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This thesis presents critical theory research into museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities. It provides a case study of coproduction within the Australian museum sector, including an embedded exemplar case in the form of Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre’s *Pacifica* program. Museums are cultural institutions dedicated to the collection, preservation, research and presentation of cultural material. This study takes an interdisciplinary approach, considering coproduction as it has been theorised and investigated in management, marketing, public administration and museology literature.

Coproduction offers an opportunity to radically reconfigure the relationship between a firm (or organisation) and its customers (alternatively clients or audiences). Management literature has investigated coproduction from the perspective of a firm’s ability to access resources that sit outside the organisation, for example through a network of suppliers or by employing dynamic capabilities that enable it to identify and access resources that are not held by its competitors. Marketing literature emphasises coproduction as a way to access operant resources (skills and knowledge), which are the means by which value is co-created by a firm and its clients. Public administration literature views coproduction as a means to involve a range of individuals in the production of public goods and services without the restrictions of an organisational structure. Within museology literature, coproduction is seen as an opportunity to redress the colonial legacy of museums by empowering communities, as well as increasing access to and participation in museums.

While coproduction has been the subject of substantial investigation across disciplines, it lacks conceptual clarity. Moreover, the notion has not been adequately ‘problematised’: little attention has been given to the capacity of coproduction to fail or the risks associated with it. This is the research gap that this doctoral research addresses. Despite arguments in favour of coproduction, there is evidence of the difficulties museums experience when working with culturally diverse communities, characterised by conflict between professionals and ‘non-professionals’ and by museums’ inability to share power and control. There is also evidence of museum resistance to this form of practice.

The overarching research question examined in this thesis is therefore: How does coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifest in museums, and what drives and inhibits it?

There are a range of approaches to coproduction, differentiated according to the level of symmetry in the relationship between participating parties, proximity between the lead firm and other contributors, and the extent of value congruence between participants. Given evidence that museums struggle to coproduce, this study has employed a definition of coproduction that is most likely to interrogate the challenges that coproduction presents to museums: museum practice conducted jointly with communities or other external parties. Emphasised in this research is work done by
museums and communities to develop exhibitions and public programs, which are museum offerings made available to audiences.

This case study of museum coproduction has employed a narrative research method through 40 semi-structured narrative interviews, triangulated with archival data, conducted across five research cohorts. At the field level, two cohorts participated in the research: Australian museum professional association representatives; and senior curators and museum managers. The embedded exemplar case of Casula’s *Pacifica* program involved three cohorts: museum staff; external stakeholders; and community representatives. An abductive strategy has been used to analyse this data in relation to three research questions:

- **RQ1**: How does museum coproduction with culturally communities manifest?
- **RQ2**: What drives and inhibits museums to coproduce with culturally diverse communities?
- **RQ3**: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?

This case study reveals that museum coproduction manifests according to six constructs: notions of value; the role played by the community; the nature of the relationship between the museum and the community; the beneficiaries of museum coproduction; the structure of external parties; and the type of resources exchanged through coproduction. This research also identifies the ways museums limit and contain coproduction through the manner in which it manifests. Museums prioritise approaches to coproduction that maintain the professional control held by museum staff and meet the needs of funding bodies. As a result, coproduction overlooks the full range of resources communities can offer museums.

Drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums present in three contexts: within the museum; from the external environment; and through communities. Not all of these contexts have equal influence on museums when they coproduce. The most significant arises from the external environment in the form of government and funding bodies, also referred to as the ‘authorising environment’ (Moore 1995). As a result, coproduction in museums is distinct from that in private or commercial settings.

Institutional entrepreneurship is a critical factor in coproduction, yet museums struggle to resist the pressure to conform to traditional museum practice. The entrepreneurial approach to coproduction demonstrated by the ‘exemplar’ case examined in this thesis is not typical of museum practice. Social capital is a source of innovation in museums and influences coproduction, yet it also has a ‘dark side’ that results in an equal capacity to drive or inhibit this work.

A distinction is evident between the process and outcomes of museum coproduction. It is possible for museums to coproduce with communities but for this work to have little or no impact on the resulting exhibitions and public programs. The process of coproduction emphasises collaboration with communities, which commonly results in conflict and disagreement. Museums perceive this to be evidence of failure, yet this dispute is the very source of the innovation and new knowledge that coproduction
enables. Museums control the influence communities have on coproduced initiatives by constraining their input professionally, programmatically, academically, spatially and regionally.

Management, marketing, public administration and museology disciplines share a desire to radically reorientate organisations’ relationships with their consumers/users. Coproduction is one way to achieve this change. The study of coproduction in museums, and the means by which this practice is avoided or constrained, therefore provides insights for all organisations and fields looking to embrace coproduction or undertake organisational change.
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**Community development:** processes through which agencies build capacity and resilience in communities, so that community members are better able to identify and take collective action on issues which are important to them.

**Constituent community:** community served by a museum due to its relationship with elected members/politicians that provide public funding to the museum.

**Exhibition:** curated presentation of artefacts; museum exhibitions may be temporary or permanent, and may be installed within a museum or offered online in a digital format.

**Local government:** third tier of government in Australia, governed by elected representatives (councillors or aldermen) and with specific responsibility for community needs like waste collection, public recreation facilities and town planning.

**Manifestation:** way in which a phenomenon materialises or takes form.

**Museology:** all the attempts to theorise or think critically about the field of museums, or the ethics and philosophy relating to museums; as such, a scientific and academic discipline which fosters the development of museums and the museum profession through research, study and dissemination of the main currents of museological thinking (Desvallées and Mairesse 2010).

**Museum:** non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment (ICOM 2007). *Gallery* is a type of museum with specific responsibility for visual artworks.

**Museum coproduction:** joint practice involving museums and communities in the development and delivery of exhibitions and public programs (section 2.4.8).

**Public program:** publicly accessible programs offered through a museum that are designed to engage audiences and foster awareness and understanding of a collection.

**Public value:** planned outcomes which add value to the public sphere or decisions made in the general public interest (Moore 1995; Scott 2013) (section 2.4.1.3). Public value acknowledges that public sector organisations have two audiences: upstream (i.e. government and funding bodies) and downstream (both service users and the ‘body politic’).

**Social exclusion:** the experience of individuals and communities who are prevented from participating fully in social systems, usually due to issues such as cultural background, socio-economic status, education level, geography or disability.

**Source community:** contemporary community that represents the cultures and ethnic groups from which museum collections are derived. These communities have legitimate moral and cultural stakes in or forms of ownership of museum collections, and therefore have special claims, needs or rights of access to material heritage held by museums (Peers and Brown 2003).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casula</td>
<td>Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD</td>
<td>Community Cultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Critical Management Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>Dynamic Capability View (of a firm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP2</td>
<td>International Association of Public Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOM</td>
<td>International Council of Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBV</td>
<td>Resource-Based View (of a firm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-D Logic</td>
<td>Service-Dominant Logic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores museum work with culturally diverse communities through a case study of coproduction in the Australian museum sector. This chapter provides the background to the study, including the research problem, research questions, context of the research, method and the contribution this research makes to knowledge.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

Museums are cultural institutions dedicated to the collection of cultural material. Museum collections are diverse and include visual art, natural science, history, ethnography, botanical material and intangible heritage. The term ‘museum’ therefore includes organisations such as galleries, indigenous keeping places, botanical and zoological gardens, science centres, and historic sites and monuments (ICOM 2007). Underpinning the work of all museums, regardless of their collection type, are commitments to public access and civic value. These commitments are achieved through the museum functions of acquisition, conservation, research, communication and exhibition, which are undertaken for the purpose of education, study and enjoyment (ICOM 2007).

The International Council of Museums’ (ICOM) Code of Ethics for Museums identifies the need for museums to collaborate as part of their ‘professional operation’, listing collaboration in the form of professional relationships, professional consultation, shared expertise, and cooperation between museums and other institutions (2013, pp. 11-12). Professional collaboration enables museums to: gain economy of scale (Waibel et al. 2009); share resources (Draper 2006); increase innovation and competitiveness (Camarero and Garrido 2012); and build capacity within the organisation (Moussouri 2012).

ICOM also acknowledges the need for museums to work with communities. Principle six in the Code of Ethics determines that ‘museums work in close collaboration with the communities from which their collections originate as well as those they serve’ (ICOM 2013, pp. 9-10). Within this principle, two forms of community are implied: firstly, communities that represent the countries, cultures, regions and faiths from which museum collections are derived—also referred to as ‘source communities’ (Peers and Brown 2003); and secondly, those communities for which museums provide access and civic value in their role as public cultural institutions, including opportunities for social change and individual improvement (Bennett 1995), as well as social inclusion and access (Bennett 1995; Mason 2004; Sandell 2002; Sandell 2007). This second group can be referred to as ‘constituent communities’.

Postcolonial and postmodern critiques of museums (Bennett 2004; Boast 2011; Crowley and Matthews 2006; Hooper-Greenhill 1992) query the capacity of museums to collaborate with communities. The nature of museums’ work in collecting, research, education and exhibitions has made them an inevitable subject for the examination of...
professional and institutional power structures, and the processes through which discourse and identity are controlled and manipulated. For example: Duncan (1995) and O’Neill (2002) highlight the impact of aesthetic and institutional processes on museum practice; Hooper-Greenhill (1992), Keith (2012), Rice (2003) and Sherman and Rogoff (1994) examine the ways in which museums construct and control representation, knowledge and discourse; while O’Neill (2002) and Sandell (1998; 2002) study the means by which museums contribute to processes of cultural exclusion. Such critiques are influenced by the work of scholars such as Said (1979) and critical theorist Foucault (1972; 1974; 1979; Foucault and Gordon 1980; Foucault and Hoy 1986) in the ways they highlight the hegemonic and governmental nature of museums. Case studies of museum–community collaboration appear to justify these critiques, providing evidence of: the containment of democratisation and pluralisation processes (Ang 2005; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010); reinforcement of the structures of social exclusion (O'Neill 2002); and maintenance of the boundaries of museum professionalism (Ang 2005; Davies 2010; Keith 2012). It seems that museums struggle to work collaboratively with communities.

The emphasis on collaboration with communities is a new principle in the ICOM Code of Ethics, appearing for the first time in a 2006 review. Underpinning this new and broader interest in museum collaboration can be seen the influence of ‘new museology’: a move to increasing reflexivity within museums and calls for their integration with the multicultural social groups they serve (Pollock 2007; Ross 2004; Stam 1993; Vergo 1989a). New museology seeks to develop new forms of museum practice that acknowledge that social and cultural structures are diverse, complex and multilayered, and that enable meaningful power and control to sit with the communities represented and served by museums.

1.3 AIM AND SCOPE

This doctoral research examines collaboration in museums through a coproduction lens. The aim of this study is to examine the drivers, inhibitors and manifestations of museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities, leading to an emergent model or practice for the application of new museology. The notion of coproduction—museum practice conducted jointly with communities or other external parties—enables a number of the principles captured in new museology. Coproduction offers opportunities for: dialectic and democratic museum practice; representation of diverse and contested histories and cultural identities; and an outwardly looking, audience-focused organisation that builds value through its relevance.

Examining museums’ work with communities from diverse cultural backgrounds enables the study of museum collaboration with both ‘source’ communities and ‘constituent’ communities; culturally diverse communities not only have links to the cultures from which museum collections are derived, but represent the general public to which museums are accountable. However, this research has relevance beyond communities defined by culture. While postcolonial theory highlights the relationship between museums and minority cultural groups, cultural representation is controlled and manipulated in similar ways for all groups defined as ‘other’. Although this
research focuses on culturally diverse communities, its findings have implications for museum work with all populations defined in contrast to a dominant social group.

Museum collaboration with communities occurs across a range of museum functions, including: collecting (Herle 2001; Newman and McLean 2006); research (Newman and McLean 2006); learning initiatives (Fincham 2003); and preservation and conservation (Australian Department of Communications 1998; English Heritage 2007). This study investigates museum coproduction with communities to develop exhibitions and public programs. Exhibitions and public programs are the public interface of museums, presenting the ‘published’ or museum-authorised voice (Gurian 2006; Newman and McLean 2006).

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVE

Case studies of museum and community collaboration highlight concerns shared with other sectors regarding the capacity of public sector organisations to coproduce (Bovaird 2007; Brudney 1985; Evers 2006; Needham 2008). Research into museum work with communities provides evidence of: the containment of democratisation processes (Ang 2005; Fouseki and Smith 2013; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Scott 2012); reinforcement of the structures of social exclusion (Bennett 2004; Iervolino 2013; O'Neill 2002; Varutti 2013); and maintenance of the boundaries of museum professionalism (Ang 2005; Ashley 2012; Keith 2012; Scott 2012; Varutti 2013).

Coproduction is argued to be a valuable concept for museums as it provides a means for representing cultural diversity and reflecting the pluralistic nature of modern society. Museum coproduction, particularly that which requires ‘joint practice’ involving museums and communities, is likely to be resisted by curators because it challenges their professional authority and control (Bovaird 2007; Keith 2012; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010). Coproduction also requires changes to traditional museum practice, which is likely to be met with institutional resistance (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Sandell 2003). As a result of this existing literature into coproduction and its value within museums, the overall research question driving this doctoral research is: How does coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifest in museums, and what drives and inhibits it?
1.4.1 RESEARCH QUESTION 1: HOW DOES MUSEUM COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES MANIFEST?

Across the various disciplines interested in coproduction, different models have emerged. However, in none of these fields has a particular coproduction model gained acceptance by either scholars or practitioners. Coproduction can involve a range of approaches, differentiated according to: the level of symmetry in the relationship between museum and community (Fisher and Smith 2011); the proximity between museum and community (Brandsen and Honingh 2016); and the extent of value congruence between museum and community (Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010). The most common investigations into the manifestation of coproduction consider the roles played by the various parties (Bovaird 2007; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b) and the nature of the relationship between the key players (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011; Evers 2006; Osborne et al. 2016; Phillips 2003; Simon 2010). Much of the literature relating to coproduction models is conceptual (for notable exceptions see Alford 2009; Anderson and Crocca 1993; Bovaird 2007; Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Davies 2010; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Minkiewicz et al. 2016; Needham 2008; Ostrom 1996; Pestoff 2012; Thyne and Hede 2016).

This current research addresses this gap by undertaking empirical research into the manifestation of coproduction in museums, drawing on an interdisciplinary study of coproduction typologies. The emphasis on coproduction as ‘joint practice’ (see section 2.4.8) means that the research focus extends beyond the relationship between provider and external parties to encompass coproduction within a value network or service ecosystem (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011; Greer et al. 2016; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011). The use of a critical theory paradigm ensures that issues of power are considered within the manifestation of coproduction in museums.

1.4.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHAT DRIVES AND INHIBITS MUSEUMS TO COPRODUCE WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES?

There are many advocates for coproduction. According to management literature, coproduction increases the resources available to museums by identifying and accessing assets outside the organisation (den Hertog et al. 2010; Greer et al. 2016). Marketing literature emphasises operant resources (skills and knowledge) as the most critical of these (Vargo and Lusch 2004). Public administration sees coproduction as an opportunity to deal with entrenched problems in public services (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Boyle and Harris 2009). According to museology literature, coproduction assists museums to develop exhibitions and public programs that better acknowledge the complexity of cultural diversity and that present views and opinions other than just the ‘museums’ (Lynch and Alberti 2010; Phillips 2003). Yet there is evidence of its avoidance or constraint in literature from management (Anderson and Crocca 1993), public administration (Bovaird 2007) and museology (Ang 2005; Davies 2010; Lynch 2011). Moreover, few empirical studies examine the mechanisms
of this resistance to coproduction or the perspective of external parties. This current research addresses this gap by examining the drivers and inhibitors of museum coproduction.

**1.4.3 RESEARCH QUESTION 3: WHAT IMPACT DOES COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES HAVE ON MUSEUM PRACTICE?**

Previous research identifies a distinction between the *process* of coproduction and the *outcomes* of this work (Alford 2009; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Voorberg et al. 2014). Within museology research, the separation of process from outcomes highlights the dilemma of ensuring coproduction results in high-quality museum offerings while also empowering the participating communities (Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Mason 2004; Phillips 2003). The ways this separation between coproduction process and outcomes is achieved are not clearly understood, nor are its implications for the practice of museum coproduction.

Research into this distinction is largely framed within cultural theory and drawn from research based on practitioner reflections (see for example Boast 2011; Gurian 2006; Iervolino 2013; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Varutti 2013). The use of an in-depth, embedded case study method extends these empirical approaches. As an interdisciplinary study drawing on management, marketing, public administration and museology, a wider theoretical framework is provided for this investigation of the distinction between process and outcomes. The use of a critical theory paradigm again enables issues of power to be explored in relation to the impact of coproduction on museum practice.

**1.5 RESEARCH CONTEXT**

**1.5.1 AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM SECTOR**

Australian museums are largely publicly funded and accountable institutions. Private collections are excluded from the official museum definition (ICOM 2007). The Australian museum sector receives 65% of its income from government sources (Mansfield et al. 2014). According to an Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2009) report, most of this government funding comes from state/territory governments (62.2%), followed by federal government (31.2%), the balance coming from local government (6.6%).

The field-level case examined in this research is coproduction as practised in the Australian museum context. Australia museums operate within a cultural programming and policy context common to Anglophone countries (Gibson 2008). According to the most recent ABS data (2009), there are 1184 museums in Australia operating from 1456 locations across the country. These organisations employed more than 7500 people and were responsible for over 52.5 million objects in their collections. The 2011 Australian census found that 37% of the population aged 15 years and over had visited a museum at least once in the previous 12 months (ABS
2014). The museum sector is characterised by a low degree of professionalisation (Adler and Kwon 2013). Despite internationally agreed professional museum standards (Desvallées and Mairesse 2010) and code of ethics (ICOM 2013), along with a plethora of museum studies university programs, museum workers are not professionally registered and many are volunteers. Of those who are primarily employed in museums, 44% work in cultural occupations such as guides, curators, technicians and conservators (ABS 2014). In 2009 museums had 23,426 volunteers working a total of 444,749 hours. Both employed and volunteer museum staff are supported by professional bodies at state and national levels.

### 1.5.2 CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES

The term ‘community’ refers to any sized group of people who share a characteristic, be that place of residence, cultural or ethnic background, or an interest or hobby (Butler 2013; Ratten and Welpe 2011). In other words, communities can be defined according to: geography (for example, the community of London’s Notting Hill); culture (Pacific Islander communities); common circumstances (refugee communities); social and economic conditions (socially excluded communities); or hobbies and interests (Harley Davidson owners). The Code of Ethics (ICOM 2013) identifies two forms of community with whom museums should collaborate: ‘source’ communities that represent the countries, cultures, regions and faiths from which museum collections are derived; and communities that museums ‘serve’ in their role as public institutions. Source communities are defined by a shared ‘culture’, while served communities represent a museum’s constituency and are usually defined by a shared sense of place or geography.

The complexity of the notion of ‘community’ is frequently overlooked. Modern use of the term assumes its universal value; the concept has been described as a powerful symbol of goodness, integrity and unity (Bauman 2001) and as ‘warmly persuasive’ (Williams 1976 cited in Bennett 1998). It is important to acknowledge the intricacy and potential difficulty of notions of community. Any individual will have multiple—even conflicting—community allegiances (Onciul 2013; Simon 2016). For example, culturally diverse communities that are constituents of a local council which manages a museum may be simultaneously served and source communities for that institution; in other words, a community identified by shared place of residence while also a community identified by shared cultural background. Community membership is often voluntary—for example, the choice of football team and associated fan community; it can also be assigned—for instance, being part of a socially excluded community (Coffee 2008; Newman and McLean 2006; Tlili 2008; West and Smith 2005). Communities differ in terms of their resources, capacities, culture and behaviour. It is important to be aware that diversity exists not only between, but also within, communities (Fouseki and Smith 2013; Kahn 2000; Witcomb 1998).

A shared sense of ‘identity’—often cultural identity or race—is a common way to define a community (Simon 2016). Defining a community according to ‘culture’ is not straightforward, as it presupposes a community that is not only homogenous but also static and resistant to contemporary influences (Gunew 1994; Onciul 2013). Delanty
(2010) notes that in Western countries culture is a means of pluralising and dividing communities. He cites programs in which cultural diversity is promoted as a positive virtue as a ‘soft’ form of multiculturalism and an alternative to rights-based politics of inclusion. He suggests that multiculturalism expressed in programs of cultural awareness—as commonly found in museums—are designed to encourage tolerance and social harmony. Bauman suggests that any recognition of cultural difference becomes a means of constructing barriers around communities, arguing that ‘culture’ is a synonym for ‘besieged fortress’ (2001, p. 141).

Culturally diverse communities are defined by comparison to a dominant, usually Western, cultural identity. The term ‘culturally diverse’ is often synonymous with ethnic communities (for example Ethnic Communities Council of Victoria 2012). The notion of culturally diverse communities has a strong political purpose, particularly within the public sector, where a commitment to working with culturally diverse communities is seen to demonstrate a commitment to accessible public services (for example Australian Institute of Family Studies 2008). Comparison of cultural communities to a dominant cultural group is often negative, requiring communities defined by their cultural difference to ‘prove’ their aesthetic value, professionalism and the innovative development of their traditional art forms (Gunew 1994).

Yet the relationship cultural communities have to their originating cultures is also problematic. While the dominant Western culture is likely to assume cultural communities have an idealised relationship with their ‘homeland’—as perhaps suggested by museums’ notion of ‘source’ community—the actual diasporic experience is more complex and requires transplanting culture into a new context and interacting with other groups (Gunew 1994).

1.6 RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

The concept of coproduction has currency within a range of disciplines. Those that are drawn on in this research include management, marketing, public administration and museology. Despite their interest in coproduction, the concept has been poorly conceptualised (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Fisher and Smith 2011; Osborne et al. 2016; Ostrom et al. 2010). Existing scholarship presents varied understandings of the nature of coproduction, this diversity apparent both within and between disciplines. This case study of coproduction in museums presents a new model for the manifestation of coproduction, a model that is the result of empirical research and unique in its interdisciplinary nature. The critical theory nature of this study reveals the range of approaches that coproduction can involve and the hierarchy that is inherent in its various forms.

The complexity and challenges of coproduction are investigated in this case study. While public administration and museology literatures have acknowledged (but not fully resolved) the difficulty of coproduction, management and marketing research has yet to substantially question the capacity of firms and organisations to coproduce (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Heidenreich et al. 2015). This case study has found that drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums present in the external environment,
within the institution and from the community. Institutional entrepreneurship plays a critical role in museum coproduction, because it requires changes to established forms of museum practice. Relational skills and social capital also underpin coproduction, but with equal potential to drive or inhibit this work.

Across all disciplines the ‘micropractice’ of coproduction and its management implications are poorly understood (Bovaird 2007; Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Greer et al. 2016; Osborne et al. 2016; Ostrom et al. 2010; Voorberg et al. 2014). Museology research has identified the potential for museums to undertake coproduction but with this work having little or no impact on the resulting exhibitions and public programs (Ang 2005; Lynch and Alberti 2010). The mechanisms used to separate the process and outcomes of coproduction have not been fully investigated. This case study highlights the impact conflict has on the collaborative processes involved in coproduction, and museum responses to this dispute. It also reveals the means by which museums contain the influence communities have on coproduced exhibitions and public programs.

Methodologically there is a lack of empirical research into coproduction, particularly in marketing, where conceptual research dominates the field. Empirical research has generally failed to gain the perspective of communities (or consumers or clients) (for notable exceptions see Alford and Yates 2016; Fisher and Smith 2011). This methodological gap is addressed in this current research through the inclusion of community representatives as one of the research cohorts.

A common critique of new museology is that, despite thirty years of theorising and debate about museum role and function, there is little evidence of change within the sector (Janes 2009; McCall and Gray 2014). This case study contributes to practice by offering guidelines for the practice of coproduction in museums. These guidelines also ensure this critical research moves beyond critique by offering ‘transformative redefinition’ (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009; Gephart 2004), aiming to improve museum practice by increasing museums’ capacity to collaborate with communities.

