of government are important in this sense. In addition to these relatively “formal” governance models, also more innovative and radical patterns of stakeholders’ engagement may be achieved. This is particularly noteworthy in the Italian case. As illustrated, autonomous (local networks of) informal groups can respond to the diminished role of the state through the self-government of cultural projects, which represent the most innovative examples of social participation in arts and culture.

- **Arts and culture for social cohesion.** Far from being elitist pastimes, arts and culture are assuming growing importance as means to foster social cohesion and integration. This makes even more reasonable the possibility of cultivating cooperative relationships between public institutions and TSOs, both interested in generating social impacts for their communities. Especially at the local level, numerous examples have been registered. These involve various target groups (e.g. unemployed individuals, immigrants, disadvantaged young people, detainees) and diverse forms of arts and culture (prevalently theatre, but also visual arts, music, dance, cultural events, etc.). It is interesting to notice that such a trend do not involve unusual stakeholders (just) as passive participants (e.g. spectators), but also as co-producers of cultural contents – then making social participation a fully-fledged achievement.

- **Crowdfunding and crowdsourcing.** All the four countries examined are establishing such forms of stakeholders’ online involvement as consolidated practices. Interestingly, these are not limited to the funding of arts and culture, but they additionally regard the decision-making in these processes. The underlying belief is that “crowdfunders” and “crowdsourcers” cannot be considered as mere donors, but they are instead interested in cognitively contributing to the development of cultural initiatives. In fact, the individual decision to engage in such forms of cooperation reveals an implicit affection for the project financed. It then became reasonable (and favourable) to “exploit” such benevolence not just in financial terms, as external actors may also bring cognitive resources, such as their competences and know-how. This may ultimately generate continuative forms of social participation in arts and culture.

In conclusion, this country-field research has shown interesting developments in the realm of social innovation (in general) and social participation (in particular) in the arts and cultural

sector. It is however important to notice how further investigations are going to be conducted for understanding to which extent such innovations meet actual social needs and, if this is the case, how better they do it in comparison to other solutions. This report then represents a valuable basis to develop a more fine-grained analysis.
6. References


Hearn Steven et al. (2014). *Rapport à la ministre de la culture et de la communication et au ministre de l’économie, du redressement productif et du numérique, sur le développement de l’entrepreneuriat dans le secteur culturel en France.*


Hjorth-Andersen, C. (2013). *Hvad koster kulturen?* Jurist- og Økonomforbundets forlag. (What is the cost of Culture?).


Jeannin O., *Le crowdfunding, triomphe ou faillite de la culture?,* dossier pour le Forum d’Aïvignon, 2013


Médiamétrie et al. (2014). *L’audience des sites internet dédiés à la contrefaçon audiovisuelle en France*, Rapport, 1er Juillet 2014