### 1.7 RESEARCH METHOD

This research presents an embedded case study of coproduction in the Australian museum sector. It involves a field-level case involving museum professional bodies and senior curators, along with an embedded case in the form of an exemplar of museum and community coproduction. Both cases are investigated through document research and narrative research. An overview of this case study design is provided in Figure 1.
1.8 SCOPE OF RESEARCH

This thesis explores coproduction in the form of museums and culturally diverse communities working together to produce exhibitions and public programs. Coproduction is defined for the purposes of this study as joint practice involving museums and communities (section 2.4.8). Museums include all public institutions that are responsible for the management of cultural collections (e.g. social history museums, art galleries, ethnographic museums) (section 1.5.1). Culturally diverse communities are groups of people that share the same cultural identity or cultural background (section 1.5.2). Exhibitions and public programs are the main services, or offerings, that museums provide to audiences and the general public.

1.9 STRUCTURE OF THESIS AND SUMMARY

Chapter 1 has provided a background to the current study, its research aims and scope, context, the research method and contributions. Chapter 2 provides a detailed overview of extant literature informing the current study and development of the three research questions. Chapter 3 provides the details of the research methodology. Chapter 4 presents the final findings and Chapter 5 offers a discussion of this case study research. Chapter 6 concludes the thesis and indicates directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this review is to critique the literature and relevant theoretical foundations, leading to an identification of knowledge gaps resulting in the three research questions. Literature from museology, public administration, marketing and management is combined within this review, offering a holistic approach to the contribution each discipline makes to the investigation of coproduction in museums. The chapter begins by outlining museum work with communities and coproduction in museums. From these foundations, discussion is devoted to examining literature that considers how coproduction manifests, what drives and inhibits museums to coproduce, and the impact of coproduction on museum practice.

2.2 MUSEUM WORK WITH COMMUNITIES

2.2.1 APPROACHES TO MUSEUM WORK WITH COMMUNITIES

When museums work with communities to develop exhibitions and public programs, a range of approaches can be involved. Participation, engagement, audience development, collaboration, partnership and coproduction are all means by which museums and communities might interact in the creation of exhibitions and public programs. Table 1 profiles some of the literature on these various ways museums and communities work together.

Table 1: Evidence of the diverse ways museums work with communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Study context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fouseki and Smith 2013)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Consultation with communities in the development of exhibitions to acknowledge the Bicentenary of Britain’s abolition of the slave trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Canning and Holmes 2006)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Evaluation of the ‘Repertory grid’ as a community consultation tool for exhibition development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Davis 2010)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum consultation with communities in Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Simon 2010)</td>
<td>Case study and anecdotal research</td>
<td>Audience and community participation in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brook 2016)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Impact of geography on museum participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Knudsen 2016)</td>
<td>Ethnographic study</td>
<td>Impact of partnerships on museum participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bandelli and Konijn 2015)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Levels of participation in science museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Study context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Evans 2016)</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Impact of cultural policies and infrastructure provision on museum participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Suzić et al. 2016)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Use of social media to increase engagement in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Baker et al. 2016)</td>
<td>Narrative interviews</td>
<td>Use of narrative techniques to increase engagement in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anico 2008)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Community engagement in local government museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Schorch et al. 2016)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Engagement of Māori communities and culture in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Herguner 2015)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Use of governance processes to increase community engagement in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nash et al. 2011)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Civic engagement of communities in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Parker 2012)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Developing an organisational culture that enables audience development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kawashima 2006)</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Use of marketing, education and outreach to make museums socially inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deeth 2012)</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Use of audience development to increase access to contemporary art galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Harlow 2014)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Use of audience development to diversify, broaden and deepen museum audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phillips 2011)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum collaboration with indigenous communities and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lynch 2011)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum collaboration with communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Boast 2011)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum collaboration with indigenous stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Draper 2006)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum collaboration to increase resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phillips 2003)</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Collaboration with source communities to develop museum exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scott 2012)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum collaborations with indigenous artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Study context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Witcomb 1998)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Museum collaboration with migrant communities to develop exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thyne and Hede</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Use of coproduction in museums to offer authentic visitor experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Minkiewicz et al.</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Coproduction of the service experience in museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lynch and Alberti</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Coproduction of museum exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Davies 2010)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Coproduction of temporary museum exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.2 DEFINITIONS OF MUSEUM WORK WITH COMMUNITIES

The distinction between the different ways museums can work with culturally diverse communities is not always clear. In many of the examples listed above, researchers do not specify their use of the terms ‘consultation’, ‘participation’, ‘engagement’, ‘audience development’, ‘collaboration’/’partnership’ or ‘coproduction’. Researchers also use these terms interchangeably. For example, Lynch (2010) uses the terms ‘engagement’, ‘participation’ and ‘partnership’ interchangeably, while Boast (2011) acknowledges the need to distinguish between ‘consultation’ and ‘collaboration’ in museums despite the tendency to use these terms without distinction.

Phillips (2003) identifies the value of establishing clear models of collaboration between museums and communities in order to improve the outcomes of this work and establish collaboration as an accepted form of museum practice. She argues that, ‘clarity in identifying the model to be used in a given collaborative exhibition project not only greatly enhances its chances of success, but also the long-term validity of the new paradigm’ (Phillips 2003, p. 158). The different forms of work involving museums and communities highlight issues relating to the use of power and relinquishing of control. In examining the increasing interest in community involvement in museums, Mason and Graham have noted the ‘rise in terms such as “consultation”, “outreach”, “inclusion”, “engagement”, “inreach”, “co-curation” and “co-production”. Each of these terms has different connotations and politics in terms of how much control is retained, ceded, or shared by institutions and individuals’ (2013, p. 163). To aid both scholarship and practice, it is important that there are clear and well-understood definitions of the various forms of museum work with communities. Table 2 offers some definitions.
Table 2: Definitions of approaches that involve museums working with communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach to museum work with communities</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>‘Involvement by individuals or representatives of the community in shaping service development and implementation’ (Canning and Holmes 2006, p. 276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>‘I define a participatory cultural institution as a place where visitors can create, share, and connect with each other around content. ... The goal of participatory techniques is both to meet visitors’ expectations for active engagement and to do so in a way that furthers the mission and core values of the institution’ (Simon 2010, p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>‘to ease access to the museum collections for groups, so that they come to see collections as resources for heritage and identity, to be used as the basis of work—workshops, exhibitions, etc.—that addresses their own issues. The museum acts as a facilitator to support groups in developing their own issue-based work’ (Herguner 2015, p. 782)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience development</td>
<td>‘the efforts of arts organizations to increase the populations they serve’ (McCarthy and Jinnett 2001, p. 16) by “broadening” audiences (attracting more audience members like those currently attending), “deepening” them (enriching the experience of participants), or “diversifying” them (bringing new groups into the fold)’ (Parker 2012, p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership</td>
<td>‘In a collaborative, community-based exhibit, there are many players—operating both as members of groups and as individuals—who during the exhibit development process interact in mutually dependent, interlocking spheres. They usually approach the same task from divergent perspectives, yet can utilize the opportunity to further their own agendas’ (Kahn 2000, p.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction</td>
<td>‘Enabling individuals or groups to shape or modify an activity so that it becomes a different thing (Lynch 2010, p. 16)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 BACKGROUND TO COPRODUCTION

2.3.1 THE VALUE OF COPRODUCTION IN MUSEUMS

When museum work with communities involves coproduction—collaboration between various individuals, groups and actors in order to shape or modify a market offering or an activity (Lynch 2010; Minkiewicz et al. 2016)—a range of opportunities are made available. Coproduction can realise the changes to museum practice called for by new museology (McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993). It assists the development of pluralistic and dialogic museum offerings that better acknowledge the complexity of diversity and cultural representation (Kahn 2000; Macdonald 2016; Phillips 2003; Vergo 1989a; Witcomb 2009). Coproduction shifts internally focused museum practice to enable outward-looking and audience-focused institutions (Boorsma and Chiaravalloti 2010; Coffee 2008; Davies 2005; Sandell 2003). It assists the development of authentic and distinctive museum offerings (Derbaix and Gombault 2016; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Phillips 2011; Thyne and Hede 2016). When they coproduce, museums offer greater public value and relevance, not only to their immediate users but also to society or the ‘body politic’ more generally (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Holden 2006; Scott 2013). Furthermore, coproduction enables museums to build new and more diverse audiences (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011; Kawashima 2006; Parker 2012) and to tackle issues of access and exclusion (Boast 2011; Gibson 2008; Mason 2004; Newman and McLean 2006; Sandell 2003).

2.3.2 COMPARISON OF DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO COPRODUCTION

The term ‘coproduction’ is used by a range of disciplines, including marketing, management, public administration and museology. Insights into the definitions of coproduction used within these different disciplines are provided in Table 3.

Marketing literature investigates coproduction within the shift to S-D (service-dominant) logic and relational, rather than exchanged, notions of value (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004). This large body of research is comprised mostly of conceptual studies, rather than empirical research into the practice of delivering relational value. These studies are also predominantly positive, underpinned by an aspirational commitment to S-D logic and assumptions about the unproblematic nature of coproduction (for exceptions see Fisher and Smith 2011; Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Heidenreich et al. 2015; Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010). For example, Fisher and Smith suggest that marketing literature assumes coproduction involves ‘a balanced, shared, harmonious relationship between producers and consumers, where controlling the co-creation process with consumers ensures a predictable and satisfactory outcome for a company’ (2011, p. 325). As a result the discipline is seen to be lacking a framework that explains how relational value formation occurs in practice (Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Grönroos 2011; Ranjan and Read 2016). While there have been some recent developments in relation to value-in-use approaches to co-creation involving a
firms and its customers (Frow et al. 2015; Payne et al. 2008), these are generally distinct from coproduction (Frow et al. 2011).

Table 3: Definitions of coproduction across a range of disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Definition/influence of coproduction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>‘Participation in the core offering itself. It can occur through shared inventiveness, co-design or shared production of related goods, and can occur with customers and any other partners in the value network.’</td>
<td>(Lusch and Vargo 2006, p. 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Joint production process: the customer participates as co-producer of resources and processes with the provider,’</td>
<td>(Grönroos 2011, p. 291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Consumers now seek to exercise their influence in every part of the business system. Armed with new tools and dissatisfied with available choices, consumers want to interact with firms and thereby co-create value. The use of interaction as a basis for co-creation is at the crux of our emerging reality.’</td>
<td>(Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b, p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>‘Value coproduced by two or more actors, with and for each other, with and for yet other actors.’</td>
<td>(Ramirez 1999, p. 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Combinations of service functions provided by a coalition of providers, both parties in the value chain and actors in the wider value network.’</td>
<td>(den Hertog et al. 2010, p. 494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>‘Process through which inputs used to produce a good or service are contributed by individuals who are not ‘in’ the same organisation.’</td>
<td>(Ostrom 1996, p. 1073).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Provision of services through regular, long-term relationships between professionalised service providers (in any sector) and service users or other members of the community, where all parties make substantial resource contributions.’</td>
<td>(Bovaird 2007, p. 848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Coproduction means delivering public services in an equal and reciprocal relationship between professionals, people using services, their families and their neighbours. Where activities are coproduced in this way, both services and neighbourhoods become far more effective agents of change.’</td>
<td>(Boyle and Harris 2009, p. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Definition/influence of coproduction</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museology and cultural theory</td>
<td>‘Enabling individuals or groups to shape or modify an activity so that it becomes a different thing.’</td>
<td>(Lynch 2010, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Arts consumers provide a valuable contribution to the achievement of the artistic objectives. They complete the work of art by giving meaning to the new metaphor and by acknowledging its artistic value. The audience takes part in the ‘coproduction’ of artistic value.’</td>
<td>(Boorsma 2006, p. 76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Museology literature, conversely, is highly critical of the collaborative work that has occurred between museums and communities. While new museology demonstrates a desire for coproduction, the discipline’s strong tradition of postcolonial critique of museum practice does not assume that collaboration can be readily achieved and is sceptical about its possibility (see for example Ang 2005; Anico 2008; Boast 2011; Coffee 2008; Hooper-Greenhill 1992; Iervolino 2013; Keith 2012; Scott 2012; Varutti 2013; Witcomb 1998). Museology research acknowledges the complexity of the organisational change required by coproduction, and the reluctance of museums to share power and control. Public administration has also identified the obstacles professional practice presents to the requirements of coproduction, and the new professional skills it requires of public administrators (Bovaird 2007; Butcher 2015; Ryan 2012). While there are a number of coproduction typologies and frameworks in public administration literature (for example Bovaird 2007; Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Evers 2006; Osborne et al. 2015; Osborne and Strokosch 2013), none have yet gained acceptance. As in the marketing discipline, public administration tends to assume the ‘virtuous’ qualities of coproduction and has given inadequate attention to its conceptualisation (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Voorberg et al. 2014).

Management literature approaches coproduction as an opportunity to access new resources and increase the competitive position of an organisation (den Hertog et al. 2010; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b). This has led to research into the management of value networks and supply chains (den Hertog et al. 2010; Frow et al. 2014; Normann and Ramirez 1993; Ramirez 1999), with little attention given to the complex nature of the relationships and interactions through which these resources are made available, or the diversity inherent in the resources that can be made available through coproduction. The high rate of failure within alliances more broadly has been noted, along with a lack of theoretical understanding of alliance performance (Suseno and Ratten 2007).

Identified in this summary overview are the merits of an interdisciplinary approach to museum coproduction. It reveals that, across disciplines, there are both synergies and contradictions in relation to how coproduction is approached and conceptualised, and each field offers a body of research comprising strengths and gaps in existing literature. Huxham notes the complexity and potentially ‘baffling’ nature of interdisciplinary research (2003, p. 402). The gap in interdisciplinary research, not only into
coproduction but into the science of services more generally, has been identified as a priority for marketing research (Ostrom et al. 2010).

Also evident in this summary is the relevance of Foucault’s theories in relation to the constructed nature of knowledge and the notion of power/knowledge. The limited interdisciplinary research into coproduction demonstrates one means through which disciplines are constructed and internally managed (Clark et al. 2011; McKinlay et al. 2012). The specificities applied to coproduction theory in each of these disciplines are evidence of the rarefaction of discourse—the ways what can be thought or said become limited (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Feder 2010).

### 2.4 CONCEPTUALISING COPRODUCTION

Six emergent themes characterise the ways coproduction has been conceptualised: notions of value; role filled by external party; form of interaction between provider (museum) and external party (user/consumer/audience/community); beneficiaries of coproduction; structure of external parties; and type of resources exchanged through coproduction. These themes in the literature and their associated constructs are summarised in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coproduction construct</th>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notion of value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction construct</td>
<td>Conceptualisation</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coproduction construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Form of interaction

| Participatory/creative | External parties interact with provider as stakeholders involved in a network or supply chain through participatory or creative relationships. These relationships can be categorised as ‘crowdsourcing’, ‘co-creating’ or ‘audience-as-artist’. This generally involves participation in small groups or networks and voluntarily contributing to the design of coproduced initiatives. | Frow et al., 2015, Lusch et al., 2010, Normann and Ramirez, 1993, Vargo and Lusch, 2011 (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b) (Australia Council for the Arts 2010) (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) (Osborne et al. 2016; Osborne and Strokosch 2013) (Brandsen and Honingh 2016) (Arnstein 1969) (IAP2 2014) |

### Beneficiaries

### Coproduction construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coproduction construct</th>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Structure of external parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of external parties</th>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2.4.1 NOTIONS OF VALUE

2.4.1.1 VALUE AS EXCHANGED

The most established notion of value is that which involves an exchange: value is produced by providers and consumed by customers. Value is embedded in the products or services that focal organisations produce. As a result value is understood to be added during the production process, separate from the customer, and determined by the price paid for the product or service (Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Holt 1995). When conceptualised in this manner, value does not require interaction, but rather the exchange of products and services in which value is contained.

In arts marketing, the notion of value being exchanged is highlighted by Hill et al., who define marketing as an ‘integrated management process which sees mutually satisfying exchange relationships with customers as the route to achieving organisational and artistic objectives’ (2003, p. 1). Within museology literature, the notion of museums offering value to audiences and visitors through the quality and nature of the exhibitions and programs it offers is strongly held. The notion of value ‘embedded’ in objects resonates with museums, given their role in managing collections and artefacts. Objects that are collected and held in museums are assumed by the very nature of a museum’s role and function to have inherent value (Vergo 1989b). The reverential nature of museum architecture and exhibitions, which manifests both tacitly and implicitly, is designed to enhance messages about the significance of the material displayed (Duncan 1995). The desire for museum offerings to better acknowledge cultural diversity, and to present a range of perspectives and opinions, demonstrates an assumption that value is exchanged through the services offered by museums (for example Boast 2011; Herle 2000; Krmpotich and Anderson 2005; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Newman and McLean 2006; Scott 2012). The purpose of audience development is to facilitate the exchange of value through museum services, through broadening, deepening or diversifying museum audiences (Barbosa and Brito 2012; Deeth 2012; Kawashima 2006; Kemp and Poole 2016; Mc Carthy and Jinnett 2001; Parker 2012).

Transactional value also drives the use of an organisation’s dynamic capabilities to undertake coproduction and thereby increase the resources available to it; this is referred to as the dynamic capabilities view (DCV) of a firm, which is aligned with the resource-based view (RBV) of competitive advantage (den Hertog et al. 2010). The use of coproduction for this aim emphasises an organisation’s access to resources that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable (Barney 1991). It is argued that an RBV view is relevant not only to dyadic exchanges between a provider and customers, but also to the development of value within a supply chain (Hunt and Donna 2012).
2.4.1.2 VALUE AS RELATIONAL OR EXPERIENTIAL

Value can also be conceptualised as relational—requiring interaction between the provider and external party. Rather than being received through an exchange, value is subjectively and experientially determined by the consumer (Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Lusch and Vargo 2006) or other actor (Vargo and Lusch 2011). The interaction on which this notion of value depends can occur between a dyad in terms of a firm and its customers (Grönroos 2006; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b; Vargo and Lusch 2004), or involve multiple stakeholders/actors operating within a network or ‘service ecosystem’ (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011).

Relational models of value are emphasised in marketing literature connected to S-D logic, service logic and co-creation experience. S-D logic understands value as fundamentally derived and determined in use—the integration and application of resources in a specific context. It involves a major conceptual/paradigm shift resulting from emphasis on the exchange of service, rather than goods (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004). S-D logic is based on the assumption that value is always co-created; therefore customers are formed through the value creation process and value is the result of a reciprocal exchange. Coproduction is a component of value co-creation (described as ‘nested’ within value co-creation) and involves ‘participation in the creation of the core offering itself, occurring through shared inventiveness, co-design, or shared production of related goods, and can occur with customers and any other partners in the value network’ (Lusch and Vargo 2006, p. 284). While S-D logic initially emphasised coproduction in terms of dyadic relationships between firms and customers (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004), this has been expanded to an interest in value creation within networks or systems, and a corresponding shift to interest in generic actors and a service ecosystem (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Vargo and Lusch 2011). As a result S-D logic conceptualises the relational nature of value at micro (individual), meso (firm/organisation) and macro (market/field) levels (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016).

S-D logic has informed research into coproduction and co-creation in museums (Minkiewicz et al. 2016; Thyne and Hede 2016; White et al. 2009). Boorsma introduces the idea of ‘artistic value’, suggesting that, ‘arts consumers provide a valuable contribution to the achievement of the artistic objectives. They complete the work of art by giving meaning to the new metaphor and by acknowledging its artistic value. The audience takes part in the “co-production” of artistic value’ (Boorsma 2006, p. 76). Osborne et al. (2015; 2013) have tailored S-D logic to a public service context, arguing that the shift from a transactional to a relational focus within public sector organisations should take the form of a public-service–dominant approach based on three elements: building relationships across the public service delivery system; understanding that sustainability derives from the transformation of user knowledge; and professional acceptance of the inalienable need for coproduction with service users (2015).
An alternative marketing theory that deals with relational value and the potential for coproduction is the Nordic School’s notion of service logic (Grönroos 2006). Service logic argues that marketing theory was previously extended to incorporate coproduction by attending to the specific nature of service development:

Services emerge in “open” processes where the customers participate as co-producers and hence can be directly influenced by the progress of these processes. Traditionally, physical goods are produced in “closed” production processes where the customer only perceives the goods as outcomes of the process’ (Grönroos 2006, p. 319).

More specifically, service logic involves mutual or reciprocal interaction between two or more parties. During this interaction, value creation processes simultaneously occur, resulting in mutual benefit—this mutual benefit being the fundamental basis of business (Grönroos 2009). Through interaction, value can be created for the provider, stakeholder and customers, although value is determined by the beneficiary (often the customer), usually on the basis of experience. The key elements needed for value to be created are interaction between value-creating resources and a beneficiary (Grönroos 2006). Unlike S-D logic, service logic holds that customers can be the sole creators of value (Grönroos 2009) through their experiential determining of value.

A third marketing framework for coproduction is co-creation experience, which argues that experience-centric means of creating value have replaced traditional goods- and service-centric models. Co-creation is therefore the key to securing competitive advantage (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b). Value is embedded within human experiences; therefore personalised experiences created through engagement and experience hold the key to value in our society. The challenge for organisations and businesses is to offer deeper engagement and interaction, for example through relationships (Chen et al. 2012).

Service logic and co-creation experience models of relational value both have parallels in museology literature to participation (Bandelli and Konijn 2015; Brook 2016; Evans 2016; Knudsen 2016; Simon 2010) and engagement (for example Anico 2008; Baker et al. 2016; Herguner 2015; Nash et al. 2011; Schorch et al. 2016; Suzić et al. 2016). These similarities are indicated in Table 2. For example, the suggestion that participation involves techniques that aim ‘both to meet visitors’ expectations for active engagement and to do so in a way that furthers the mission and core values of the institution’ (Simon 2010, p. 5) aligns with Grönroos’s (2009) discussion of value creation that results in mutual benefit. The suggestion that engagement enables communities to ‘see collections as resources for heritage and identity, to be used as the basis of work—workshops, exhibitions, etc.—that addresses their own issues. The museum acts as a facilitator to support groups in developing their own issue based work’ (Herguner 2015, p. 782) corresponds to the personalisation of experiences discussed as part of co-creation experiences (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a).
2.4.1.3 PUBLIC VALUE

When coproduction occurs within the public sector, it has been associated with the delivery of public value — the delivery of value into the public domain. Public value acknowledges that the public sector services both ‘upstream’ and ‘downstream’ audiences (Wensley and Moore 2011). Public resources (obtained from communal or government sources) (Greer et al. 2016) are received from upstream audiences and used to develop offerings for downstream audiences—otherwise known as service users. Moore (1995) develops the notion of public value in order to highlight this triadic relationship and its implications for public sector organisations and their managers. Within a public context, value requires a three-way relationship in the recognition and receiving of benefits, highlighted through the Public Value Strategic Triangle (Moore 1995; Moore and Benington 2011), shown in Figure 2. Within a museum context, the three points on the Public Value Strategic Triangle are: operational capacity (the museum, including staff, board, collections, networks and relationships), authorising environment (government, funders, professional bodies, artists, arts sector) and public value outcomes (audiences, communities, active citizens) (Scott 2013). The task of the strategic and entrepreneurial public manager is to align, or negotiate trade-offs between, the three points on the Public Value Strategic Triangle (Benington and Moore 2011).

![Figure 2: The Public Value Strategic Triangle (Moore and Benington 2011)](image)

Because public value emphasises the triadic relationship involved in public services, it highlights the role of service users in their capacity to act as ‘legitimators and testimonial providers’ for the receipt of public value (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012, p. 1122). Before it can be recognised that value has been delivered to the public domain, public value needs to be acknowledged by all points on the Public Value Strategic Triangle. While in the private sector value is created and acknowledged through the relationship between the firm and its consumers, in the public sector the influence of the authorising environment makes public value a three-way process of recognition.
(Moore 1995; Moore and Benington 2011). The notion of value within a public setting is also complex because public organisations make things happen not only through resources but also through legislation, compliance and government authority. In contrast to the private sector, clients or customers do not always pay directly for public services, and in some cases the use of the service is sanctioned or mandated (Alford 2011; Wensley and Moore 2011).

The acknowledgement of value within the public sector is further complicated by the fact that the beneficiaries of public services include not only those in direct receipt of this work, but also the wider public, citizens or body politic. The public acknowledges public value by giving its approval to taxation and government spending (Alford 2011; Hartley et al. 2015; Wensley and Moore 2011). Public value emphasises the need for public institutions to look outside their own organisation to determine the value and relevance of the services they offer, with priority given to value that is identified and acknowledged by citizens (Alford and O’Flynn 2009; Moore 1995; Scott 2013).

2.4.2 ROLE FILLED BY EXTERNAL PARTY

2.4.2.1 USERS AND CUSTOMERS

One role that can be filled by external parties involved in coproduction is that of ‘user’ or ‘customer’. When external parties are assigned this role, coproduction assumes a situation in which there is strong demarcation between provider and user. As a result, provider and user are not proximal (Brandsen and Honingh 2016) and there is limited value alignment between the two parties (Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010) and a lack of relational symmetry (Fisher and Smith 2011). In other words, coproduction is conceptualised within a context in which the organisational boundary of the provider is rigid and impermeable.

Within marketing and management literature, the situation is identified in references to ‘consumers’ or ‘customers’ (for example Anderson and Crocca 1993; Dong 2015; Etgar 2008; Frow et al. 2015; Grönroos 2009; Minkiewicz et al. 2016; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b; Thyne and Hede 2016; Vargo and Lusch 2004). Public administration identifies the involvement of ‘citizens’, ‘users’ or ‘communities’ in the demarcation between coproduction providers and users (for example Alford 2016; Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Brudney 1985; Brudney and England 1983; Sharp 1980; Whitaker 1980). Museology literature uses the terms ‘communities’, ‘visitors’ and ‘audiences’ to distinguish participants from the providing organisation (for example Ang 2005; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010).

When the external party fills the role of user or customer, emphasis is placed on their contribution in terms of work or physical labour. This type of contribution can be referred to as: customer participation as producers (Dong 2015); codelivery (Bovaird 2007); coproduction (Osborne et al. 2016; Ryan 2012); co-construction (Osborne et al. 2016); complementary coproduction in the implementation of core services (Brandsen and Honingh 2016); enhanced engagement, crowdsourcing and co-creation.
Public administration literature highlights that the work of citizens can be compulsorily acquired. This work can be compelled (having to place bins on the street in order for rubbish to be collected) or coerced (offenders meeting probation requirements) (Alford 2009; Alford 2016; Brudney 1984; Brudney and England 1983; Whitaker 1980).

2.4.2.2 STAKEHOLDERS

The external party involved in coproduction can also take on a ‘stakeholder’ or ‘collaborator’ role. In these circumstances there is greater proximity between the provider and users (Brandsen and Honingh 2016), stronger value alignment between the two parties (Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010) and more symmetry in their relationship (Fisher and Smith 2011). This situation is evidence of the organisational boundary of the provider being more fluid or permeable. When conceptualised in this manner, the demarcation between provider and external party is less distinct.

The involvement of external parties as stakeholders frequently takes the form of design of services. This contribution is more complex than contributing to the ‘work’ of service delivery because it involves higher order skills, knowledge and actions. For example, contributing to the design of services may involve tacit or ‘sticky’ knowledge used to improve existing or develop new services (Von Hippel 1994 quoted in Osborne et al 2013). Contributions of external parties to the design of services or products is acknowledged in customer participation as: designers (Dong 2015); coplanners (Bovaird 2007); codevelopment (Anderson and Crocca 1993); co-design and co-innovation (Osborne et al. 2016); audience-as-artist (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011); and co-creative and hosted exhibitions (Simon 2010).

Research suggests that contributing to the design of services and products is more fulfilling and motivating for external parties. While Alford and Yates (2016) found no link between satisfaction and the coproduction of public services, Dong (2015) found satisfaction was higher when customers participated in the design rather than production of services, particularly when participation was optional. Brudney (1985) notes that when citizens and administrators are involved in program design, both parties commit to coproduction with equal dependence and input. In contrast, Davies (2010) found design input was a way that museums categorised different roles within exhibition development processes; external consultants but not community members were allowed to have design input into exhibitions, while neither party were permitted to have design input into exhibition themes.

Some scholars highlight the need for external parties to be involved in both the design and delivery of coproduced services. For example, Boyle and Harris (2009) argue that ‘the key to reforming public services is to encourage users to design and deliver services in equal partnership with professionals’ (2009, p. 3). Approaches to coproduction that specify this need include: enhanced coproduction (Osborne and
Strokosch 2013); complementary coproduction in service design and implementation (Brandsen and Honingh 2016); and full user/professional coproduction (Bovaird 2007). Input into both design and delivery is also possible within approaches such as co-creation and audience-as-artist (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) and co-creative exhibitions (Simon 2010).

The conceptualisation of coproduction in which external parties take on an active and empowered role includes emphasis in management literature on the resource and innovation potential of coproduction (for example den Hertog et al. 2010; Frow et al. 2015; Normann and Ramirez 1993; Ramaswamy and Gouillart 2010; Ramirez 1999). Marketing literature’s recent shift in interest to generic actors and value networks or service ecosystems also assigns roles to external participants that allow them the potential for greater influence on coproduction (Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011; Chen et al. 2012; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016; Gummesson 2006; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Service logic argues that, through interaction, value can be created for stakeholders as well as the provider and customers (Grönroos 2009). Within service logic, Grönroos (2011) gives greater agency to the customer in terms of their influence and control when he acknowledges that value is uniquely and both experientially and contextually perceived and determined by the customer, and that the influence of the provider is limited to facilitating value for the customer. Within public administration literature the stakeholders for public services include users, community groups and third-sector organisations is acknowledged in public administration literature (for example Bovaird 2007; Boyle and Harris 2009; Brandsen and Pestoff 2006; Butcher 2015; Pestoff 2012; Stephens et al. 2008). Museology literature acknowledges that stakeholders involved in collaboration with museums take the form of both community groups and audiences (for example Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011; Herle 2001; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Newman and McLean 2006; Simon 2010).

### 2.4.3 FORMS OF INTERACTION

A coproducitive relationship between a provider and external parties can broadly be distinguished between the external party either receiving or contributing to the services offered by the provider. In a cultural context, this has been described as participating in the arts receptively (attending or spectating) or creatively (making something) (Australia Council for the Arts 2010). Brown and Novak-Leonard (2011) expand on these forms of interaction in their Audience Involvement Spectrum (Figure 3), which demonstrates the influence of curatorial, interpretive and inventive control on the relationship between the provider (cultural organisation) and external parties (audience).
2.4.3.1 RECEPTIVE

According to Brown and Novak-Leonard (2011), if the external party is engaged in a ‘receptive’ manner, their interaction with the provider can be that of ‘spectating’ or ‘enhanced engagement’. They also argue that these two points in their Audience Involvement Spectrum are not truly forms of participatory or coproduction practice, as they do not involve the external party in ‘expressive’ participation. Receptive forms of coproduction generally involve a dyadic relationship between provider and external party, emphasise the external party’s contribution in terms of work and are involuntary. As a result, receptive forms of coproduction align with notions of: consumer coproduction (Osborne and Strokosch 2013); coproduction (Osborne et al. 2016); complementary coproduction in implementation (Brandsen and Honingh 2016); contributory participation (Simon 2010); and user/community delivery of professionally planned services (Bovaird 2007). Receptive forms of coproduction also generally fall within Prahalad and Ramaswamy’s (2004b) firm and consumer (one-to-one) category of coproduction.

### 2.4.3.1.1 SPECTATING

Brown and Novak-Leonard (2011) argue that ‘spectating’ is the most passive point on the Audience Involvement Spectrum, and involves simply receiving an artistic or cultural product. Boorsma’s (2006) identification of the co-creative processes undertaken by arts audiences challenges this view: the processes required to give meaning to an artistic offering and acknowledge its artistic value mean that spectating requires a high level of agency from the external party (Boorsma 2006).
2.4.3.1.2 ENHANCED ENGAGEMENT

‘Enhanced engagement’ has a greater educational role and therefore requires a deeper conceptual engagement with a cultural product than pure spectating. Enhanced engagement is associated with audience development, which has been described as the integration of programming, marketing and education in relation to arts and cultural products (Kawashima 2006; Wiggins 2004). Audience development has also been categorised as approaches designed to broaden, deepen and diversify audiences for the arts (McCarthy and Jinnett 2001). Broadening involves attracting more audience members like those currently attending and encouraging them to explore different art forms, deepening involves enriching their experience of artworks and diversifying involves changing the demographic profile of audiences and attracting traditional non-attenders (McCarthy and Jinnett 2001; Parker 2012).

2.4.3.2 PARTICIPATORY/CREATIVE

When the external party is engaged in a ‘creative’ (Australia Council for the Arts 2010) or ‘participatory’ manner, their relationship with the museum can be that of ‘crowdsourcing’, ‘co-creator’ or ‘audience-as-artist’ (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). Within these approaches to coproduction, the external party becomes ‘expressive’ rather than ‘receptive’ (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) and their relationship with the provider is closer to that of a ‘stakeholder’ who contributes to the development of exhibitions and public programs as part of a supply chain or networked process (Frow et al. 2015; Lusch et al. 2010; Normann and Ramírez 1993; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Prahalad and Ramaswamy’s (2004b) firm and consumer communities (one-to-many) category of coproduction aligns with participatory forms of coproduction.

2.4.3.2.1 CROWDSOURCING

Crowdsourcing forms of coproduction require the external party to become activated in choosing or contributing to the creation of an artistic product, typically curated or produced by professional artists and curators (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). The audience is not yet ‘on stage’ (or ‘on the walls’ in a museum context) but has contributed to the cultural service (museum exhibition and public program). This level of involvement requires greater community involvement in curatorial and interpretive creative control (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). These approaches also fit within the definitions of: contributory participation (Simon 2010); participative coproduction (Osborne and Strokosch 2013); and traditional professional service provision with users and communities involved in planning and design (Bovaird 2007). Crowdsourcing falls within definitions of co-design (Osborne et al. 2016) and coproduction in the design and implementation of core services (Brandsen and Honingh 2016)—but with a level of impact that is wider than on the immediate service user. Community consultation may be part of this approach to coproduction (Arnstein 1969; IAP2 2014).
2.4.3.2 CO-CREATION

Co-creation is the next level within the Audience Involvement Spectrum (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) and is characterised by the external party being directly involved in the creation of the services offered by the provider. This type of coproduction also falls within the definitions of: enhanced coproduction (Osborne and Strokosch 2013); and also co-construction (Osborne et al. 2016); collaborative participation (when involving audiences) and co-creative participation (when involving communities) (Simon 2010); full user/professional coproduction (Bovaird 2007); and coproduction in the design and implementation of core services (Brandsen and Honingh 2016). Gibson and Edwards (2016) add a further distinction in terms of ‘facilitated participation’ (funded cultural programs that aim for betterment) and ‘everyday participation’ (self-initiated cultural activity).

2.4.3.3 AUDIENCE-AS-ARTIST

The most participatory level within the Audience Involvement Spectrum is approaches to coproduction that are referred to as ‘audience-as-artist’ (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). This relationship requires the community to take substantial control of the artistic experience. A professional curator or artist may design the experience, but the outcome depends on the participants. Audience-as-artist approaches to coproduction align with notions of: co-innovation (Osborne et al. 2016); hosting (Simon 2010); and user/community delivery of coplanned or codesigned services (Bovaird 2007). Coproduction in the design and implementation of core services also falls within this category (Brandsen and Honingh 2016).

2.4.4 BENEFICIARIES OF COPRODUCTION

2.4.4.1 PROVIDER

The literature emphasises the provider as a key beneficiary of coproduction delivering increased resources (den Hertog et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2004) and competitive advantage (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). The customer is primarily viewed as a source of operant resources, coproducing the value derived from exchanges with the provider (Arnould et al. 2006). Coproduction also supplies resources to the provider by connecting them to value networks (Lusch et al. 2010; Normann and Ramirez 1993; Ramirez 1999). Public administration literature sees the benefits of coproduction for providers in terms of the increased efficiency and effectiveness of public services such as museums (Bovaird 2007; Boyle and Harris 2009). In terms of public value, coproduction increases the relevance of public services and increases or guarantees the government funding received by public sector organisations (Alford 2011; Moore 1995; Moore and Benington 2011; Scott 2013). Museology literature argues that coproduction not only enables museums to access cultural knowledge and assets held by communities (Lynch and Alberti 2010; Peers and Brown 2003), but also provides a means of facilitating the institutional changes required by new museology (McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993; Vergo 1989a).
2.4.4.2 EXTERNAL PARTY

Inherent in approaches to coproduction across all disciplines is a reorientation of the relationship between the firm and its customers or external parties. The result is a range of coproduction benefits that also result for external parties, and the beneficiaries of coproduction are diverse. Customers and consumers are emphasised as external beneficiaries of coproduction. Customers are identified as the key deciders of value according to service logic (Grönroos 2006) and as essential co-creators of value within S-D logic (Vargo and Lusch 2008). Coproduction is part of a ‘personalisation’ agenda within public administration (Needham 2011) that aims to make public services more accessible while also building the skills and capacity of users (Boyle and Harris 2009; Stephens et al. 2008). Coproduction within museums better acknowledges the diversity and complexity of cultural identity (Boast 2011; Coffee 2008; Lynch 2011; Phillips 2011) in exhibitions and public programs made available to visiting publics.

Stakeholders are also acknowledged as external beneficiaries of coproduction. Within S-D logic, stakeholders are broadly acknowledged in notions of value networks and service ecosystems (Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011; Chen et al. 2012; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016; Gummesson 2006; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Service logic argues that, through interaction, value can be created for stakeholders as well as the provider and customers (Grönroos 2009). Public administration acknowledges coproduction can involve collaboration between government departments, (Boyle and Harris 2009; Christensen and Lægreid 2007) and secure the input of the third sector (agencies and community organisations) (Brandsen and Pestoff 2006). Within museology literature coproduction is recognised as an opportunity to empower communities (Boast 2011; Coffee 2008; Lynch 2011; Phillips 2011).

2.4.4.3 MUTUAL (PROVIDER AND EXTERNAL PARTY)

Coproduction that provides mutual benefits to the provider and external party is highlighted in collaborative approaches to coproduction. When conceptualised in this manner, coproduction enables collaborative advantage in that it results in something that could not have been attained by any of the organisations (or individuals) acting alone (Huxham 2003). Mutuality is also a focus of service logic (Grönroos 2006; Grönroos 2009) and its emphasis on reciprocal interaction between parties. The mutual benefits of approaches to coproduction have been considered in empirical research in marketing literature (Thyne and Hede 2016), management (Anderson and Crocca 1993) and public administration (Alford and Yates 2016; Brudney 1985; Brudney and England 1983).
2.4.4.4 Third Party

Coproduction also provides benefits to third party stakeholders. The critical distinction made here is that these stakeholders are not directly involved in the collaboration or coproduction of the service. Importantly, third party stakeholders are not directly involved in collaborating or participating with the provider in coproduction, but are often consumers or customers. Within marketing theory, the concepts of value initiators and experience-sharing recognize work done by actors who take initiatives to integrate resources for the direct benefit of others (Chen et al. 2012). Value co-creation that occurs between actors and stakeholders operating at meso or macro levels of a service ecosystem (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016) could also enhance the service offerings available to customers at a micro level. Within the public sector, the notion of public value adds to the complexity of who benefits from coproduction. The beneficiaries of public services include not only those in direct receipt of the work of public organizations, but also the public. Moreover, this demonstration to the body politic that public funds have been well-spent vouches for the government and government departments who allocate this funding (Wensley and Moore 2011).

2.4.5 Structure of External Parties

2.4.5.1 Individual

The way in which the external party is structured and organized impacts on the conceptualization of coproduction. Within early public administration literature, Brudney and England (1983) emphasized a distinction between individual and collective forms of coproduction. This distinction continued in Bovaird’s (2007) categorization of coproduction according to differing levels of professional and community involvement. He distinguishes between individual and collective or community involvement in coproduction. When individuals are involved in coproduction, they are identified as either consumers (Arnould 2006; Etgar 2008), customers (Dong 2015; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b), clients (Alford 2009), users (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Evers 2006) or citizens (Loeffler et al. 2008; Whitaker 1980). Despite the distinction between individual and collective coproduction made in public administration theory, marketing and management research tends to emphasize coproduction with individuals. S-D logic (Etgar 2008; Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004), service-logic (Grönroos 2006) and co-creation experience (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b) were all at least initially premised on the notion of exchange between a firm and its consumers or customers.

2.4.5.2 Collective

Coproduction can also involve the provider working with external parties in the form of groups which are either formally or informally organized. These groups are commonly referred to as communities (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Phillips 2003) or co-operatives (Bovaird 2007; Evers 2006). Public administration literature has
considered the impact on coproduction of the way the community is organised or governed. Collective coproduction, in which the external party works as a group, is seen as a more effective means of coproducing. Pestoff notes, ‘only when citizens are engaged in organized collective groups can they achieve any semblance of democratic control over the provision of public financed services’ (2009, p. 218). Brudney and England (1983) note the higher order of coproduction of collectives over individuals. Attention to coproduction with collectives rather than individuals is a more recent development in S-D logic literature. It is acknowledged in the shift to considering co-creation of value that involves actor-to-actor interactions and the operations of a service ecosystem (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Frow et al. 2014; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Collective involvement in coproduction is also identified in terms of the influence of consumer communities (Chen et al. 2012; Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013).

### 2.4.6 TYPES OF RESOURCES THAT ARE EXCHANGED

Underpinning the paradigm shift from goods-dominant to service-dominant logic in marketing literature is a corresponding change in emphasis from operand resources (on which an act is performed to produce an effect) to operant resources (resources that produce effects) (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004). According to management literature, the resources that offer a provider competitive advantage are those that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and without strategically equivalent substitutes (Barney 1991). This literature does not distinguish between operant and operand resources. It is also important to note that the distinction between these two forms of resources is not always clear-cut. Some resources can function simultaneously as operant and operand resources. Examples include cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984), which is an operant resource that can be traded as a good (Peñaloza and Mish 2011), and the engagement of fan communities, which can be leveraged for sponsorship (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013).

#### 2.4.6.1 OPERANT RESOURCES (SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE)

According to S-D logic, service requires the exchange of operant resources in the form of either skills and knowledge (Vargo and Lusch 2004) or imagination, emotions and experience (Arnould et al. 2006). Value is created through the integration of these resources and is obtained through context or use—the notion of value-in-use (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004). Museology literature acknowledges coproduction as a means to access operant resources from communities in the form of their intangible cultural heritage (Davis 2010; Peers and Brown 2003; Witcomb 1998). This recognises that cultural heritage comprises more than just the built environment and objects, and involves traditions or living expressions inherited from ancestors and passed on to descendants. Oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events and traditional craft skills are forms of intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO n.d.). Intangible cultural heritage is therefore a specialised knowledge and skill that forms a cultural operant resource (Arnould 2006; Arnould et al. 2006).

Operant resources are also required from museum audiences in terms of the behaviour required to be engaged and actively participate in the coproduction of their visitor
experience (Minkiewicz et al. 2016). Public administration research emphasises coproduction as an opportunity to access new resources that enable the delivery of more effective and efficient public services (Boyle and Harris 2009; Stephens et al. 2008). While scholars have not specified whether these are operant or operand resources, the type of resources that deal with ‘wicked problems’ in public services are likely to be operant resources in the form of the community’s tacit and ‘sticky knowledge’ (Osborne et al. 2015).

### 2.4.6.2 OPERAND RESOURCES (GOODS AND MATERIALS)

Within marketing’s service logic literature, Grönroos (2006; 2011) argues that operand resources continue to play an important role in the receipt of value-in-use, and that both operand and operant resources are used simultaneously in coproduction. Service logic claims that ‘value is created when products, goods or services are used by customers’ (Grönroos 2006, p. 323). Boorsma’s (2006) strategic logic in arts marketing aligns with service logic in that it requires an audience’s interaction with operand resources in the form of artworks and artefacts. This interaction between operand resources (collections and heritage sites) and operant resources (interpretive and conceptual skills and knowledge) is also demonstrated in Thyne et al.’s (2016) research into coproduction and authenticity in museums.

Operand resources continue to feature in approaches to coproduction that are grounded in exchange notions of value and the use of coproduction to embed greater value in museum offerings in terms of exhibitions and public programs. Lynch and Alberti (2010) observe that artefacts in a museum collection (and equally gaps in the collection) influence community engagement and are the locus for coproduced interpretations of exhibitions and public programs. They report that the selection of artefacts for museum display was a highly contested aspect of museum coproduction with communities and a task that curators were unwilling to relinquish control of. The museum Code of Ethics (ICOM 2013) also emphasises the importance of operand resources, highlighting museum collaboration with communities in terms of the return and restitution of ‘cultural property’—i.e. operand resources in the form of artefacts and collections.

### 2.4.7 RQ1: HOW DOES MUSEUM COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES MANIFEST?

The above discussion highlights the complexity in the conceptualisation of coproduction, along with the lack of clarity around it. Within each of the six themes that are evident in the literature relating to coproduction (notions of value; role filled by external party; form of interaction between provider and external party; beneficiaries of coproduction; structure of external parties; and nature of the resources exchanged through coproduction), scholars have reached diverse—sometimes even contradictory—conclusions about the nature of coproduction. Hence coproduction is the subject of ‘conceptual confusion’ (Brandsen and Honingh 2016, p. 428) and a ‘woolly word’ in public policy (Osborne et al. 2016, p. 40). As a result, research is needed into the dimensions of coproduction and how it should be conceptualised.
(Ostrom et al. 2010). Research Question 1 therefore investigates: **How does museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifest?**

### 2.4.8 DEFINITION OF COPRODUCTION EMPLOYED IN THIS RESEARCH

This research defines museum coproduction as: *joint practice involving museums and communities in the development and delivery of exhibitions and public programs*. The implications of this definition are that it does not assume communities are involved in the consumption of the coproduced offering. Instead, it approaches this from the notion of a value network (Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011), service ecosystem (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016) or collaboration (Golding 2013; Phillips 2003) in which communities and museums work together on the development of exhibitions and public programs for a third party audience. The community is a stakeholder in the endeavour and therefore has an equal and reciprocal relationship with the museum. The community also has the potential to participate in all aspects of the design and development of exhibitions and public programs, and to make significant resource contributions to this work.

The above definition of coproduction is employed by this research because it offers the strongest alignment with the aims of new museology (McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993; Vergo 1989a), as it invests the community with the highest level of power and influence, and therefore requires the greatest level of change in the traditional role of the museum and curators. It is also the approach to coproduction that is most likely to challenge museums and to be resisted or avoided (Ang 2005; Bovaird 2007; Keith 2012; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010; McCall and Gray 2014; Sandell 2003).

### 2.5 DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Coproduction between museums and culturally diverse communities can be seen as both obligatory and discretionary. As Sandell (2003) notes, change in museum practice is not only enabled but also enforced. Obligatory factors that influence coproduction are largely external to museums, for example, professional standards and practice (Bovaird 2007; Brudney 1985) and ethical requirements (Clifford 1997; ICOM 2013; Peers and Brown 2003; Sandell 2007). Enabling issues that support coproduction are largely internal to museums and include, for example, relational skills (Davies 2010; Iglesias et al. 2011) and organisational commitment (Lynch and Alberti 2010; Sharp 1980). Within public sector organisations such as museums, coproduction is internally driven by governance and logistical motivations (Bovaird 2007; Joshi and Moore 2004; Needham 2008), governance drivers being the reduced capacity of government services and issues of public trust, and logistical drivers recognising the complexity of public services and the issues involved in designing and delivering effective services. Because some level of participation from communities is required, coproduction is further influenced by the capacity and motivation of the communities involved (Jakobsen and Andersen 2013; Kalaiiginanam and Varadarajan 2006). Therefore a range of factors drive or inhibit coproduction in museums. These influences are present.
within the external environment, internal to the institution or come from the community.

Table 5 outlines the influences that drive or inhibit museum coproduction and summarises the literature in which they are examined. In many instances the factors listed function interchangeably as drivers and inhibitors. For example, government funding is an external influence that drives coproduction by resourcing museums to undertake this type of work (Sandell 2003). Government funding also inhibits coproduction by encouraging opportunistic behaviour that prevents organisational commitment to coproduction (Lynch 2010). The distinction between drivers and inhibitors is not always apparent in the factors that influence coproduction in museums.

### Table 5: Drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Scope of issue</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External drivers/inhibitors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Scope of issue</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional drivers/inhibitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Scope of issue</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills, ability to act as institutional entrepreneurs and dynamic capabilities</td>
<td>(Lusch et al. 2010) (Battilana and Leca 2009) (den Hertog et al. 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Visser and Togt 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community drivers/inhibitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Museums are compelled to coproduce with communities for political reasons, resulting from their being public sector organisations in receipt of public funding and support</td>
<td>(Durrer and Miles, 2009), (Mason, 2004), (Sandell, 1998), (Sandell, 2002), (Sandell, 2003), (Tlili, 2008), (Tlili et al., 2007) (ICOM 2013) (Gray 2008b; Gray 2016) (Bennett 2005) (Hooper-Greenhill et al. 2000) (Johanson et al. 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.1 EXTERNAL DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

2.5.1.1 ETHICS AND RESPECT

Coproduction in museums responds to external demands for museums to behave ethically and with respect for culturally diverse communities. This driver of museum coproduction is highlighted in the Code of Ethics and the requirement that ‘museums work in close collaboration with the communities from which their collections originate as those they serve’ (ICOM 2013, p. 10). This ethical principle identifies the need for museums to acknowledge the origin of their collections and respect the communities they serve. Phillips (2003) notes a second ethical strand in the shift to collaborative museum practice, citing the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human
Rights (United Nations n.d.) and the protection of traditional indigenous knowledge noted under article 22. The emphasis on ethical practice and demonstration of respect to communities is influenced by postcolonial critique of museums (Bennett 2004; Boast 2011; Crowley and Matthews 2006) and aligns with the change in museum function called for by new museology (McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993; Vergo 1989a). Given the professional, academic training of museum curators and their role as intellectuals (Bauman 1987), it is a critique that resonates within museums.

2.5.1.2 GOVERNMENT POLICY AND FUNDING

One mechanism through which mandated government demands for museum coproduction are realised is funding. Scholars are divided on whether this funding drives or inhibits coproduction within a museum. Sandell (2003) supports programs that fund small-scale pilot projects, arguing they have enabled incremental change in the ways museums work. Lynch (2011) is critical of these programs, arguing they encourage opportunistic behaviour rather than organisational commitment to coproduction. Her evaluation found that the funding environment in which museums operate reduces their organisational capacity for coproduction, as it: limits the opportunity for reflective practice; establishes a competitive environment which rewards success rather than risk-taking; and creates project delivery pressures which compromise the effective delivery of coproduced initiatives. Gray (2016) argues museums exercise agency through the way they respond to external government policy.

Instrumental government policy also has the potential to drive coproduction in museums. Coproduction is an opportunity for museums to meet government requirements in relation to cultural democratisation and emancipation (Ang 2005). Most recently this has been demonstrated in the UK through New Labour’s social inclusion agenda, resulting in a range of government policy and funding requirements for museums to work with socially excluded communities (Coffee 2008; Newman and McLean 2006; Tlili 2008; West and Smith 2005). The political imperatives relating to access and social inclusion have strong links to the aims of new museology, requiring museums to ‘become more representative in their collections and to think differently about the ways material cultures are displayed in order to upset and challenge the hierarchical discourses of power that have traditionally shaped museum exhibitions’ (Gibson 2008, p. 254).

The instrumental use of cultural policy is seen to compromise the value of the arts per se. Gray (2002) describes this situation as ‘policy attachment’—the use of arts to achieve non-arts goals. Belfiore (2002) queries the evidence leading to the claims of the social impact of the arts, while Holden (2006) identifies government reliance on the reporting of audience size and profile for the emphasis placed on instrumental outcomes. Alternatively Gibson (2008) questions the instrumental/intrinsic dichotomy scholars have applied to cultural policy, using museum education to highlight the lack of consistency in this critique. She also identifies the long history of instrumentalism in cultural policy (Gibson 2008).
In an Australian context, museum coproduction is likely to be part of a shift to cultural planning which has seen government increasingly responsible for the delivery of arts programs, but framed within a loosely defined and all-encompassing notion of culture rather than arts practice (Stevenson 2005). Stevenson (2005) suggests that, particularly within a local government setting, this cultural work is likely to be aligned with equally marginalised community development priorities. While instrumental policy bolsters the capacity of museums to deliver public value, policy attachment is evidence of the low status of the arts within government and undermines their value per se (Gray 2002; Holden 2006).

2.5.1.3 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND STANDARDS

The conventions associated with established forms of professional practice are an external influence that can drive or inhibit coproduction in museums. This factor manifests through notions of professional standards, curatorial authority and museum expertise. Maintaining professional autonomy and adhering to professional standards or conventions compromise the capacity of professionals to coproduce, not only in museums (Davies 2010; Lynch 2011; Minkiewicz et al. 2016) but also in other public sector organisations (Bovaird 2007; Brudney 1985) and the commercial sector (Anderson and Crocca 1993; Von Hippel 2005).

Coproduction involves a new set of professional skills and capabilities (Anderson and Crocca 1993; Bovaird 2007). It therefore requires professionals to deviate from conventions in professional practice that are the result of institutional logics or templates (Battilana et al. 2009; DiMaggio and Powell 1983) or path dependency in which an established sequence of events comes to constitute a self-reinforcing process (Garud and Karnøe 2013). Davies (2010) notes the impact of the attitude of museum staff and their fear that coproduction will diminish the museum through loss of control of curatorial voice. Minkiewicz et al. (2016) found that a commitment to curatorial excellence contradicted marketing practice and orientation towards consumers. Professional reluctance to share ‘turf’ with volunteers (Davies 2010; Sharp 1980), fear of interference or the loss of professional autonomy (Brudney 1985; Sharp 1980) and professional disenfranchisement (Anderson and Crocca 1993) are major impediments to coproduction.

Alternatively, there is evidence that professional practice may enable coproduction in museums. Sandell (2003) identifies exposure to the ideas and agendas of other museums and cultural institutions—as well as other sectors that have tackled similar issues—as a potential driver of coproduction. Similarly, Sharp (1980) notes that coproduction requires promotion and dissemination of shared learning through professional networks.
2.5.1.4 PROFESSIONAL BODIES

Scholars have suggested that the museum sector as a whole needs training and guidance in order to coproduce. Sandell (2003) identifies the need for advocacy that promotes the value of partnerships with museums to other agencies, as well as professional guidance on best practice and training. Lynch (2011) suggests that a lack of openness in the museum profession (influenced by the competitive nature of museum funding) inhibits change and organisational learning in relation to coproduction. Therefore the shift to coproduction needs to be addressed not only at an organisational level, but also across the museum sector at a field level.

Museum professional bodies play a key role in shaping attitudes and behaviour at a field level through programs such as professional standards, accreditation, professional development, awards and recognition, and reporting in professional journals. Being positioned within the museum sector but outside the industry per se, professional bodies can influence or constrain the organisations within their sector (DiMaggio 1991). This places professional bodies in the role of ‘behind the scenes ringmaster’ rather than ‘centre stage musclemen’ (Lefsrud and Suddaby 2012, 322).

Moreover, museum professional bodies offer a site for the study of administrative professionalism, a form of professional activity that is unique to the public sector, as it is a less competitive environment in which inter-organisational contact is seen as coordination rather than collusion (DiMaggio 1991). Greenwood et al. (2002) identify the role played by professional associations in enabling the adoption of innovations at a field level through the process of ‘theorisation’—a means by which changes such as those required by coproduction are presented, debated and then potentially endorsed.

2.5.2 INSTITUTIONAL DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

2.5.2.1 EVALUATION AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Organisational learning is argued to be an internal factor likely to drive or inhibit coproduction in museums. Lynch (2011) emphasises evaluation and reflective practice as key influences on museum coproduction, identifying organisational reflexivity and dialectic practice as essential for ongoing organisational commitment to coproduction. Similarly, Sandell (2003) sees evaluation and research as drivers of community engagement within museums, while Sharp (1980) suggests the promotion and dissemination of shared learning are drivers of coproduction. The assumption underpinning this argument is that museums which coproduce then undergo an organisational change due to the explicit and tacit knowledge that has been gained though the experience (Argote and Miron-Spektor 2011).

Learning in the form of evaluation and reflection is also a manifestation of an organisation’s dynamic innovation capability in terms of the ability to evaluate work and performance and then identify either new ways of working or modifications to existing services and processes (Ambrosini and Bowman 2009; Teece et al. 1997). In
fact, den Hertog et al. (2010) suggest learning may even form an underpinning requirement of service innovation, an idea reinforced in marketing literature as part of the value-creating processes that occur within a service ecosystem (Greer et al. 2016; Lusch et al. 2010; Payne et al. 2008). Organisational learning is highlighted in Webb et al.’s (2011) study of the links between marketing and entrepreneurship, with learning required not only to identify an organisation’s failure to meet customer needs but also to address the issue or identify opportunities to exploit new resources. Huxham and Hibbert (2008) identify four types of learning that may occur during collaborative processes: sidelining (learning from or with partners is not important); selfish (we take from you without giving to you); sharing–exchanging (we take from you and we give to you; you take from us and give to us); and sharing–exploring (we learn together to create knowledge).

2.5.2.2 INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The framing of coproduction within the vision of new museology highlights the extent to which this form of work presents a departure from traditional museum practice. Scholars acknowledge that coproduction with culturally diverse communities requires a change in the way museums function and the role they play in our society (for example Keith 2012; Pollock 2007; Rosenberg 2011; Ross 2004; Stam 1993). At the heart of this work is the need for change and innovation in the way museums operate and are managed (Sandell 2003). The organisation’s capacity for innovation and entrepreneurship therefore drives or inhibits coproduction in museums.

Institutional entrepreneurs are drivers of innovation and therefore have the capacity to enable coproduction in museums. These are actors (either individuals or organisations) that mobilise resources to transform existing institutions or create new ones (Battilana and Leca 2009, p. 260). These roles may be cultural intermediaries (see 4.5.2.4.2) (Bourdieu 1984; Crabbe 2007; Durrer and Miles 2009; Kurin 1997) or mediators (Agostino et al. 2013). They are filled by individuals who have agency although embedded within institutional logics (Agostino et al. 2013). The collective equivalent of cultural intermediaries and mediators are the proto-institutions (Lawrence, Hardby, and Phillips 2002 cited by Davies 2010) identified in examples of long-term, successful coproduction relationships in museums.

Battilana and Leca (2009) suggest institutional entrepreneurs justify their institutional change projects by appealing to the particular values embedded in their fields of activity. Framing the shift to coproduction within the theory of new museology is possibly a means to achieve this value alignment within museums. Other indicators of the capacity to act as institutional entrepreneurs include a lack of resources and position in the field—with organisations and individuals on the periphery, or of a lower status, being most likely to perform an institutional entrepreneurial role (Battilana et al. 2009). These two indicators have interesting parallels to Davies’ (2010) finding that small and volunteer-run museums display the greatest capacity and interest in coproduction. Two final conditions required for institutional entrepreneurs are processes for legitimising change by overcoming resistance and diffusing the project and, in the case of organisations that act as institutional entrepreneurs, the need for
multiple departments or sections to be involved in addition to top managers (Battilana and Leca 2009).

The innovative and entrepreneurial nature of coproduction is also acknowledged within a DCV of service innovation. DCV is an extension to the RBV of organisational competitive strategy, which views competitive advantage in terms of resources defined as ‘an asset or input into production (either tangible or intangible) that an organisation owns, controls or has access to on a semi-permanent basis’ (den Hertog et al. 2010, p. 496). Organisations gain strategic value and competitive advantage from resources which are simultaneously valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and imperfectly substitutable (Barney 1991; Newbert 2008). Dynamic capabilities are also seen to underpin the functioning of a service ecosystem (Greer et al. 2016). In the context of museum coproduction, culturally diverse communities provide resources to museums that are available on a semi-permanent basis through relationships between the two parties. RBV also acknowledges that museums must be able to harness and use these resources effectively in order to achieve their benefit—access to resources is not enough on its own (Newbert 2008).

Dynamic capabilities are those that allow an organisation to access and make use of these resources, and are dynamic in the sense that organisations can alter their capabilities as the environment changes and when currently useful capabilities become obsolete (Douglas et al. 2012). In other words, they are evidence of an organisation’s capacity to create, renew or alter its resource mix as environments change (Ambrosini and Bowman 2009; Greer et al. 2016). These dynamic capabilities are linked to service innovation (Camarero and Garrido 2012; den Hertog et al. 2010; Frow et al. 2015; Matthing et al. 2004; Webb et al. 2011) and likely to be evident in museums that coproduce.

Den Hertog et al. (2010) emphasise the link between RBV/DCV and coproduction through the inclusion of ‘coproducing and orchestrating’ as one of their six dynamic service innovation capabilities. Drawing on supply chain or supply network theory (Normann and Ramírez 1993; Ramirez 1999), they note ‘the core service provider has to co-design and co-produce a service innovation with other suppliers and manage the accompanying alliance’(2010, p. 502). The capabilities required for coproducing within a DCV are: ability to engage in alliances/networks and manage coalitions; capacity to organise and act in open service innovation systems; understanding of the value network; and identification of orchestration of a service system as a dynamic capability (den Hertog et al. 2010). Trust, social capital and a commitment to knowledge development are critical aspects of alliances that enable these strategic advantages (Suseno and Ratten 2007). While originally developed within a commercial context, there is evidence that RBV and DCV models of organisations and performance are also relevant in public sector organisations such as museums, where the goal is ‘not competitive advantage for the elite, but a maximisation of performance for all’ (Douglas et al. 2012, p. 22). Douglas et al.’s (2012) study of the applicability of RBV and DCV within the public sector found that capabilities which draw on intangible organisational assets are critical for high performance. From interviews with senior public sector managers, leadership, culture, management learning and
positional assets were identified as being critical for performance (Douglas et al. 2012).

2.5.2.3 ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND LEADERSHIP

Organisational support is highlighted by a number of researchers as a factor that drives or inhibits coproduction in museums. Museums are likely to coproduce when it is a strategic priority for the organisation, organisational resources are committed to coproduction and there is a commitment to coproduction from leadership (Huxham 2003; Lynch 2010; Lynch 2011; Sandell 2003; Sharp 1980). Lynch (2011) suggests the drivers of museum coproduction include an organisation-wide commitment expressed in clearly articulated aims documented in internal strategies. Davies observes that coproduction is most successful in museums where the business or operation model has evolved to a ‘mission which is responsive to a multicultural and postmodern world where historical truth is elusive and subjective’ (Davies 2010, p. 315). Strategic and policy support for coproduction can appear not only in the form of formal strategy, but also through emergent or autonomous strategic commitments (Barney 1991).

The implementation of coproduction requires resourcing and organisation-wide commitment to this type of practice. A major inhibitor of coproduction is therefore not viewing this activity as core museum work. Lynch (2011) is particularly critical of the lack of embeddness of coproduction, arguing it is only undertaken by museums in response to opportunistic short-term project funding. McCall and Gray (McCall and Gray 2014) note short-term funding as a barrier to the implementation of new museology in general. Sandell (2003) identifies the need for coproduction to be given equal importance to traditional museum functions such as collecting and research. Tlili et al. (2007) describe coproduction as requiring a shift from professional norms which are internally focused and see the museum as good because of its collections.

Minkiewicz et al. (2016) emphasise the need for risk-taking leadership in relation to coproduction. Similarly, Ambrosini and Bowman (2009) emphasise the role managers play in building the dynamic capabilities of an organisation. Coproduction in museums is therefore likely to be driven by leadership that garners and embeds organisation-wide support for a new and innovative form of museum practice. Two leadership approaches which are likely to drive coproduction are empowering leadership styles, which influence employees by encouraging self-directed action to anticipate or initiate workplace changes (Martin et al. 2013), and visionary leadership, which motivates staff and shapes organisational practice (Taylor et al. 2014). While coproduction requires committed, top-down leadership, it is also important to resource and support coproduction at the level of museum workers. Sharp (1980) emphasises the investment of time and resources to communicate the meaning and importance of coproduction to street-level bureaucrats who will be asked to work with it. Coordination of the organisational requirements of coproduction is seen to be another critical factor in its achievement (Anderson and Crocca 1993; Brudney and England 1983).
2.5.2.4 RELATIONAL CAPABILITIES

Museums require complex relational skills to coproduce. These skills are needed to form effective working relationships with communities and to develop trust and commitment. The coproducive relationship between the museum and the community provides the means through which the museum can access operant resources (skills and knowledge) from the community. The museum’s access to these resources therefore depends on the effectiveness of its relationship with the community (Pérez-Nordtvedt et al. 2008) or actors within the service ecosystem (Greer et al. 2016). The relational capabilities required for coproduction include: establishment of coproducive relationships (Davies 2010; Evers 2006; Iglesias et al. 2011; Lusch et al. 2010; Sharp 1980); building credible commitment (Davies 2010; Ostrom 1996); incentives to coproduce or unique value propositions (Davies 2010; Greer et al. 2016; Iglesias et al. 2011; Ostrom 1996); shared values or value congruence (Brudney 1985; Greer et al. 2016; Lynch 2011); identification of suitable parties (Davies 2010; Pérez-Nordtvedt et al. 2008); trust and communication (Davies 2010; Evers 2006; Iglesias et al. 2011; Lynch 2011; Pérez-Nordtvedt et al. 2008; Suseno and Ratten 2007); diversity within the museum workforce (Davies 2010; Sandell 2003); and ability to deal with conflict, disagreement and differences of opinion (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Greer et al. 2016; Lee 2007; Lynch 2011). Bovaird identifies that professionals working in the public sector generally lack the skills required to work closely with users and communities, suggesting coproduction requires a new type of public service professional who can ‘overcome the reluctance of many professionals to share power with users and their communities and who can act internally in organisations (and in partnerships) to broker new roles for coproduction’ (2007, p. 858).

Poor relational skills, conversely, reveal the ‘dark side’ of collaboration. When museums do not have the skills required to develop strong and effective relationships with communities, the result is inability to accommodate disagreement and dispute, or to deal with the consequences of service failure (Heidenreich et al. 2015). Mechanisms through which coproduction is blocked, limited or manipulated by museums undermine the relationship between the museum and the community, and the effectiveness of coproduction. While Ostrom (1996) highlights that coproduction requires the community to be empowered and able to influence the process and outcome of coproduction, Brudney (1985) observes the tendency for control and the design of coproducive processes to remain with the service bureaucracy. A common barrier to coproduction is the attitude of museum staff and their fear that coproduction will diminish the museum through a loss of control over curatorial voice and the museum’s social authority (Davies 2010; Minkiewicz et al. 2016; Newman and McLean 2006). Huxham has coined the phrase ‘collaborative thuggery’ to describe the playing of politics and manipulating of agendas that result in ‘collaborative inertia’ (2003). Conflict is therefore an inhibitor of coproduction in museums, which can manifest in any of Gelfand et al.’s (2008) four types of conflict cultures: dominating (which they describe as active and disagreeable); collaborative (active and agreeable); avoidance (passive and agreeable); and passive-aggressive conflict cultures (passive and disagreeable).
2.5.2.5 CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES/CULTURAL BROKERS

Coproduction in museums can be driven by individuals who take the lead and initiate this type of museum practice. These individuals fill the role of cultural intermediaries (Bourdieu 1984; Crabbe 2007; Durrer and Miles 2009; Featherstone 1991; Newman and McLean 2006) or cultural brokers (Kurin 1997). The term ‘cultural intermediary’ was coined by Bourdieu (1984) and more recently has been used to describe individuals who form a ‘bridge’ between the arts, cultural organisations and communities. For example, the term has been applied to arts administrators working in social inclusion, access and outreach roles (Crabbe 2007; Durrer and Miles 2009; Newman and McLean 2006). Kurin observes that cultural brokers:

coordinate horizontally in webs of relationships, rather than vertically and hierarchically through chains of command. For cultural brokers, cultural representations do not just happen, nor are they commanded to happen. They are negotiated and emergent, the result of strong knowledge, respect, a bedrock of good practice, and a lot of luck. (1997, p. 23)

A similar role is filled by Brudney’s (1985) notion of ‘neighbourhood organisers’, who resource the capacity of lower income communities to be involved in coproduction. Intermediaries have also been identified in marketing literature in relation to mutual exchange endeavours (Oliver 2006) and the facilitation of value networks (Lusch et al. 2010).

Existing literature indicates that cultural intermediaries drive coproduction due to their interpersonal skills. Durrer and Miles’ (2009) narrative research with staff from galleries and arts centres in Liverpool, UK, observes that cultural intermediaries have empathy with the excluded, as well as highly developed relationship-building skills. Crabbe’s (2007) study of cultural intermediaries in social inclusion sports programs characterises this work as voluntary and informal, founded on trust and understanding—their role being to build relationships through dynamic engagement that takes account of individual circumstances.

Cultural intermediaries also drive coproduction through their capacity to function as institutional entrepreneurs (Battilana and Leca 2009) and through the dynamic capabilities they bring to service innovation (den Hertog et al. 2010). Cultural brokers have unique interpersonal skills that are valuable resources and they use these skills to initiate new and innovative forms of museum practice. For example, they have the potential to initiate broader organisational learning in relation to coproduction through their individual experience in collaboration and community engagement (Visser and Togt 2016). They are also able to secure both internal and external social capital (Suseno and Ratten 2007).
2.5.3 COMMUNITY-BASED DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS

2.5.3.1 POLITICAL

The political drivers of coproduction result from the fact that museums are public sector organisations in receipt of government funding. The political need for museums to coproduce is identified in the museum Code of Ethics (ICOM 2013) and the requirement that they work in close collaboration with the communities they serve. These are the communities to which museums provide access and civic value in their role as public cultural institutions (Bennett 1995; Sandell 2007).

Scholars argue that political drivers pay more attention to the instrumental value of museums than their intrinsic offerings. As Gray (2016) highlights, museums have become the interest of non-museum policy sectors, rather than the reverse. The instrumental value of museums is emphasised in literature relating to the service museums provide to communities (Gibson 2008; Gray 2008b). The historical role of museums as vehicles for social change and individual improvement has been well documented (for example Bennett 2005; Gibson 2008; Mason 2004; Sandell 1998). More recently, scholars have examined museums as institutions able to address the mechanisms of social exclusion and to implement social inclusion policies (Durrer and Miles 2009; Mason 2004; Sandell 1998; Sandell 2002; Sandell 2003; Tlili 2008; Tlili et al. 2007).

The social inclusion role filled by museums has particular value for work with culturally diverse communities. Within Australia (and also internationally) there is a strong link between social exclusion and cultural background. People in families headed by migrants from non-English-speaking countries have higher rates of poverty than those headed by people born in Australia or other English-speaking countries (Lloyd et al. 2004). There is also evidence of links between cultural diversity/social exclusion and participation in the arts and culture more broadly. Research conducted for the Australia Council for the Arts (Australia Council for the Arts 2010) found those born overseas in a non-English-speaking country have significantly lower levels of both creative and receptive arts participation compared to the total Australian population.

The notion of serving communities has a particularly strong resonance in museums run by local government. Scholars suggest local museums’ proximity to communities emphasises their need to be responsive to local residents, ratepayers and elected members. This responsiveness is due to the need for museums to be relevant and accessible, while providing distinctive cultural offerings that are valued by users (Hooper-Greenhill et al. 2000; Johanson et al. 2014; Tlili et al. 2007). Within this context the notion of ‘constituent’ communities arguably has greatest resonance.
2.5.3.2 CULTURAL

The cultural drivers for museums to coproduce with communities acknowledge the specialist cultural resources held within these communities. These resources are largely operant resources (such as intangible cultural heritage), but include operand resources such as artefacts and collection material (Iervolino 2013; Varutti 2013). The operant nature of intangible cultural heritage is highlighted by UNESCO, which suggests, ‘the importance of intangible cultural heritage is not the cultural manifestation itself but rather the wealth of knowledge and skills that is transmitted through it from one generation to the next’ (n.d.). Intangible cultural heritage is inherently rooted in a community context, as communities are essential to the acknowledgement, practice, maintenance and transmission of a culture.

It is for this reason the Code of Ethics identifies the need for museums to work in close collaboration with the communities from which their collections ‘originate’ (ICOM 2013). These are also referred to as source communities, defined by Peers and Brown as:

groups in the past when artefacts were collected, as well as to their descendants today. These terms have most often been used to refer to indigenous peoples in the Americas and the Pacific, but apply to every cultural group from whom museums have collected … Most importantly, the concept recognises that artefacts play an important role in the identities of source community members, that source communities have legitimate moral and cultural stakes or forms of ownership of museum collections, and that they have special claims, needs or rights of access to material heritage held by museums. (2003, p. 2)

Source communities can be distant from the museum, as in the case of Torres Strait Islander communities whose cultural heritage is housed at the University of Cambridge (Herle 2001). They can also be close to museums, as in African diaspora communities now living close to the UK museums that marked the bicentenary of the 1807 Abolition of the Slave Trade Act (Lynch and Alberti 2010). Moreover, contemporary collecting of cultural material results in the creation of local source communities (Ang 2005; Lynch and Alberti 2010).

Indigenous communities and their right to self-determination have challenged the contemporary role of museums. Postcolonial theory is particularly critical of the way museums have traditionally worked with indigenous cultures and communities (Bennett 2004; Boast 2011; Nicks 2003; Phillips 2011). The result of this critique is a new emphasis on the representation of social relationships in museum (for example Clifford 1997; Kreps 2003; Nicks 2003), which the use of coproduction can assist (Heywood 2008; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010).
2.5.3.3 CAPACITY

Coproduction may be driven by communities who expect or demand to collaborate with museums (for example Kahn 2000; Mason 2004; Phillips 2011). Bovaird contends the capacity of a community to coproduce is not a given, and is compromised by the economic, political and social rights that underpin citizenship (2007, p. 855). Therefore the capacity of a community may also inhibit coproduction in museums.

Scholars have examined the impact of access and equity on coproduction (for example Brudney 1984; Warren et al. 1984; Whitaker 1980). Brudney (1985) identifies challenges associated with the implementation of coproduction as: the different levels of agency with which citizens contribute resources and ways in which their participation can be encouraged or supported; the demands joint service delivery places on communities; the additional challenges of implementing coproduction within lower socio-economic communities; and the risk of co-optation, particularly where service deliverers and service receivers have dissimilar values. Jakobsen and Andersen (2013) investigated the extent to which citizens from disadvantaged backgrounds were restricted in their capacity to coproduce due to limited knowledge about coproduction (particularly how to coproduce and the importance of their input), as well as by a lack of materials and resources. Ang (2005) highlights that the more marginalised a community, the more difficult it will be to engage it in coproduction. Ratten and Welpe (2011) discuss community-based entrepreneurship, noting the impact social and cultural background have on opportunities for entrepreneurs. Marketing literature has identified the impact that customer assets and resources (Etgar 2008) and idiosyncrasies (Kalaigiananam and Varadarajan 2006) have on coproduction.

Recent attention to museums and social exclusion has also questioned the capacity of communities to coproduce. Evers (2006) suggests the social capital debate favours direct and practical forms of participation. Etgar (2008) argues the capacity of a community to coproduce is influenced by issues such as their discretionary time, skills and expertise, interpersonal skills and access to computers and ICT. Within the cultural sector, the notions of cultural repertoire (Coffee 2008) and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984)—which shape an individual’s social attitudes towards museums—are potential inhibitors of museum coproduction (Tlili et al. 2007). The same factors that result in museums contributing to processes of social exclusion are likely to inhibit coproduction. The impact of these issues may be mitigated through a processes of culturalisation (Coffee 2008) or organisational socialisation (Kelley et al. 1990), whereby the community is supported to fulfil the role of a partial employee (Kelley et al. 1990). Increasing the agency of individuals and raising their capacity to contribute to cultural programs as ‘self-governing’ subjects has been described as a feature of ‘advanced liberalism’ (Rose 1996 quoted in Gibson and Edwards 2016), and a hallmark of cutting edge cultural practice (Gibson and Edwards 2016). While community capacity may inhibit coproduction in museums, steps can be taken to build community capacity with the aim of increasing participation in coproduction.
The above review of literature relating to the drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums highlights the complex environment in which this form of museum practice is developed and implemented. Coproduction is influenced not only by factors in the museum’s internal and external environments, but also by issues inherent to the communities involved. In addition, many of the factors that influence museum coproduction appear to have an equal capacity to act as drivers or inhibitors of this work.

From this literature review it is apparent that existing research is unable to ‘specify the potential intricacy, complexity, or difficulty that is involved with dialogue, interactivity, and collaboration with consumers’ (Fisher and Smith 2011, pp 326). An understanding of the management of coproduction remains a gap in service science literature (Ostrom et al. 2010), as does governance in value networks (Lusch et al. 2010). Public administration and museology theory provide some initial insights into the complexity involved in the management of coproduction. Public administration research has begun to reveal the complexity of coproduction, with Bovaird (2007) noting resistance from professionals who fear its impact on their professional status, and undermine community input and lack the skills required to coproduce. In museology literature, Lynch observes that museum coproduction which involves ‘real engagement … faces hitherto unseen obstacles that inevitably result in the dissatisfaction of both staff members and community partners’ (Lynch 2010, p. 20). As a result, she highlights the need for research into the organisational change required by coproduction (Lynch 2010).

As a result of this review, Research Question 2 emerges: What drives and inhibits coproduction with culturally diverse communities in museums?

2.6 IMPACT OF COPRODUCTION ON MUSEUMS

Existing literature distinguishes between the process of coproduction and the outcomes of this work (Alford 2009; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Voorberg et al. 2014). The same distinction has been observed in relation to cultural planning (Stevenson 2005). The emphasis in existing scholarship is on the process involved in coproduction. Phillips notes in relation to the development of collaborative exhibitions a ‘shift in emphasis from product to process’ (2009, p. 158). Similarly, Mason’s (2004) study of socially inclusive museums suggests future research should focus on processes of interaction and possible experiences, rather than on specific outcomes. In marketing literature, Payne et al. (2008) acknowledge the centrality of process within the co-creation of value. Alternatively, Boyle and Harris (2009) argue that prioritising process rather than outcomes has contributed to the current crisis in public services (2009).

There is also evidence to suggest the process of museum coproduction is disconnected from its outcomes. Lynch and Alberti’s examination of museum and community coproduction for the Myths about Race exhibition at Manchester Museum highlights
this disconnection, noting that while the project was ‘effective in engaging visitors, here we reflect upon the problematic aspects of the process. In the (distasteful) medical maxim, “the operation was a success but the patient died”—here the product survived despite a defective process’ (Lynch and Alberti 2010, p. 16). Their conclusion is that museums control and manipulate the outcomes of coproduction and as a result coproduced exhibitions are not affected by poor process.

Table 6: Impact of coproduction on process and outcomes of museum work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coproduction construct</th>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/ manufacturing processes</td>
<td>Coproduction affects museum processes in terms of the ways exhibitions and public programs are developed or manufactured</td>
<td>(Etgar 2008) (Davies 2010; Davies 2011) (Brudney 1985) (Pestoff 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.6.1 IMPACT OF COPRODUCTION ON PROCESS OF MUSEUM WORK

2.6.1.1 EXPERIENTIAL DESIGN

One field of investigation into coproduction processes considers the design of experiential experiences and interactions between the coproducing parties. This area of research is largely grounded in experiential or relational notions of value (see section 2.4.1.2). In marketing literature, this area of research is often aligned with S-D logic and notions of value-in-use, in which the external party is also a consumer and so involved in the consumption of the service (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004). The alternative marketing framing for this investigation is service logic, which assumes the firm (museum) is a facilitator of value and therefore able to directly and actively influence its customers’ value creation (Grönroos 2011). In museology, the design of experiential experiences is generally classed as participation (Simon 2010), engagement (Herguner 2015) or audience development (Mc Carthy and Jinnett 2001; Parker 2012).

While marketing literature relating to experiential design is largely conceptual, examples of empirical research include Echeverri and Skålén’s (2011) observation that value co-creation (and co-destruction) involves five interaction value practices—informing, greeting, delivering, charging and helping. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004b) model their approach to coproduction on the principles of DART: Dialogue; Access; Risk assessment; and Transparency. Payne et al.’s (2008) model of co-creation sees the encounter process involving co-creation opportunities, planning, implementation and metrics managed by the provider, combined with a consumer processes informed by emotion, cognition and behaviour. Frow et al. (2015) propose a co-creation design framework (in which coproduction is one co-creation form) that
address five dimensions: co-creation motive; co-creation form; engaging actor; engagement platform; level of engagement; and duration of engagement.

Marketing literature includes empirical research specific to the design of experiential museum services. Thyne and Hede (2016) investigated coproduction and authenticity in house museums, concluding that through the use of artefacts and storytelling, audiences work with the museum to coproduce an experience that draws on their skills, knowledge and previous experience. Audiences were supported and motivated by the museum to manage dissonance and develop mindfulness in order to fully engage with museum experiences (Thyne and Hede 2016). Minkiewicz et al. (2016) found museum coproduction aligns with the coproduction practices proposed by Ramaswamy and colleagues (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b; Ramaswamy and Gouillart 2010). The experiential design of museum services therefore requires consumers to take on active roles (active participation); engaging cognitively and emotionally (engaging consumers in co-production); and direct interaction and support to personalise experiences (supporting consumer coproduction) (Minkiewicz et al. 2016). White et al. (2009) identify that relational value in the arts is the result of a triadic relationship involving the audience, arts organisation and artists.

Coproduction processes relating to experiential design have also been the subject of extensive scholarship within museology—although, as noted above, experiential museum design is conceptualised as participation, engagement or audience development rather than coproduction. This body of research addresses experiential design that aims for pedagogical or cognitive outcomes. Examples of scholarship relating to pedagogically driven experiential design include Langworthy et al.’s (2015) study of informal learning by policymakers in science museums, Marandino’s (2016) examination of pedagogical discourse in science museums and Gul and Akmehmet’s (2015) study of informal learning in interactive spaces in art museums. Scholarship relating to cognitive experiential design is demonstrated in Baker et al.’s (2016) study of the use of storytelling and narrative in contemporary music exhibitions, Francis’s (2015) study of the use of narrative discourse by the British Museum and Lanz’s (2016) study of exhibition design practices for presenting the topic of migration.

2.6.1.2 PRODUCTION PROCESSES

The processes involved in coproduction have been investigated in terms of their parallels to traditional production and manufacturing processes. For example, Etgar (2008) models coproduction according to a five-stage development process: development of antecedent conditions; development of motivations; calculation of co-production costs; activation; and generation of outputs and evaluation of results. Frow et al. (2015; 2011) propose a typography that categorises co-creation (distinct from coproduction) according to the input of external actors’ production activities, resulting in twelve categories: co-conception of ideas; co-design; co-production; co-promotion; co-pricing; co-distribution; co-consumption; co-maintenance; co-outsourcing; co-disposal; co-experience; and co-meaning creation. Similarly, Davies (2010; 2011) examines museum coproduction according to the constituent processes of producing a
museum exhibition (initial idea, management and administration, design and production, understanding the audience, associated program, curation).

Etgar’s (2008) examination of the antecedent conditions and motivations required for coproduction (his stages one and two respectively) are closely aligned with the drivers and inhibitors of coproduction identified in this literature review (section 2.5). The calculation of coproduction costs is stage three within Etgar’s (2008) process. The cost implications of coproduction are also highlighted in public administration literature (Brudney 1985; Pestoff 2009). The calculation of costs relates to the time and resources museums need to allocate to coproduction (Davies 2010). Activation (stage 4) involves consumption, distribution/logistics, assembly, manufacturing/construction, design and initiating. A key implication of coproduction at this stage is the integration of consumers and non-consumer partners in coproduction (Etgar 2008), which raises issues relating to the technical and functional quality of consumers’ work. The fifth and final stage is evaluation, when consumers determine whether the effort of participating in coproduction was worthwhile (Etgar 2008). Lynch (2011) is highly critical of museums’ ability to undertake this stage in coproduction, highlighting their lack of organisational reflexivity and inability to analyse their work from the perspective of both the museums and their community partners.

Davies’ (2010; 2011) study of museum coproduction highlights the various functional tasks involved in the production of museum exhibitions. Examining coproduction with all external parties (consultants and academics as well as communities), she identifies the various forms of involvement of different types of external parties in coproduced museum exhibitions. The involvement of external parties was high in relation to identifying the initial idea, design and production, understanding the audience and delivering (but not planning) the associated public program. Coproduction in relation to curatorial work was low, particularly in terms of defining the narrative of exhibitions. This was seen to be evidence of museum reluctance to share curatorial work with external parties (Davies 2010).

2.6.1.3 COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES

There is an extensive body of literature that examines the process of coproduction in terms of collaboration. This research has been largely grounded in management, public administration and museology disciplines, but with little interdisciplinary exchange of findings (Huxham 2003). Collaboration has traditionally been conceptualised in terms of the exchange of value (section 2.4.1.1), assuming this work involves external parties contributing as stakeholders to produce offerings for consumption by a third party. More recently, marketing literature has developed an interest in service ecosystems and networked co-creation of value (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016; Laud et al. 2015; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011).

Research into collaborative processes demonstrates a lack of conceptual clarity (Conner 2016; Huxham 2003) similar to that which has beset coproduction. Collaborative mechanisms available within the public sector have been described as
‘multifarious and abundant’ (Agranoff and McGuire 2003, p. 6). Studies that aim for greater conceptual clarity regarding collaborative processes include Huxham’s (2003) research into the complex micro-processes of participation, which explores five themes: common aims; power; trust; leadership; and membership structures. Marketing literature emphasises the co-creation of value propositions as a key mechanism for forming relationships and shaping perceptions of value within a service ecosystem (Akaka et al. 2013; Frow et al. 2014; Payne and Frow 2014). Frow et al. describe value propositions as a ‘dynamic and adjusting mechanism for negotiating how resources are shared within a service ecosystem’ (2014, p. 340) that can be categorised according to six forms: promises; proposals; invitation to play; bridge connecting our worlds; wild card; and a journey to a destination. They suggest value propositions take different forms at micro, meso and macro levels (Frow et al. 2014).

In cultural theory, Brown and Novak-Leonard’s (2011) Audience Involvement Spectrum categorises the collaborative involvement of external parties according to the influence of curatorial, interpretive and inventive control of the interactions between an arts organisation and its audience. Within a museum specific context, Simon’s (2010) four levels of museum participation (contributory, collaborative, co-creative and hosted) are determined according to organisational commitment, levels of control, relationship between museum and participant, level of commitment sought from participants, extent of staff involvement, skills to be gained by participants, and goals for museum visitors not involved in the participation.

The advantage of collaboration is that it enables an organisation to achieve something it would not be able to realise if acting alone (Huxham 2003). This is accomplished by providing access to new resources and resource configurations (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Moussouri 2012; Suseno and Ratten 2007; Vargo et al. 2008) which are the result of shared and egalitarian development processes that fully utilise the diverse skills and knowledge of a collaborating team (Davies 2010; Lee 2007). Vargo and Lusch emphasise the systems nature of collaboration, which they discuss in terms of a service ecosystem: ‘a spontaneously sensing and responding spatial and temporal structure of largely loosely coupled, value-proposing social and economic actors interacting through institutions, technology and language’ (Vargo and Lusch 2011, p. 185). Lee (2007) and Moussouri (2012) draw on Wenger’s (1999) notion of a ‘community of practice’ to describe the collaborative nature of museum exhibition development. Collaboration requires interaction between groups from diverse backgrounds, this diversity manifesting through either professional identity (Lee 2007; Moussouri 2012) or community affiliation (Boast 2011; Draper 2006; Gurian 2006; Iervolino 2013; Kahn 2000). The diverse nature of collaborative teams requires strong communication and interpersonal skills (Anderson and Crocca 1993; Argote and Fahrenkopf 2016; Davies 2010).

Collaborative processes are understood by both scholars and practitioners to be complex and difficult to realise. There is extensive research into the problems posed by collaborative processes. Brudney (1985) argues coproduction requires participants to influence program design with equal dependency and input. Collaboration requires managers to share power (Pestoff 2009) and as a result takes away their control.
Prahalad and Ramaswamy highlight this complexity from the perspective of the external party, arguing ‘the role of the customer in service innovation must be contributing knowledge, skills, and experiences, his or her willingness to share frustrations, requirements, problems and expectations, and his or her readiness to experiment and learn’ (2000, p. 80). The diverse nature of collaborative teams—which is the source of collaborative advantage—is also a source of conflict. This conflict can manifest as resistance (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013) or dispute (Lee 2007). Huxham (2003) has also identified ‘collaborative thuggery’ in which team members appear facilitative and empower team members, while at the same time manipulating agendas and ‘playing politics’.

Further research indicates that the problematic aspects of collaboration may in fact reveal the means by which collaboration enables innovation and creativity. The difficulties team members experience when collaborating may be necessary to achieve the advantages offered by collaboration. Lee argues conflict within collaborative teams is not necessarily the result of incompatible goals and opinions, but instead an essential part of the collaborative process; ‘uncertainty and conflict indicate a natural dialectic process of knowledge exchange’ (2007, p. 186). Similarly, Fryberg (2013) contends conflict and resistance does not diminish the success or output of collaborative processes, but instead are the manifestation of interactions that lead to new meaning creation and innovation. She argues that collaboration research needs to understand collaborative processes can be ‘simultaneously contradictory and creative’ (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013, p. 1178).

2.6.1.4 PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

Coproduction has been investigated from the perspective of project management theory. This research considers how to plan and then manage effective coproduction initiatives. According to this body of research, coproduction processes are influenced by: the scope of work that coproduction involves; assigning roles and responsibilities; time lines for the coproduced initiative; and resourcing implications.

There has been extensive investigation of the impact of scope on coproduction. A number of scholars have argued that coproduction is deeper and more empowering of communities if they have input into the planning and design of this work. While community involvement in the delivery of coproduction is common (Alford 2009; Ang 2005; Davies 2010; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010), research suggests a deeper level of contribution enables more profound innovation in service delivery. Brudney’s (1985) conceptual study of coproduction and its implementation notes that, when citizens and administrators are involved in program design, both parties commit to coproduction with equal dependence and input. Contribution to the planning of coproduction is an opportunity to move beyond Pestoff’s ‘glass ceiling’ of citizen participation (2009), enabling communities to make decisions and take responsibility for coproduction. The scope of coproduction and the input of various parties underpin a number of categorisations of coproduction practice (for example Bovaird 2007;

The influence of the roles and responsibilities involved in coproduction are highlighted in Davies’s (2010) museum coproduction research. Her study found that coproduction was not equally present across all aspects of exhibition development, but instead concentrated in certain development functions. Similarly, Bovaird (2007) categorises coproduction according to the roles assumed by professionals and their community partners. Den Hertog et al. (2010) indicate that, because coproduction is a new type of practice, it requires new organisational structures and relationships, while Matthing et al. (2004) note the need for cross-functional organisational teams to participate in coproduction.

The scheduling of coproduction is seen to affect its implementation. A number of scholars have argued that coproduction is deeper and more empowering of communities if they are involved early in the initiative (Brudney 1985; Davies 2010; Davies 2011; Pestoff 2009). Matthing (2004) highlights the need for continuous customer input into service improvements. Scheduling also impacts on coproduction because it is process intensive, meaning that longer time lines are required to deliver coproduced initiatives (Bovaird 2007; Loeffler et al. 2008; Lynch and Alberti 2010).

The impact of resources on the process of coproduction is one reason that community capacity is seen to either drive or inhibit coproduction (section 2.5.3.3). Etgar (2008) notes the impact of resources held by the customer on coproduction, highlighting the influence of their level of affluence, amount of discretionary time, skills and education. The influence of resourcing has parallels to the impact issues of social and cultural exclusion have on coproduction (Ang 2005; Coffee 2008; Jakobsen and Andersen 2013; Tlili 2008). The organisational commitment of resources is also necessary for coproduction (Anderson and Crocca 1993; den Hertog et al. 2010).

2.6.2 IMPACT OF COPRODUCTION ON OUTCOMES OF MUSEUM WORK

Some scholars suggest that coproduction has little or no impact on the exhibitions and public programs offered by museums. Despite the implementation of well designed and resourced coproduction processes, it is possible that the results of this work are no more dialectic, authentic or empowering of communities than exhibitions and public programs produced through traditional museum practice. Lynch (2010) identifies a range of means through which museums limit the ‘active agency’ of communities including: processes of false-consensus and ‘rubber stamping’; limiting communities to the role of ‘passive beneficiaries’; treating museums as ‘invited spaces’; and placing communities on the ‘periphery’ of the museum. Ang (2005) observes ways in which museums limit the processes of democratisation and pluralisation within exhibitions. Bovaird (2007) highlights the distinction between rhetoric and action in relation to public sector coproduction more broadly. A distinction is therefore made between the influence of communities and the influence of the museum on the exhibitions and public programs that result from coproduction.
2.6.2.1 COMMUNITY-INFLUENCED

Museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities provides an opportunity to change traditional museum narratives and discourse. Francis (2015) argues the challenge for museums is to make their exhibitions richer discursive spaces by communicating through dialogic, rather than monologic, discourse. New museology has identified the impersonal, authorial and institutional voice of the museum, and the way in which voice and authorship are intimately connected to knowledge and authority (Mason et al. 2013). In other words, museums need to allow multiple voices and multiple perspectives into their exhibitions—particularly voices that might otherwise be silenced (Francis 2015). The advantage of museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities is that it provides the museum with access to diverse and often overlooked voices and perspectives (Kahn 2000). Mason et al. (2013) and Kahn (2000) highlight the use of audiovisual material to collect and present different voices and perspectives in museum exhibitions. Iervolino (2013) notes the involvement of community members as guides and storytellers in exhibitions. Coffee (2008) reminds us that the impact of voice and representation through coproduction can be unintentional and unconscious, as well as planned and conscious. Witcomb (2009) highlights the need for individual as well as collective voices, and the identification of what is shared, as well as differences between people.

Coproduction also enables museums to function as places of cultural interaction. This results in museums becoming meeting places or cultural hubs where communities (often indigenous communities) meet and interact with both museum professionals and audiences. The notion of museums as places of cultural interaction was introduced in Clifford’s (1997) discussion of museums as ‘contact zones’, drawing on the work of linguist Mary Louise Pratt (1991). Golding (2013) describes this outcome of coproduction as the transformation of museums from ‘sites where knowledge is transmitted to passive audiences, to potential forums or contact zones where new voices and visibilities are raised and new knowledge(s) actively constructed’ (2013, p. 25). The notion of a contact zone suggests collaboration beyond the exhibition space or exhibition narrative (Onciul 2013), and the creation of new knowledge as well as the sharing of existing knowledge (Golding 2013; Varutti 2013). Examples of research into community influence through coproduction in the form of contact zones include: Portland Museum of Art’s consultation with Tlingit elders (Clifford 1997); collaboration between the National Taiwan Museum and Chimei Amis Indigenous Museum (Varutti 2013); an exhibition of Torres Strait Islander material at the University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (Herle 2000); the Papuan Sculpture Garden at Stanford University (Boast 2011; Clifford 1997); and collaboration with local indigenous Blackfoot First Nations communities by Canadian museums (Onciul 2013).

Scholars have also identified ways the influence communities have on exhibition discourse and cultural interactions is manipulated or constrained by museums. In his critique of contact zones within museums, Boast (2011) highlights the asymmetry often inherent in these relationships. He argues contact zones involve a dominant culture providing a negotiated space. In his view, the general optimism about what has
been achieved through recent collaboration and diverse representation within museums overlooks the asymmetry that accompanies what are in fact spaces of appropriation: ‘no matter how much we try to make the spaces accommodating, they remain sites where the Others come to perform for us, not with us’ (Boast 2011, p. 63).

Lynch (2010; 2011) has also identified the inability to shift coproduction from the margins to the core of the organisation. This is largely the result of ‘rubber stamping’, which contains community engagement by limiting it to consultation rather than collaboration. Instead of contributing to museum work in equal and reciprocal terms, communities remain passive publics relegated to the consumption of museum products (Lynch 2010). Ang (2005) highlights the boundaries museums place around the contribution that can be made by communities, with the judgement of aesthetic value and content of exhibitions being beyond what could be expected from ‘non-specialist’ communities. The result is that communities have limited active agency and are allowed minimal input into decision-making and the allocation of resources (Lynch 2010). Coproduction in museums has been described as ‘empowerment-lite’, the result of ‘a level of control, risk aversion and “management” by [museums] that served to undermine its impact and value for the “target” [communities]’ (Lynch 2010, p. 11).

Further insights highlight the ways museums manipulate the outcomes of coproduction with communities. Lynch (2010) identifies behaviour she describes as ‘consensual power’ or ‘false consensus’, which rewards less challenging behaviour and those communities whose values are best aligned with the museum’s. Alongside this behaviour is the manipulative use of power by museums, achieved through institution power (control of decision-making and agenda-setting) and invisible power (community contribution short-changed through rhetoric) (Lynch 2010). Huxham (2003) identifies similar situations in her research into collaboration more broadly, highlighting the capacity for leaders to appear committed to the spirit of collaboration by being highly facilitative and empowering, while at the same time engaging in ‘collaborative thuggery’. This may also be a pragmatic requirement of collaboration, rather than damaging (Huxham 2003).

2.6.2.2 MUSEUM-INFLUENCED

Existing scholarship also considers the need for museums to maintain their influence on the exhibitions and public programs that are the outcome of their work with communities. There are two interlinked themes within this literature: the need for the professional knowledge of museums to influence coproduced exhibitions and public programs; and the need to ensure the quality and standard of museum offerings.

Varutti (2013) distinguishes between two types of knowledge that contribute to coproduction: curatorial or museum knowledge; and community knowledge. These different types of knowledge are part of the conflict involved in collaboration between museums and communities, with the result that coproduction becomes a ‘framework through which to observe the negotiations—of knowledge, status, authority, identity—at play between actors’ (Varutti 2013, p. 71). The knowledge that is considered superior is curatorial knowledge, with the result that coproduction provides a limited
flow of information towards the museum (Varutti 2013). The ‘superior’ nature of professional and museum knowledge is also acknowledged in the way museum curators maintain their professional authority and independence. Lynch and Alberti (2010) observed the ways museum staff involved in coproduction relegated ideas and suggestions made by community members to unspecified future exhibitions. Ang (2005) notes that the judgement of aesthetic value was a specialisation retained by museum staff. Davies (2010) reports that defining the exhibition narrative was a task museum staff were reluctant to share with external parties. Beyond a museum-specific context, Anderson and Crocca (1993) observed IT engineers opposing ideas from customers that they had originally identified as innovative and worthy of further development.

Distinctions are also made between various disciplines of professional knowledge. The need for curators to influence the exhibitions and public programs that result from coproduction therefore becomes more nuanced, and leads to hierarchies between different types of museums and subject specialisations. This situation is highlighted in Clifford’s (1988) model of the art-culture system (Figure 4), which distinguishes between art and culture, and the corresponding implications for categorising artefacts and understanding means of cultural production. According to the art-culture system, art galleries are distinguished from ethnographic museums because galleries collect masterpieces created by individual artists, whereas ethnographic museums collect ethnographic artefacts created through traditional means by cultural groups (Clifford 1988). The distinction between singular means of production (masterpieces in galleries) and collective means of production (artefacts in ethnographic museums) suggests that coproduction is more appropriately practised in museums. Demonstration of this theory in museum practice is found in McLean and Newman’s investigation of coproduction initiatives in Scotland, which notes that in many cases this work was ‘dominated by the curatorial process, influenced by the various discourses, which was encoding the meanings that were presented and so controlling the nature of the product that was consumed’ (2006, p. 61). In considering the arts sector more broadly, Boorsma distinguishes between approaches to co-creation within different art forms, observing ‘the acquisition of knowledge seems to be a relatively important reason for visiting an exhibition in a museum, while theatre attendees seem to attach relatively more value to the emotional benefits’ (2006, p. 84). She goes on to emphasise the value of co-creation in relation to performing arts.
Concerns about the quality and standards of coproduced exhibitions and public programs are also used to prioritise the influence of museum professional staff on museum offerings. Museum coproduction is subject to expectations of professional control and input. Ang (2005) reports that art critics were keen to criticise the aesthetic standards of gallery exhibitions that involved a level of innovation due to coproduction with communities. Cole refers to coproduction as ‘trendy efforts that undermine the time-tested traditional role of museums to carefully curate, research, display, and make critical judgments about the quality and importance of art’ (2016, p. 35). When tailoring co-creation for the arts sector, Boorsma (2006) maintains the primary role of the artist. She identifies as Condition 1 for a strategic logic in arts marketing ‘the art consumer is a co-creator in the total art process, but not a co-designer of the product in terms of its form’ (Boorsma 2006, p. 85). She elaborates on the artist-led nature of co-creation in the arts by proposing: ‘a certain level of artistic freedom on the part of the artist is a necessary condition. The art consumer should not be actively involved before the artistic idea has developed its form’ (Boorsma 2006, p. 85). Tensions relating to quality are found not only in collaborations between museums and communities; they also impact on negotiations involving curatorial and education museum staff in relation to the dispute between scholarship and popularisation (Lee 2007).

### 2.6.3 RQ3: WHAT IMPACT DOES COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES HAVE ON MUSEUM PRACTICE?

There is limited understanding of the process of coproduction and its management requirements (Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Ostrom et al. 2010; Thyne and Hede 2016). Despite research that draws on a range of frameworks (experiential design, production and manufacturing, collaboration, project management), previous scholarship has not attended to the ‘micropractice of interactive value formation’ (Echeverri and Skålén...
2011, p. 253) and the management of coproduction processes is not clearly understood (Ostrom et al. 2010). Ways of integrating resources through coproduction remains a gap in knowledge, particularly when collaboration in the design of products and services is involved (Ostrom et al. 2010). Most research has investigated coproduction from the perspective of service users. The implications of coproduction for the role of service professionals is a particular gap in knowledge (Bovaird 2007; Osborne et al. 2016). Museum are able to deliver exhibitions and public programs through coproduction, regardless of the effectiveness of the processes that are involved (Ang 2005; Kahn 2000; Keith 2012; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010). Voorberg et al. (2014) found that little attention was given to the outcomes of this work within public administration. As a result, Research Question 3 investigates: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?

2.7 AN A PRIORI COPRODUCTION FRAMEWORK

This literature review identifies an a priori framework (using inductive identification to establish descriptions of characteristic and patterns from existing literature) (Blaikie 2010) of museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities, outlined in Table 7.

Table 7: An a priori museum coproduction framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How is museum coproduction with culturally communities manifested?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notions of value</td>
<td>Value as exchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value as experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External party role in museum coproduction</td>
<td>External party as stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External party as audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of interaction</td>
<td>Receptive relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries of coproduction</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual (provider and external party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of external parties</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource exchange</td>
<td>Operant resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operand resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2: What are the drivers and inhibitors for museums to coproduce with culturally diverse communities?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External drivers and inhibitors</strong></td>
<td>Ethics and respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government policy and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional practice and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal drivers and inhibitors</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation and reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational commitment and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural intermediaries/cultural brokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community drivers and inhibitors</strong></td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on process</strong></td>
<td>Experiential design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production/manufacturing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project management process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Community influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum influenced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

In this chapter, an interdisciplinary review of literature relating to museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities has been undertaken, resulting in the identification of three research questions presented schematically in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Schematic representation of research questions
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY
3.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the research methodology, stages and analysis used to address the research questions identified for this research. It also details the stance and method used to identify the research questions. Further, it outlines the measures of trustworthiness relevant to this qualitative research.

3.2 EPISTEMOLOGY

This doctoral research is grounded in a subjectivist epistemology that acknowledges knowledge is influenced by social, political and cultural values, and is dynamic and evolving (Jones et al. 2013). A key tenet of a subjectivist epistemology is that meaning is interactive and intersubjective. This research has aimed to produce findings that allowed participants—museum stakeholders—to share their perspectives, which are interpreted and co-interpreted through interaction between the researcher and participants (Gray 2009).

A subjectivist epistemology fit with the aim of this study and its interest in coproduction. One of the key principles of coproduction, particularly in the public sector, is the need for collaboration that involves equal and reciprocal relationships between professionals and service users (Boyle and Harris 2009; Stephens et al. 2008). At the same time, extant literature highlights the challenges these types of collaborative relationships present to professional groups and the ways they resist coproduction (Ang 2005; Bovaird 2007; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010). When working with culturally diverse communities, the need for collaborative approaches carries the additional impetus of respect and ethical responsibility (ICOM 2013; Peers and Brown 2003).

A subjectivist epistemology requires a collaborative relationship between the researcher and participants, and results in co-constructed research processes and discoveries (Lincoln et al. 2011; Manning 1997). The use of subjectivism therefore offered parallels to the practice of coproduction and the aim of this doctoral research: to develop a model or practice for the application of new museology. For example, a subjectivist epistemology respects the voice and social settings (Gephart 2004) of research participants, and aims to incorporate these into the analysis and reporting of the research. Similarly, a subjectivist approach requires an alertness to the privileged position of researchers and professionals, and the need to empower those who may be constrained by social structures.

Despite a commitment to a subjectivist epistemology, at some points this doctoral research has also drawn on constructionist approaches to knowledge. Use of constructionism was needed to develop a shared understanding of the way museum coproduction is organised and delivered. At this point in the research it was assumed that, through interaction and negotiation involving the researcher and research participants, the ‘truth’ of each coproduction project could be created and the complex
human phenomenon involved in each project understood. In these phases the researcher assumed an interpreter role in the collaboration with the research participants (Jones et al. 2013).

The use of these epistemologies has enabled development of an understanding of the way the Australian museum sector conceives of coproduction with culturally diverse communities (constructionism) (section 5.2), followed by analysis of this understanding in order to reveal the oppressive or emancipatory nature of these projects (subjectivism) (sections 0, 5.4 and 5.5). The commitment of this research was to a subjectivist epistemology, with constructionism providing an initial understanding on which a subjectivist approach was then built.

### 3.3 CRITICAL THEORY APPROACH

This research has adopted a critical theory paradigm, building from the assumption that museums are elitist organisations retaining control of both museum function and the outcomes of coproduction. This research has assumed that museums will have difficulty in collaborating with culturally diverse communities because they are unable to relinquish or share control in their relationships with these communities. As a study of organisational behaviour, it has been particularly influenced by critical management studies (CMS) and the study of power within management and organisations (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009; Clegg 2009). Postcolonial critique of museums and the change in museum function sought by new museology provide evidence that museums deserve the ‘whip’ of a critical theory approach—exploration of ‘dominant phenomena surrounding organisation and work that appear to reign un(der)-challenged’ (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009, p. 63). Previous research highlights the difficulties experienced by both public sector professionals (Bovaird 2007) and museum curators (Ang 2005; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010) when required to coproduce, and the challenges faced by the museum sector in fully realising the ideals of new museology (Janes 2009; McCall and Gray 2014).

The use of a critical theory paradigm has affected the design of this research in three ways. Firstly, the interest in power and need to look beyond the ‘myth’ of museum coproduction required a decentred approach, drawing on the perspective of groups other than the dominant organisation. As a result, this research places emphasis on both a broad context and deep level of analysis. This has been achieved by drawing on the perspectives of museum staff, community members and external stakeholders (the embedded case), as well as gaining the field-level viewpoints of museum professional bodies and senior curators (the field-level case).

Secondly, a critical theory paradigm impacted on the research questions. Within a critical theory approach, research seeks to investigate questions that elite groups are reluctant to have answered or that radically differ from established modes or conventional views (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010). In this current research, the third research question (RQ3: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?) is critical because it allows coproduction to have no impact on museum practice. Therefore RQ3 ‘problematises’ museum
coproduction, rather than just identifying gaps in the literature (Dubois and Gadde 2014); creating a distinction between coproduction processes and outcomes is one way museums may be able to create a ‘myth’ around their work with communities while retaining control of museum offerings. This research question has aimed to disrupt rather than just build on existing literature (Alvesson and Sandberg 2011).

Thirdly, a critical theory approach requires research to have a strong grounding in theory in order to avoid getting ‘trapped’ in empirical data and losing sight of the emancipatory interest of the research (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010). In this doctoral research, a grounding in theory has been achieved by drawing on the notion of new museology as a response to postcolonial critique of museum role and function (McCall and Gray 2014; Pollock 2007; Ross 2004; Stam 1993), as well as the work of Foucault and his interest in relational forms of power and the links between discourse, knowledge and power (Foucault 1972; Foucault 1974; Foucault 1979; Foucault and Gordon 1980; Foucault and Hoy 1986; McNay 1994).

### 3.3.1 PERSONAL BIOGRAPHY AND ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

Awareness of the personal perspective of the researchers is important in qualitative research due to the need for reflexivity (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009). Within a subjectivist epistemology, the personal biography of the researcher provides insight into their influence on the dynamic nature of knowledge, capacity to advocate for those engaged in the research, stance within the research and values they bring (Jones et al. 2013). From a critical theory perspective, the personal biography of the researcher reveals the subjective basis on which their insights are founded, the position from which they analyse the relational aspect of power and knowledge, and their capacity to construct alternative forms of management and organisation (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010).

Having trained originally as a museum curator, I worked for many years in arts and community development roles in government. This background enabled me to take on the role of an ‘empathetic but non-participant observer’ (Langley 2009, p. 421). My perspective and commitment aligned with that of ‘cultural broker’, a term coined by Richard Kurin (1997) of the Smithsonian to describe museum staff with the relational skills and ethical approach needed to facilitate collaboration with culturally diverse communities. The perspective of a cultural broker has much in common with ‘institutional entrepreneurs’, actors who mobilise resources to transform institutions and are often found on the periphery of an organisation or sector (Battilana and Leca 2009). I was therefore well placed to theorise changes to museum function (Battilana and Leca 2009; Greenwood et al. 2002; Lawrence 2008). My academic training in arts and museum studies meant I was influenced by postmodern and postcolonial critiques of museums. As a result, I brought a strong commitment to the aspirations embodied in new museology (Janes 2009; McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993), as well as the capacity to think both technically and critically about museums and cultural policy (Gibson 2008). Moreover, I was well-positioned within a CMS framework (section 3.3.2.2) and the need for a pragmatic rather than ‘anti-managerial’ approach (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009).
PRINCIPLES AND CONCEPTUAL ASSUMPTIONS

Given its grounding in a subjectivist epistemology and critical theory paradigm, this research has drawn on a number of theoretical principles and conceptual assumptions that need to be made explicit in order to avoid ‘casting an illusion of objectivity’ (Keleman and Rumens 2008) over the research. Outlined here are the key concepts and theories that have informed this doctoral study. They include ontological concepts (the notion of power), operational concepts (critical management studies) and sensitising concepts (new museology) as well as approaches to qualitative research (bricolage) (Blaikie 2010).

NEW MUSEOLOGY

Postmodern and postcolonial thinking has significantly influenced the study of museums. Witcomb summarises postcolonial critiques of museums as suggesting, ‘the collecting and display practices of museums erase the meanings objects had in the social world which made and used them, and provide an alternate set of meanings which implicate them not only within a capitalist commodity system but also within bourgeois, patriarchal systems of value’ (1998, p. 386). These criticisms have resulted in a re-visioning of museum role and function termed ‘new museology’ (Vergo 1989a), which aims to transform the role and function of museums. Vergo cautions that, unless this radical change takes place, museums will find themselves ‘living fossils’ (1989a, p. 4). The changes that new museology involves include: the relationships between museums and their communities, particularly issues of power and control; need for an external rather than internal focus; and development of new performance measures that better identify museum relevance (McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993). These changes have implications at field, organisational and individual levels.

New museology notes a move towards increasing reflexivity within museums. It acknowledges that notions of value and meaning are endowed and constructed by museums, and that concepts of truth need to be interrogated and contested in museum practice (Stam 1993). The changes outlined in new museology therefore seek dialectic and democratic museum practice. Museums are required to better present diverse and contested histories and cultural identities (Ross 2004; Stam 1993). This shift in museum practice acknowledges that social and cultural structures are diverse, complex and multilayered, and require meaningful power and control to sit with the communities that are represented and served by museums.

A key implication of new museology is greater integration of museums with the social groups they serve. This is particularly the case for museum work with culturally diverse communities and non-dominant cultures (Stam 1993). New museology seeks to develop new forms of museum practice that place less importance on collections and the curatorial profession, instead paying attention to a museum’s relationships with people and communities (McCall and Gray 2014; Stam 1993). This shift in orientation has variously been described as moving from: legislator to interpreter of cultural meaning (Ross 2004 borrowed from Bauman 1987); protector of Eurocentric heritage to broker of identity (Trofanenko 2006); mandate driven to market driven (Tlili et al.
2007); hegemonic to dialogic institution (Rosenberg 2011); collection focused to public service (Lynch 2011); and museum as contact zone (Boast 2011; Clifford 1997). These changes to museum role and function require changes in the way the impact of museums is determined. Vergo highlights the need to measure the success of museums through criteria other than ‘more money and more visitors’ (1989a, p. 3).

### 3.3.2.2 CRITICAL MANAGEMENT STUDIES

The study of power within management is referred to as critical management studies (CMS). CMS investigates the ways work practices maintain or reinforce imbalances of power, particularly through institutionalised practices such as emphasis on profit, racial inequality or environmental irresponsibility (Clegg 2009; Keleman and Rumens 2008; Wickert and Schaefer 2015). What distinguishes CMS from other areas of critical research is its focus on management and organisations, and the recognition that “‘real’ (i.e. lived and living) conditions constrain choice and action in the contemporary organisational world” (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009, p. 63). In other words, CMS requires a pragmatic approach which is not anti-managerial or demonising of those viewed as exercising institutional power, but realising that achieving ‘class, gender and race and ecological justice may have drastic consequences for the material functioning of organisations alongside effects on member subjectivities’ (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009, p. 65). Gibson reveals her alliance with CMS in cultural policy studies, arguing that a ‘combination of theoretical, historical and technical knowledge’ (2008, p. 253) enables insights that address both the critical and the practical. The aim of CMS research is to change the ways organisations are managed, referred to as progressive performativity (Spicer et al. 2009; Wickert and Schaefer 2015) or transformative redefinition (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009).

### 3.3.2.3 POWER

The adoption of a critical theory paradigm has meant that this doctoral research is interested in issues associated with power. It draws on the work of critical theorist and philosopher Michel Foucault, who examined the interrelationships between power, knowledge and discourse. According to this view, power is not a commodity but a relational phenomenon. In other words, power is ‘the affect of social relations rather than something an actor can “have”, “hold” or “keep in reserve”’ (Lawrence 2008, p. 174). Foucault’s interests lie not in the notion of sovereign power and its manifestation in central and formalised means such as the state and class relations, but in the more subtle and diffuse ways power relations of inequality and oppression are expressed and maintained (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; McNay 1994). Foucault’s work therefore offers insights into how museums are able to construct the myth or illusion of collaboration with culturally diverse communities, and the mechanisms through which they maintain power and control when working with culturally diverse communities.

Foucault proposed the concept of power/knowledge—which acknowledges that power produces knowledge, and that discourse and knowledge have power and truth effects (Clark et al. 2011). The knowledge that Foucault is most interested in is knowledge shaped by relational forms of power, in other words, forms of knowledge that ‘can
only exist with the support of arrangements of power, arrangements that likewise have no clear origin, no person or body who can be said to “have” it’ (Feder 2010). The importance of discourse for Foucault lies in the ways it constitutes objects and subjects (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010). Foucault’s overriding interest in discourse is its rarefaction; that, despite the potential for infinite production of meanings in discourse, at any one point in time there are a limited range of possibilities in terms of what to think or say.

Foucault’s influence over the past forty years has been widespread, crossing all fields in the social sciences. While his work was by no means limited to the study of organisations, he identified its relevance to the examination of organisational behaviour. For example, he acknowledged the influence of relational forms of power in relation to organisations and management:

   The real political task in a society such as ours is to criticise the workings of institutions that appear to be both neutral and independent, to criticise and attack them in such a manner that the political violence that has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight against them. (Chomsky and Foucault 2006, p. 41)

The danger with all of Foucault’s methodologies is the temptation to seek in them prescriptive approaches to research or theoretical propositions (Burrell 1998). What he actually presents to the researcher are a number of sensitising ideas and issues, or ‘a set of profound philosophical and methodological suspicions towards the objects of knowledge that we confront, a set of suspicions that stretch our relationship to such objects, and to the uses to which such related knowledges are put’ (Hook 2005, p. 4). The need for researchers to treat Foucault’s methodologies with caution is highlighted in the suggestion that his work is characterised by ‘contradiction, wilful obscurantism and a determination to avoid totalising theories’ (McKinlay and Starkey 1998, p. 5).

As a research project that draws widely on the work of Foucault, this research approaches its subject matter as being shy and shape-shifting, of indeterminable substance and without conscious awareness. It is a research task that has required flexibility and the ability to deal with contradiction and anomalies. The research design used in this doctoral study therefore needed to: attend to what is missing; examine dynamic processes; build complexity; seek dualism; and acknowledge many voices and actors. It has required both depth and superficiality, as well as breadth and intricacy (Burrell 1998).

While Foucault’s approaches and insights have primarily been used to analyse the data collected for this case study, they have also had implications for the broader design of this research. Preoccupations with discourse and power/knowledge are just as pertinent to the function of research as the research problem being investigated. Attention to the issues raised by Foucault can be plotted in relation to the stance taken in the research, role of the researcher, reporting and presentation of results and criteria used to determine the conduct of qualitative research. An interest in discourse and power/knowledge is also relevant to the study of museums, as these cultural organisations are simultaneously the product of, and contributor to, relational forms of
power or power/knowledge. The museum’s complicity in the constituting of objects and subjects is unavoidable given its function as a collecting and exhibiting institution (Vergo 1989b).

Foucault’s work spans many stages of development, each categorised by a particular set of preoccupations with the way relational power manifests and its study is approached. The following section outlines three of these periods or themes in Foucault’s work which have been found relevant to this doctoral research.

3.3.2.3.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHOD

In the archaeological method, Foucault’s concern is to show how new paradigms of knowledge emerge and shape new ways of thinking about the world (Foucault 1972; Foucault 1974; McKinlay et al. 2012; Scheurich and McKenzie 2005). Its interest in discourse is as a means to examine the social effects of knowledge produced by discourses and intellectual disciplines (Clark et al. 2011). The archaeological method distinguishes between surface-level knowledge and the underlying governing structures that create this knowledge. It challenges assumptions such as different types of knowledge, the progress of knowledge and the notion of truth (McNay 1994). The archaeological method provides a means to consider ways professionals (such as museum curators) create knowledge and use this knowledge in processes of normalising (Foucault 1979).

The archaeological method is relevant to this doctoral research because it draws attention to the effect of professional constructs that influence museum and community coproduction. The archaeological method has been used to explore the notions of: different types of museums (e.g. museums, art galleries, ethnographic museums, contemporary art spaces); different roles and functions within museums (e.g. curatorial, exhibitions, education, public programs); and the various disciplines with which museums engage (e.g. visual art, contemporary art, ethnography, social history). It also offers insights into the distinction between museum knowledge and community knowledge that has been observed in case studies of museum–community collaboration (Iervolino 2013; Varutti 2013).

3.3.2.3.2 GENEALOGICAL METHOD

Foucault’s genealogical method examines the relationship between knowledge and power and the ways their inter-relatedness manifests in discourse (Burrell 1998; Foucault and Gordon 1980; McNay 1994). The notion of discourse considered within genealogy is not that traditionally associated with language, but a framework or logic of reasoning through which objects are systematically formed. Discourses are not simply mirrors of social reality but constitute the ‘crucial way’ to exercise power (Clark et al. 2011). The genealogical method recognises power relations are inscribed in discourse, and looks for ways to explain the control, selection, classification and distribution of the production of discourse through power relationships (Foucault and Gordon 1980; Foucault and Rabinow 1991). Foucault’s genealogical method and examination of the rarefaction of discourse require not just a study of its internal
processes, but also an examination of external social forces. Discourse is seen to be influenced, created, manipulated, reshaped and controlled by a range of procedures which present opportunities for the study of power and knowledge (Foucault and McLeod 1981; McNay 1994). The genealogical method also considers resistance. As well as understanding power as repression or constraint, resistance and thwarting the operation of power/knowledge are themselves expressions of power (Caldwell 2007; Feder 2010).

Within this doctoral research, the genealogical method has been relevant to explore power/knowledge as part of the discursive processes that underpin museum practice. It has been observed that within museums, ‘discourse creates objects … Objects may physically pre-exist those discourse and their institutions, and they may persist beyond them; but appropriated by new institutions, their meanings are remade and they are transformed into new kinds of objects’ (Errington 1998 quoted in Varutti 2013, p. 68). The critique of museum practice expressed through new museology (Hooper-Greenhill 1992; McCall and Gray 2014; Vergo 1989a) is grounded in the use of power/knowledge by museums. The collaborative process and negotiation involved in museum coproduction also manifest through discourse. Because narrative interviews are the primary data source used in this research, attention to the role of discourse is relevant—not for the language research participants used to describe museum coproduction, but in terms of the ways different research cohorts developed accounts of museum coproduction.

3.3.2.3 GOVERNMENTALITY

Governmentality or the ‘art of government’ examines processes that seek to improve the happiness and quality of life of individuals, while at the same time intensifying regulatory control over individuals and increasing the strength of the state (Foucault and Gordon 1980). Governmentality is largely a response to liberal democracy, building on the argument that liberal government involves maintaining or extending individual freedom while being held to account for the welfare of the population. This contradictory dilemma requires expansive systems and structures involving all manner of organisations, routines and strategies which make knowledge powerful and power knowledgeable (McKinlay et al. 2012). Discourses, new knowledge, disciplinary technologies and bodily control give birth to modern governmentality—an ensemble of institutions, procedures and forces that allow the exercise of a specific, complex and relational form of power (Clark et al. 2011).

The most obvious relevance governmentality has had to this research lies in the fact that museums are publicly funded organisations or government entities, and therefore accountable both to elected officials and senior bureaucrats, as well as the general public and citizenry (Wensley and Moore 2011). Museum coproduction can target the communities that museums are expected to serve (ICOM 2013), otherwise known as their constituent communities. In a broader sense, governmentality is relevant to museums because they are large institutions organised through systems and procedures directed to the care and wellbeing of collections, staff, stakeholders and audiences.
3.3.2.4 BRICOLAGE

This research draws on the notion of bricolage in its approach to qualitative research. Within a research context, bricolage refers to adapting a range of tools and techniques to the research task, and can be considered in relation to interpretive, narrative, theoretical and political research activity (Denzin and Lincoln 2011). When applied within a coherent and committed research stance, bricolage is an opportunity to broaden the interpretive repertoire available to critical qualitative research, and demonstrate care rather than the oppositional stance that characterises much CMS research (Spicer et al. 2009).

The relationship between individuals and their contexts is the dynamic that lies at the heart of qualitative research; therefore bricolage needs to acknowledge the manner in which ontology and epistemology are inextricably linked (Kincheloe et al. 2011). The pursuit of rigour is therefore a priority for the bricoleur, requiring a use of literature, theory and methods that is considered and consistent, rather than an opportunistic or ad hoc ‘grab bag’ of approaches. This research seeks to achieve the rigour required by bricolage through an interdisciplinary approach and use of a case study methodology in which multi-methods are employed. The stance taken in this research (subjectivist epistemology and critical theory paradigm) also vouches for the value of bricolage as an opportunity to investigate complexity and the implications of power, thereby requiring an active construction of the research design, rather than use of universally applicable methodologies (Kincheloe et al. 2011). The involvement of five different research cohorts provides this study with a multiperspectival process that resists a reductionist approach (Kincheloe et al. 2011).

3.4 RESEARCH STAGES

This thesis presents findings from a case study of coproduction in museums. While the outcomes of this research are reported as a single set of findings (Chapter 4), these conclusions are in fact the result of a staged and iterative research process. This doctoral study has involved six stages of research development. Stage 1 involved development of an a priori coproduction framework. Stage 2 involved phase 1 case study data collection (the field-level case) and initial analysis of this data in order to identify the exemplar of museum coproduction which forms the embedded case. Stage 2 also produced an initial a posteriori museum coproduction framework. Stage 3 involved phase 2 case study data collection (the embedded case) and theoretical coding of all the case study data (field-level and embedded cases). Emergent coding of the case study data was undertaken in Stage 4. Stage 5 involved analysis and discussion of findings and development of the final a posteriori museum coproduction framework. Stage 6 concluded the research process through the development of museum coproduction guidelines. These research stages are illustrated in Figure 6.
3.4.1 STAGE 1: DEVELOPMENT OF A PRIORI THEORETICAL MODEL OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

The first research stage involved an interdisciplinary review of literature relevant to coproduction in museums (Chapter 2). The gaps in this literature led to the research questions investigated in this study. This literature also resulted in an a priori framework of museum coproduction (Table 7), which guided the research design and interview questions. The interdisciplinary approach used in this doctoral research (drawing on management, marketing, public administration and museology) enabled theoretical triangulation (Yin 2009) of this framework.
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**Figure 6: Overview of research stages**
3.4.2 STAGE 2: REFINEMENT OF THEORETICAL MODEL OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION USING PHASE 1 DATA

The second research stage involved phase 1 investigation of the field-level case—coproduction in Australian museums. Narrative research interviews were conducted with two research cohorts: the heads of museum professional bodies (nine research participants) and senior museum curators (seven research participants). Documents and archives relating to the organisations of these research participants were also collected. The phase 1 analysis of this data resulted in an initial *a posteriori* framework of museum coproduction and also identified an exemplar case of museum coproduction in the form of Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre’s *Pacifica* program. *Pacifica* forms the embedded case examined in this study. The initial *a posteriori* framework was used to create a code book which defined and illustrated each of the theoretical codes that constituted the framework. It identified which codes were derived from literature and which emerged from phase 1 data analysis. These two categories are referred to as theory-driven and data-driven codes (DeCuir-Gunby et al. 2011).

3.4.3 STAGE 3: THEORETICAL DATA ANALYSIS AND MEMBER CHECKING

The third research stage involved phase 2 case study research, in which data from the embedded case study—Casula’s *Pacifica* program—was collected. Three cohorts participated in narrative interviews: museum staff (nine research participants), external stakeholders (seven research participants) and community representatives (eight research participants). Documents and archival material relating to the *Pacifica* program were also collected. Data from both the field-level and embedded cases were then theoretically coded using the *a posteriori* museum coproduction framework developed in stage 2. This involved a second coding of data relating to the field-level case. Theoretical coding was undertaken using QSR NVivo qualitative data management software. During this stage, a report of initial findings was presented to the research cohorts involved in the embedded case study context (museum staff, stakeholders and community representatives). This member checking (Stake 1995) or respondent validation (Bazeley 2013) process was designed to enable research participants to comment on the accuracy and credibility of the account.

3.4.4 STAGE 4: EMERGENT CODING OF DATA

In the fourth stage, theoretically coded data was re-investigated to identify emergent codes. Framework matrix reports were produced of the theoretically coded data (using QSR NVivo). These reports were reviewed to identify emergent codes from within the theoretically coded data.
3.4.5 STAGE 5: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

In stage five, the theoretically coded and emergent data was used to analyse and discuss the research questions that had been identified from the gaps in the literature. This stage also resulted in a final *a posteriori* framework of coproduction in museums.

3.4.6 STAGE 6: MUSEUM COPRODUCTION GUIDELINES

In the sixth and final stage, a set of museum coproduction guidelines were produced. These guidelines present a framework for museum coproduction that fits within a joint practice model. This stage met the CMS requirement of transformative redefinition of museum coproduction. This final step, in which the theoretical framework is translated into recommendations for museum practice, provides a means by which to change established museum practice. This ensures the research achieves progressive performativity (Spicer et al. 2009; Wickert and Schaefer 2015) and transformative redefinition (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009).

3.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

3.5.1 EMBEDDED SINGLE CASE STUDY

The use of case study methodology has enabled this current research to undertake in-depth analysis of a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context in which the boundaries between the phenomenon and context were not distinct (Yin 2009). This research examines coproduction within the Australian museum context (field-level case), with a subunit of analysis (embedded case) taking the form of a single exemplar of museum coproduction (Figure 7). The Australian museum context is described as a field, referring to those organisations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognised area of institutional life—in this case museums. The notion of a field acknowledges suppliers, regulatory agencies and other organisations involved in the management of cultural collections and provision of exhibitions and public programs (DiMaggio and Powell 1983).

The embedded case examined in this research is Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre’s *Pacifica* program, which was identified as an exemplar of museum coproduction by participants in the field-level case. *Pacifica* has been used as an instrumental case study to examine coproduction more broadly (Stake 1995). It has been purposively sampled (Creswell 2007) and offers an extreme or unique case (Yin 2009) in that it was identified by the museum field as a leader in museum coproduction within Australia.
This research has taken a pragmatic approach to the methodological function and value of case study research because of the consistency and alignment that case study offered to the research questions, epistemology, paradigm and research strategy used in this research. Case study enables the development of subjective knowledge within social contexts and the creation of thick, detailed and contextualised description, as required by a subjectivist epistemology and critical theory paradigm (Dyer Jr and Wilkins 1991; Fitzgerald and Dopson 2009; Van Maanen 1998).

Case study methodology is appropriate to this doctoral research due to: the use of a ‘how’ research question; attention to contemporary events; and lack of a need to control behavioural events (Yin 2009). A further rationale for the use of a case study methodology is offered by Eisenhardt (1989), who argues for its value in theory-building particularly when ‘little is known about a phenomenon or current perspectives are inadequate because they have little empirical knowledge’ (1989 p. 548). This is relevant to this doctoral research due to the lack of conceptual clarity regarding coproduction (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Loeffler 2016; Osborne et al. 2016) and the lack of empirical research into the practice of coproduction (Akaka et al. 2013; Frow et al. 2015; Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Voorberg et al. 2014).

Aligned with Fitzgerald and Dopson (2009), I contend that the overall design of the case study provided the framework of the research design, while the research method comprised the individual elements used to construct each case. Given this research involved a single case study, it provides limited capacity for generalisation and transferability of findings. However, as it involved the study of a unique or exemplar case, it presents the scenario in which Yin (2009) advocates for a single—rather than multiple—case study design.
3.5.1.1 FIELD-LEVEL CASE

The field-level case is coproduction as practised in the Australian museum context. The Australian museum sector is profiled in section 1.5.1. In summary, there are 1184 museums in Australia operating from 1456 locations across the country. These organisations employed more than 7500 people and were responsible for over 52.5 million objects. The Australian museum sector is funded at federal, state and local government levels. Museum workers are not professionally registered and many are volunteers. Both employed and volunteer museum staff are supported by museum professional bodies. Figure 8 illustrates the nature of museum professional bodies.

3.5.1.2 EMBEDDED CASE

The embedded case examined is Casula’s *Pacifica* program. This case was nominated by professional bodies and seniors curators as an exemplar of museum coproduction in Australia. The rationale provided for the exemplary nature of Casula’s work in coproduction aligns with existing literature, which indicates that those organisations most likely to coproduce with culturally diverse communities are local government museum and galleries located in areas with high levels of cultural diversity (Johanson et al. 2014; Tlili 2008). These museums are strategically aligned with their local government authority’s priorities relating to cultural planning, community engagement and community development (Blomkamp 2011; Gray 2008b; Stevenson 2005; Tlili et al. 2007). They are also innovative and entrepreneurial organisations with capacity for both organisational and professional change (Battilana et al. 2009). Desk research identified Casula’s *Pacifica* program as an annual program that involves coproduction with Pacific Island communities to develop exhibitions and public programs.

National body (codename PBA): advocate for museums and galleries, their collections and the people who work in them. Its two primary functions are advocacy to government and support for high standards of professional practice. Its purpose is to promote museum sector development, articulate ethical standards, facilitate training, advance knowledge, address issues, and raise public awareness. In addition to federal and state funding it receives membership fees. Museum staff (paid and volunteer) as well as members of the public are eligible to join.

State body (codename PBF): peak body representing over fifty art galleries and art museums. It describes its mission as being to build and strengthen the capacity of public galleries in its state to deliver valuable cultural, social and economic returns to their communities. To achieve this mission it acts as a broker between members, the three-tiers of government, the private and philanthropic sectors, education and research institutions, the media and the community. It receives funding from state government and in-kind support from a major state arts agency, and governed by a Board of Management.

Figure 8: Examples of museum professional bodies
3.5 QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The adoption of a subjectivist epistemology and critical theory paradigm, along with the use of Foucault’s methods and approaches to considering the influence of power (section 3.3.2.3), indicated the value of a qualitative approach to this doctoral research (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Gephart 2004). This approach has enabled ‘thick, detailed descriptions of actual actions in real-life contexts [that] recover and preserve the actual meanings that actors ascribe to these actions and settings’ (Gephart 2004, p. 455). It has also placed emphasis on subjective knowledge that is understood within its social context (Van Maanen 1998) and enabled research with a strong theoretical underpinning, seeking to ‘reveal how broad concepts and theories operate in particular cases’ (Gephart 2004, p. 455).

3.6.1 NARRATIVE RESEARCH

The primary method employed in this research is a narrative approach involving semi-structured, in-depth interviews. Narrative research involves the use of text or discourse to identify the story told by an individual (Creswell 2007; Lieblich et al. 1998). These interviews were designed to collect accounts of museum work. They were conducted as second-order narratives in that they involved people providing accounts about a collective experience (Creswell 2007). Table 8 profiles the narrative interview participants and categorises them according to the five research cohorts that were used to shape investigation of the field-level and embedded cases. The involvement of professional bodies, senior curators and stakeholders within the embedded case ensured this study offers greater depth and complexity than a dyadic study of museum and community representatives. This range of research cohorts has also enabled a decentred study in which relational forms of power are more likely to be revealed.

A total of 40 narrative research interviews were conducted (detailed in Table 8). A summary of these interviews across the five research cohorts is as follows:

Field-level case:
- museum professional bodies—nine interviews averaging 45 minutes
- senior curators—eight interviews averaging 45 minutes

Embedded case:
- museum staff—nine interviews averaging 45 minutes
- external stakeholders—seven interviews averaging 30 minutes
- community representatives—eight interviews averaging 50 minutes

The exception to this narrative interview profile is the interview with the Pacifica creative producer, which lasted 260 minutes and was conducted over five sessions. This was a longer interview because of the creative producer’s detailed insights into the design, aims and influence of Pacifica. They were also familiar with festivals that had served as a precursor to Pacifica. However the extended nature their involvement in the narrative interview process also had a cultural nature. This research participant was of Samoan background with a family lineage of orator chiefs. The narrative interviews in which they participated displayed characteristics of this oration tradition, requiring little questioning or prompting from the researcher.
Table 8: Overview of case study design and research cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: ‘Field-level’ case Coproduction in Australian museums</th>
<th>Phase 2: ‘Embedded’ case Casula’s Pacifica program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional bodies [PB]</td>
<td>ID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National museum/ gallery professional body</td>
<td>PB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National visual art professional body</td>
<td>PB2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National cultural development professional body</td>
<td>PB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State museum/ gallery professional body</td>
<td>PB4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State museum/ gallery professional program</td>
<td>PB5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State gallery professional body</td>
<td>PB6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State museum/ gallery professional body</td>
<td>PB7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State museum/ gallery professional body</td>
<td>PB8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State museum/ gallery professional body</td>
<td>PB9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recordings of the narrative interviews were transcribed verbatim by a contract transcriber. A similar interview script was used for all narrative interviews. All research cohorts were asked about the extent of coproduction within the Australian museum sector, the form that coproduction takes, incentives and deterrents to coproduction, the impact coproduction has on museum work and the role museum professional bodies play in relation to coproduction. For professional bodies, the interview schedule included an additional question asking participants to nominate a museum or program they considered an exemplar of museum coproduction. This question was used to identify case studies that could form the embedded case, and resulted in the identification of an exemplar case. Senior curators were also asked about the impact museum professional bodies have on coproduction in museums, as this had begun to emerge as a finding in phase 1 analysis of the narrative interviews with professional bodies. The narrative interview scripts are summarised in Table 9.

Table 9: Use of narrative interview scripts with research cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research cohort</th>
<th>Research cohort specific question</th>
<th>Generic narrative interview script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Professional bodies | Can you identify a museum that is a leader in coproduction? | **General introduction/project context**  
  • Overall what was your experience on the project?  
  • Can you give me a brief overview of how and why the project was initiated?  
  • What was your role in the project?  
| Senior curators | What impact do museum professional bodies have on coproduction in museums? | **Different forms of coproduction**  
  • How would you define the role the community played in the project?  
  • What role did the museum play in the project?  
  • How were the communities involved in the project contacted and selected?  
  • In what ways did the community participants represent their communities?  
  • In what ways did the community participants involve their communities in the project?  
  • Who benefited from the project and how?  
  • Could you describe the relationship between the museum and the communities?  
  • What did the museum and the community each contribute to the project?  
  • Were all the communities involved in the same way and at the same time?  
  • Were there any differences between the communities involved in the project?  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research cohort specific question</th>
<th>Generic narrative interview script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives and deterrents for museums to coproduce with culturally diverse communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How was the project funded and/or resourced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does a project such as this impact on the museum in terms of professional museum practice or professional standards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What impact, if any, did the museum’s OWN policies and strategic priorities have on this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What impact, if any, did policies or strategic priorities OUTSIDE the museum have on this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who were the key advocates for the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where there any opponents to the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What aspects or characteristics of the communities involved in the project supported or hindered their participation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is this the first time the museum has developed an exhibition/public program in collaboration with community groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would you describe the museum as a traditional or modern organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What aspects of the museum’s reputation do you believe the organisation is most concerned about upholding? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there aspects of the museum’s reputation that the organisation would like to change? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are your own career goals and aspirations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impact does community involvement have on the process and outcomes of museum/gallery work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When did community involvement in the project begin?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When did community involvement in the project end?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At what steps or stages in the project were the communities involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research cohort specific question</td>
<td>Generic narrative interview script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were the communities given any training or support as part of their involvement in the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What impact did community involvement have on the project’s PROCESS (i.e. the way the project was conducted)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What impact did community involvement have on the OUTCOME of the project (i.e. museum offerings)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do you see as the biggest successes or the best achievements of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What were the biggest obstacles or difficulties of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were there occasions in the project where the museum disagreed with the advice or recommendations made by community groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could the project have been undertaken without community involvement? If so, what would have been different about the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are visitors to the exhibition aware that community groups were involved in its development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What skills or characteristics does a museum need in order to work with culturally diverse communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What skills or characteristics does a community need in order to work with a museum?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has any museum sector discussion or promotion of this project been undertaken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wrap-up**

• How do you measure the success of the project and its benefits?
• Were there aspects of the project the museum was unable to achieve?
• Were there aspects of the project the community was unable to achieve?
• Is there anything further you would like to tell me about this project or experience?
• Who else would you recommend I talk to about this project?
The field-level case of museum coproduction involved narrative interviews with museum professional bodies and senior curators. These interviews were a means to determine the extent and nature of coproduction within the Australian museum and gallery sector. Museum professional bodies were questioned about the extent of coproduction in Australia to identify potential embedded cases. Research involving professional bodies and senior curators offered a form of industry checking of the findings from the literature review and contributed to the use of an abductive research strategy. This involved the use of data collected from professional bodies and senior curators to triangulate an *a priori* theoretical framework of museum coproduction that resulted from the initial literature review (Bazeley 2013). The result of this stage was an initial *a posteriori* framework of museum coproduction. This initial *a posteriori* framework was then used to analyse the data across all five research cohorts, including both the field-level case and embedded or exemplar case (museum staff, external stakeholders, and community representative).

### 3.6.1.1.1 MUSEUM PROFESSIONAL BODIES

A series of nine semi-structured interviews were conducted with managers (executive directors or program managers) of professional and advocacy bodies that support the Australian museum sector. These organisations: provide the museum and gallery sector with networking, training and professional development; contribute to government policymaking; research and evaluate the impact of museum and gallery work; and manage sector development initiatives such as standards and accreditation systems (Adler and Kwon 2013; Cowton 2009; Museums Australia n.d.). Unlike staff working within specific institutions, those employed by professional bodies bring a perspective that enables comparison between organisations, understanding of sector-wide issues and observations of trends or changes over time (DiMaggio 1991; Greenwood et al. 2002). The profile of museum professional bodies involved in this research is presented in Table 10. The participation of three national organisations ensures this research has an Australia-wide perspective.

### Table 10: Profile of participants in museum professional body research cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB1</td>
<td>National director</td>
<td>National body with combined focus on museum and gallery sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2</td>
<td>Executive director</td>
<td>National body with focus on visual arts and therefore the Australian gallery sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB3</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>National body with interest in local government work in community cultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB4</td>
<td>Executive director</td>
<td>State body with combined focus on museum and gallery sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB5</td>
<td>Senior program manager</td>
<td>State government program that enables professional development and collaboration in museum and gallery sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB6</td>
<td>Executive officer</td>
<td>State body with focus on art gallery sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11: Profile of participants in senior curator research cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Profile of museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Local government (rural) with culturally diverse constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Indigenous community art and heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>University gallery (‘young’ university with regional campuses and contemporary art collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Independent contemporary art space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Not-for-profit gallery run by craftsperson cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC6</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>University gallery (‘ivy league’ university in metropolitan location with art history collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC7</td>
<td>Department head</td>
<td>State gallery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.6.1.2 USE OF NARRATIVE RESEARCH IN EMBEDDED CASE (PHASE 2)

Narrative research interviews used to examine the embedded case of museum coproduction involved three research cohorts: museum staff; external stakeholders; and community representatives. Twenty-four participants with direct involvement in, or close observation of, Casula’s *Pacifica* program participated in this narrative research. These 24 participants are profiled and their codenames provided in Table 8. Including three cohorts in the exemplar case study ensures the case was not examined as a dyadic relationship between the museum and the community. This has enabled triangulation of the embedded case study data and ensured the case has depth and breadth (Fitzgerald and Dopson 2009). It has also ensured the case study reflects the
inherently networked notions of value creation and coproduction (Frow et al. 2014; Lusch et al. 2010; Normann and Ramírez 1993; Vargo and Lusch 2011).

3.6.1.2.1 MUSEUM STAFF

Museum staff involved in the narrative interviews were those whose salaries were paid by the museum and who worked for Casula in a professional capacity. This cohort included senior managers, program coordinators and staff from a range of functional areas across the museum. It also included other staff from the local council that managed the museum (senior executives and elected members). Members of this research cohort were identified through desk research into Casula’s organisational structure, and invited to participate in the research either by their senior manager or via direct approach from the researcher.

3.6.1.2.2 EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

External stakeholders were those engaged in a professional capacity (usually paid) by agencies and organisations with whom the case study museum collaborated. Stakeholders included representatives from other cultural organisations, funding bodies and external agencies (such as migrant resource centres and sporting organisations). These stakeholders were identified through desk research or nominated by the program coordinator employed by Casula, and were invited to participate in the research by either the researcher or *Pacifica* program coordinator.

3.6.1.2.3 COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Community representatives were from those community organisations that collaborated with the museum on the development and presentation of the *Pacifica* program. This work was usually conducted in a volunteer capacity and was part of their leadership role within their communities, often as a board or committee member of an incorporated community group. Representatives of this research cohort were identified by the *Pacifica* program coordinator, who invited them to participate in the research. Selection of the community representative research cohorts therefore relied on the program coordinator’s community knowledge and networks.

3.6.2 ARCHIVAL AND DOCUMENT METHOD

The value of archival data in organisational case study research has been highlighted, particularly for triangulating evidence (Beverland and Lindgreen 2010; Fitzgerald and Dopson 2009; Yin 2009). As well as triangulating data gained through narrative interviews, archival data has been used to develop a description of the organisation and the coproduction program examined in this case study. Data includes all publicly accessible information relating to museum professional bodies and the museums in which senior curators were currently employed. This material includes policy documents, strategic plans, exhibition programs, professional development programs and practitioner resources. Archival data collected in relation to the embedded case includes both publicly accessible material and internal working documents from
Casula. Publicly available material includes: exhibition catalogues; education kits; festival programs; public gallery terms and conditions; and exhibition reviews and media coverage. This material was provided by the museum or sourced through desk research. Internal documents used in the research include: notes of internal meetings between museum staff; minutes and agendas from curatorial advisory committee and community advisory committee meetings; and advisory committee terms of reference.

3.7 CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

3.7.1 THEMATIC ANALYSIS

The *a posteriori* framework used in this analysis was determined through the development of firstly an *a priori* museum coproduction framework (stage 1) which drew on extant literature and theory. This was then revised and expanded into an initial *a posteriori* framework using data from the narrative interviews and document research involving professional bodies and senior curators (stage 2). This data was subjected to two thematic analyses: firstly to develop the initial *a posteriori* museum coproduction framework; and secondly to investigate the field-level case. This theoretical framework was then operationalised—developed into museum coproduction guidelines (stage 6) that describe the practice of museum coproduction based on this theoretical framework. The guidelines ensure this research results in progressive performativity (Spicer et al. 2009; Wickert and Schaefer 2015) and transformative redefinition (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009) as required by CMS. They also enable cultural policy research that considers both the critical and the practical (Gibson 2008).

This thematic analysis of case study data (stages 2 and 3) conforms to Lieblich et al.’s (1998) categorical-content narrative data analysis. This involves a categorical unit of analysis in which the narrative is dissected or segmented (as opposed to a holistic unit of analysis in which the narrative is treated as a whole) and a content reading of the text which emphasises the content or meaning of the story (rather than the form of the story, for instance time lines and feelings).

Once thematic coding of the case study data was completed, the data was reanalysed to identify emergent themes (stage 4). This emergent analysis of data was designed to ‘break open’ the theoretically coded data and explore alternative meanings or constructs (Bazeley 2013). This process involved the use of QSR NVivo qualitative research data management software to run framework matrix reports which categorised the thematically coded data according to each of the five research cohorts (professional bodies, senior curators, museum staff, external stakeholders and community representatives). These framework matrix reports were then analysed to identify the constructs or themes that emerged from the data. Data was compiled into emergent categories, working from the framework matrix reports that had been exported into Microsoft Word.

This additional stage in analysis of the case study means that the approach taken in this research is closer to Yin’s (2009) iterative explanation-building approach than
Lieblich et al.’s (1998) categorical-content approach. Yin describes the iterative explanation-building process as: involving an initial theoretical statement or proposition; comparing the findings of an initial case against this statement or proposition; revising the statement or proposition; comparing other details of the case against the revision; comparing the revision to the facts of a second, third or more cases; and repeating this process as many times as needed (these last two steps required when more than one case is involved) (Yin 2009, p. 143-144).

The analysis of emergent data involved the use of a framework for initial analysis. Data was initially coded against a pre-prepared template, described as sensitising codes by Patton (2002 quoted in Bazeley 2013) rather than the use of codes generated by the data (Fitzgerald and Dopson 2009). The process through which this research has been used to build theory might be described by some scholars as grounded theory-building in that it ‘creates theory by observing patterns within systematically collected data’ (Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007, p. 30). The key distinction here is between this research design and grounded theory-building as developed by Glasner and Strauss (1967), which ignores existing theory in preference for the interpretation of meaning given by social actors (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Blaikie 2010; Creswell 2007; Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007).

### 3.7.2 ABDUCTIVE REASONING

The data analysis process described above contains a number of aspects of abductive reasoning. Abductive reasoning comprises an iterative process that involves existing theoretical understanding and empirical data, leading to a modified theoretical framework (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Blaikie 2007; Blaikie 2010; Dubois and Gadde 2014). The equal emphasis given to theory and data within abductive logic prevents the underutilisation of empirical material, a risk facing critical theory researchers (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010). Abductive logic also produces new theory through an iterative process involving both existing literature and primary data (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Bazeley 2013; Blaikie 2010), which is consistent with the aim of this research and the analytical strategy and technique it has used. Theory developed through abduction meets the requirement of Alvesson and Sandberg (2011, p. 247) that ‘theories should demonstrate both novelty and continuity; they must differ from and at the same time be connected to the established literature in order to be seen as meaningful’.

The means by which data analysis led to the interpretation of findings (stage 5) involved an intuitive process that was influenced by the bricolage employed by the researcher and drew on: the stance from which the research was approached; in-depth investigation of a highly contextualised case study; use of diverse theories and literature; an abductive research strategy that allowed the influence of both theory and data; the process of writing; and the researcher’s own reflexivity. Cornelissen (2016) describes the style of theorising used in this research as pattern description, which involves abstracting from the particular to more abstract patterns.
3.7.3 MEMBER CHECKING

Member checking (Stake 1995) or respondent validation (Bazeley 2013) with research participants in relation to Casula’s exemplar Pacifica program was also undertaken. This process was designed to enable research participants to comment on the accuracy and credibility of the account, and ensure that the representation of the research findings preserved the social meanings offered by research. Seeking feedback from participants in the research ensured critical theory’s concerns regarding the power relationship between researcher and participants has been addressed (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009; Keleman and Rumens 2008) and ensured the research is not ‘highly utopian’ (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009).

3.7.4 NETWORK MAPPING

Affiliation network mapping was used to map and illustrate the social connections of research participants involved in the Pacifica program. The interest in this analysis of data resulted from the concept of a cultural intermediary (Bourdieu 1984; Durrer and Miles 2009) or cultural broker (Kurin 1997). These roles facilitate partnerships between museums and communities, and potentially affect a museum’s capacity to coproduce (Crabbe 2007; Davies 2010; Durrer and Miles 2009; Newman and McLean 2006). The affiliations of research participants were illustrated and mapped using the qualitative analysis software Netdraw, part of the UCInet package. The data used to produce this visualisation of participants’ affiliations was drawn from the narrative interviews.

3.8 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

A single case study can attract criticism for a lack of generalisability. However, Dyer and Wilkins suggest ‘the more contexts a researcher investigates, the less contextual insight he or she can communicate’ (1991, p. 614). In advocating for the contribution made by a single case study, Flyvberg (2006) advises that in the social sciences depth, as well as breadth, is necessary for the development of the field.

The member checking undertaken for this research was constrained due to organisational circumstances at Casula at the time of reporting. Only senior museum staff provided feedback on the reporting of research findings. This was due to a reluctance from management to consult too widely about the research findings due to the discontinuation of Pacifica in 2015. Nonetheless, gaining feedback from museum staff through the member-checking process was useful in achieving critical performativity, ensuring that research moves beyond the cynicism (Spicer et al. 2009) or critical antagonism (Wickert and Schaefer 2015) that pervades CMS. Member checking with museum staff enabled micro-engagement (Wickert and Schaefer 2015) with the managers whose practice this research is most likely to affect. As it eventuated, the limited member checking that did occur resulted in the museum offering identified as the embedded case. This offer was accepted and the confidentiality conditions relating to the ethics approval for this research were revised (section 3.10).
The use of social network mapping in this research was modified from that originally envisaged. During narrative interviews in relation to the embedded case, participants were asked to identify up to 14 individuals they had directly interacted with as part of *Pacifica*. This survey also asked participants if they had interacted with artefacts or collection material during the project, with the intention of introducing actor network theory (ANT) to the research method (Latour 2007). The intended use of ANT was the result of literature suggesting that contact with collection material was a point of contention within museum coproduction, being a primary driver of community participation and point of resistance from museum staff (Ang 2005; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010). The narrative research participants offered too small a sample size to enable social network mapping, resulting in a modified approach which was to profile the affiliations of research participants. Less formal analysis of the social networks involved in the embedded case was possible from data collected through narrative interviews.

Many of the community representatives and external stakeholders involved in the embedded case were accessed through the museum. This arrangement raises a number of questions about the potential gatekeeper role played by the museum. The adoption of a subjectivist and critical theory stance highlights this arrangement as a potential research limitation, particularly in relation to the perspectives gained through this research and the potential for bias.

### 3.9 RESEARCH TRUSTWORTHINESS

Alvesson and Ashcroft acknowledge the pervasiveness of qualitative approaches in CMS which, ‘debunk images of objective researchers safely insulated in experimental environments … critical theory cultivates deep suspicion of research motives like prediction and control, of research tools that mechanise human action and erase the inherent contingency of meaning’ (2009, p. 63). Rather than respond to the criticisms of single case study research according to the positivist and quantitative research preferences of their authors (for example Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007; Yin 2009), it is important to determine criteria of research quality that provide consistency and alignment with the stance adopted by this qualitative research (Bazeley 2013; Blaikie 2010; Dubois and Gadde 2014).

In qualitative case study research such as this current study, a key determinant of quality research is construct validity—formulating the correct operational measures for the concepts being studied (Yin 2009). Internal validity (establishing causal relationships) and external validity (defining the domain to which findings can be generalised) (Yin 2009) are not indications of quality or trustworthiness relevant to this research (Fitzgerald and Dopson 2009). The reliability of research is determined by the extent to which a later investigator could replicate the same case study and arrive at the same findings (Yin 2009). Reliability is most frequently determined according to the documentation of research processes and strategies. Fitzgerald and Dopson (2009) caution against replication as a quality criterion in case study design due to the dynamic nature of organisations. The approaches which particularly vouch
for the validity, reliability and minimisation of bias in the current study are triangulation of results, transparency of process and member checking.

Triangulation involves obtaining one or more other sources of data and considering the inferences this alternative data provides (Bazeley 2013). Triangulation is a feature of the embedded case study design involved in this current research. Triangulation was enabled by investigating both field-level and embedded cases. Within each of these cases, the involvement of more than one research cohort provided additional triangulation. Additionally, each case used multiple forms of evidence by collecting both narrative and document data. This embedded case study approach and use of multiple research cohorts in each case have resulted in both internal and external triangulation of the case study.

The use of abductive research, which moves iteratively between literature and empirical data, enabled theoretical triangulation (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010). In other words, the case study was compared to the theoretical models provided through the a priori and then a posteriori framework of museum coproduction. The use of abduction is evidence of the iterative nature of this research. The iterative nature of qualitative research is emphasised in robust research design (Bansal and Corley 2012; Gephart 2004)

Transparency of the research process was provided through the clear explanation of process that explains how the research has been conducted and the findings have been reached (Bazeley 2013). The current chapter is an important demonstration of this transparency. The complexity of data analysis and interpretation also requires that critical self-reflection is reported as part of the transparency of the research. This self-reflection includes awareness of the personal biography and role of the researcher, as well as clarity of the stance (epistemology and paradigm), both of which are reported in this current chapter.

Subjectivist and critical theory research also places emphasis on co-created research in which participants are involved in confirming the conclusions drawn by the researcher (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Bazeley 2013; Manning 1997; Stake 1995). Member checking involves seeking feedback from those involved in the study in terms of the findings and conclusions. This criterion of research quality has particular resonance with this current study given that it investigates coproduction; the egalitarian principles of joint practice apply equally to the topic of this research and the stance it takes. This current study’s use of member checking in stage 3 of the research process demonstrates a commitment to co-created research.

3.9.1 BIAS

This doctoral research has used a number of approaches to mitigate the risks of bias. Source bias was managed through the participation of a range of different research cohorts. Bias in terms of the researcher’s manipulation of findings was managed through collaborative research processes and the preservation of social meaning in the reporting of findings.
Bias in data collection refers to the informant’s interest in skewing the information made available to the researcher, and may be a conscious or unconscious act (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010). Concerns regarding bias in data were minimised in this research through the participation of a number of different research cohorts. The field-level case involved two cohorts, while the embedded case involved three cohorts. These research cohorts provided different perspectives on the research topic, resulting in the collection of ‘counter-bias’ or neutral positions (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010).

Collaborative research is one means of mitigating bias on the part of the researcher. Peer debriefing and consensual validation are strategies for managing researcher bias (Bazeley 2013). Although doctoral research is largely a singular task, the involvement of a supervisory panel and doctoral requirements such as confirmation and colloquial presentations enable some level of peer debriefing. Member checking also managed bias, as well as establishing the validity of research findings.

Preserving the social contexts and lived experiences of research participants in the reporting of research is also a means of addressing researcher bias. This ensures the research presents the voices of the research participants, rather than that of the researcher. The aim of qualitative research to capture thick and detailed descriptions (Creswell 2007; Flyvbjerg 2006; Gephart 2004) is therefore a means of managing bias. This current research therefore quotes extensively from narrative interviews in order to preserve social meaning. Just as coproduction and new museology aim to give voice to culturally diverse communities, this research seeks to give voice to the research participants.

### 3.10 ETHICS CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical issues which could potentially be associated with this study were identified and addressed in the initial design and subsequent conduct of the study using Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee guidelines. As this research is considered low risk—‘the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort’ of the participants (National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia, 2007)—ethics approval was sought and obtained from the Human Ethics Advisory Groups (HEAGs) for the Faculty of Business and Law (BL-EC 27-13). This research follows all of the ethics requirements and protocols, including obtaining the informed consent of participants. Participants were presented with a detailed description of the process and given full authority to withdraw from the process at any stage.

Changes to the anonymity of the embedded case study required an update to this ethics approval midway through the project. Following the member-checking process, Casula offered to be identified as the exemplar examined in this research. Once ethics approval was received for this change, all research participants in the embedded case were advised of the alteration and given the opportunity to withdraw; none withdrew from the study. Revision to the ethics approval also required changes to the reporting on the Casula staff involved in the research; hence no profile of the museum staff is provided in this thesis (Error! Reference source not found.) to ensure the anonymity of these research participants.
3.11 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has detailed the research methodology employed and the positioning and stance adopted. It has then presented a number of key theories and concepts that underpin the approach adopted in this study. The research process has then been detailed, concluding with a discussion of the limitations of the research methodology, as well as the issue of rigour addressed by the researcher.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

4.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the findings from the embedded case study of coproduction in Australian museums. While these outcomes are reported here as a single and final set of findings, they result from the staged and iterative research process described in Chapter 3. Findings are integrated under each research question.

To consolidate findings from the various phases of this doctoral research, this chapter is structured as follows. The embedded case is described and the rationale given for its exemplar status. Findings are then presented for the three research questions. These outcomes integrate findings from the field-level and embedded cases examined in this study.

4.2 PACIFICA AS AN EXEMPLAR

The embedded case investigated in this doctoral research, Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre, was identified by professional bodies as an exemplar in that it is an Australian leader in museum coproduction. Two national bodies (PB1 and PB2) and one state body (PB7) specifically identified Casula as an exemplary illustration of museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities. This is due to the fact that it is a local government museum, responsive to its local communities and located in a region with high levels of cultural diversity. A state professional body (PB7) highlighted Casula’s innovative and distinctive programming work, noting that it is not restricted by norms or conventions within the museum field. Professional bodies (PB2, PB6, PB8) also indicated that coproduction is not widely practised in Australian museums.

4.3 PACIFICA VIGNETTE

Casula initiated the Pacifica program in 2010 as a celebration of art and culture from the diverse nations and territories of the Pacific region: Polynesia (New Zealand, Samoa, Tonga, Hawaii, Tuvalu, Cook Islands); Melanesia (Papua New Guinea, Torres Strait Islands, Fiji, Vanuatu); and Micronesia (Nauru, Kiribati, Marshall Islands).

Figure 9: Location of Casula in relation to Greater Sydney
Casula is located in western Sydney and managed by Liverpool City Council. It is a multi-disciplinary arts centre that includes six galleries (with changing exhibitions produced and presented by Casula Powerhouse), a 326-seat theatre, artist studios, Clayhouse Ceramics Studio, live-in facilities for artists, and collection storage facility. Casula is a museum with a disciplinary emphasis on contemporary art; as such it can also be referred to as a contemporary art gallery. Located on Tharawal country, Casula is surrounded by two kilometres of open space along the banks of the Georges River.

All staff at Casula are Council employees. The Centre has a Board composed of Councillors, community members and key Council staff who advise on operations. The centre is housed in a decommissioned power station and was opened as an arts centre in 1994. In addition to Council resources Casula receives funding from the NSW state government through Arts NSW.

According to 2011 census data, the Fijian community was the largest and fastest-growing overseas community in Liverpool, and the municipality was home to large and growing communities from New Zealand, Samoa and Tonga (Profile.id 2014). As a local government facility, Casula is responsive to the local community (Liverpool City Council n.d.-b). It also has a regional arts facility role and is strategically involved in building a positive image of Sydney’s west, undertaking tourism and economic development, and providing opportunities and networks for artists and cultural leaders.

![Figure 10: Festival audience (2014 Pacifica Gods)](image)

While Pacifica was coordinated by a permanent, full-time staff member, it involved collaboration with staff from across the museum and council, as well as external agencies and the broader Pacific Islander community. The staff member who coordinated Pacifica is of Samoan cultural background and brought extensive cultural and community knowledge and networks to the role. Although lacking the formal arts qualifications of the other museum staff, the coordinator was deeply embedded in their cultural background and had a long history of involvement in Pacific Island arts and
cultural programming. Their leadership within the Pacific Island community was likely strengthened through a family lineage as orators or ‘talking chiefs’.

As well as participating in the staging and delivery of Pacifica events and activities, Pacific Island communities were formally involved in the initiative through official advisory committee structures, with both a Curatorial Advisory Committee and Community Advisory Committee established to support the program. However, the coordinator suggested that community involvement in Pacifica was actually less structured than these governance structures suggest, expressing the view that formal committees result in ‘clutter’ and have the potential to interfere with collaborative processes. There was evidence of extensive work undertaken to develop grassroots community involvement and support for Pacifica.

Figure 11: Oceanic art exhibition (2014 Pacifica Gods)

Pacifica was a multi-art platform including an exhibition, festival and series of public programs. It included visual and performing arts, and encapsulated both traditional and contemporary arts and cultural practices. Figure 11 illustrates the exhibition of traditional cultural material as part of the 2014 Pacifica Gods program, while Figure 12 illustrates contemporary art offerings in the same program. The Pacifica Barbecue was seen as a highlight of the program, offering traditionally cooked food such as hangi (Māori), umu (Samoan) and lovo (Fijian).

The initiative ran for five years, and each year Pacifica involved a distinct theme: Body Pacifica (2010), Niu Warrior (2011), Pacifica Power (2012), Navigation Pacifica (2013) and Pacifica Gods (2014). The program attracted a very large Pacific Islander audience, particularly from western Sydney. The audience for the 2014 Pacifica Gods festival is illustrated in Figure 10. Drawing audiences from the city (inner Sydney) to Liverpool is a key aim of Casula’s economic development role as a regional arts centre.
The 2014 *Pacifica Gods* program was the last *Pacifica*. The coordinating staff member resigned from the position in early 2015 and the program ceased. Museum staff later suggested this resignation was the result of significant curatorial and community pressures the program had faced during *Pacifica Gods*. Some sections of the community had become less supportive of the program, with claims that it favoured Samoan cultural content and representation. Casula staff also suggested the *Pacifica* program model had been adopted by other venues and was no longer unique or innovative. Pacific Island cultural initiatives such as the traditional barbecue were continued through other opportunities, such as Casula’s 21st birthday celebrations in 2015.

4.4 RQ1: HOW DOES MUSEUM COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY COMMUNITIES MANIFEST?

This section presents final findings relating to the manifestation of coproduction in museums. The *a priori* themes identified are highlighted in orange in Figure 13.

---

**Figure 12: Marsden Community Gallery (2014 *Pacifica Gods*)**

**Figure 13: Summary of themes relating to manifestation of coproduction in museums**
4.4.1 NOTIONS OF VALUE

4.4.1.1 VALUE AS EXCHANGED

The notion of value being embedded in products or services that a museum exchanges with customers (section 2.4.1.1) is evident within this case study. From this perspective, museums are required to embed value in the exhibitions and public programs they offer to audiences. At a field level it was acknowledged that museum practice could involve ‘just putting stuff on the walls and saying I am the arbiter of taste and you either get it or you don’t’ (SC6). Casula also worked to a traditional value exchange model, which involves developing visual art exhibitions in which curators embed value for an audience. One staff member commented:

a lot of our programs here at the Centre revolve around really the visual arts and that basic of doing the theoretical research and academic research, finding artists that suit themes. Or we might … just have an artist that we really want to work with, who are doing really exciting things and we know that people want to see. (MS4)

4.4.1.2 VALUE AS RELATIONAL

This case study has also found evidence of museum coproduction in which value was conceptualised as relational—requiring interaction between the museum and its communities or audiences (section 2.4.1.2). At a field level this included facilitating value co-creation for audiences, as well as providing value-in-use through direct interaction with audiences. Facilitation of co-created value included audiences:

coming to see the [gallery’s] collection … that could be something that an individual comes to experience on their own … we don’t get in the middle of that. That might be something quite personal to each person who wants to come and perhaps ponder an artwork for an afternoon on their own terms. (SC7)

The museum becoming part of the audience’s value creation through direct interaction took the form of ‘thinking about people and how they can be involved in the work of an organisation and get their voice included’ (SC7). Within Casula’s Pacifica program, relational value was emphasised in terms of facilitating audiences’ value co-creation. An external stakeholder described their work as:

looking at what are the outcomes with every single group and targeting those specific outcomes a little bit more intensely, rather than just having an overall project and doing the same for everybody … we’re really individualising or trying to individualise the experience for every single group. (ES1)

Discussions of relational value also identified a joint practice approach to museum coproduction, acknowledging the work museums do within a service ecosystem and the notion of communities as actors or stakeholders, rather than just audiences. At a field level this was discussed in terms of collaboration with a community to address:
content that is a multi-layered, deep, complex issue and the involvement in the community served to bring out many aspects of that complexity and the depth and the feelings and emotions … To that extent I think we got a significant change in exhibitions from being purely didactic explanations of something. (PB5)

Within *Pacifica* a museum staff member suggested:

if you’re claiming to deliver a program that is about a specific community … there’s not really any way to do it other than to collaborate with them and to seek the guidance and advice to make sure that you are … delivering a program that is relevant to that community. (MS8)

4.4.1.3 PUBLIC VALUE

Museums are publicly funded organisations and Casula is managed by Liverpool City Council. Therefore the notion of public value (section 2.4.1.3)—value which is delivered into the public realm and acknowledged by both upstream and downstream audiences—is relevant to this organisation. At a field level this was acknowledged by the senior curator, who made a link between coproduction, relevance and government funding: ‘I would say [coproduction is] probably good from a funding perspective in that if we’re relevant, then we’re more prevalent and obviously having a lot of visitors is great’ (SC7).

Within Casula, a senior council manager noted the need for the museum to meet the requirements of both upstream and downstream audiences. Highlighting ratepayers as a segment of downstream audiences, he commented, ‘cultural services are … a cost in terms of a ratepayer input. But the benefits you can’t measure. They’re enormous. And I guess the success of CPAC and the museum to a lesser extent makes my job far, far easier in demonstrating what those benefits are’ (MS6).

4.4.2 COMMUNITY ROLE IN MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

4.4.2.1 COMMUNITY AS STAKEHOLDER

One role communities can take when coproducing with a museum is that of stakeholder (section 2.4.2.2). A stakeholder role enables the community to be more central to the museum and its work. As a stakeholder, the community has greater influence and can make more substantial contributions to the programs that are being coproduced.

The community is more likely to have a stakeholder role when the coproduction they are involved in takes on a collaborative approach. At a field level, a curator acknowledged the community acting in a stakeholder role when describing coproduction as, ‘collaboration, it’s definitely aware that each of the parts is different and distinct from each other and has to work together in order for the whole machine to work’ (SC6). Collaborative approaches enabled communities greater self-expression in the contribution they made to coproduced exhibitions and public programs because ‘[coproduction] changes the anonymity of voice in museums … It’s
not just a matter of crediting a particular community, it’s a matter of museums having changed their notion of voice, not speaking in the abstract but from one’s heart’ (PB1). Coproduction acknowledged the authority and expertise of the community, thereby requiring ‘a collaborative relationship with communities and acknowledgement that the communities were the ones who held the knowledge’ (PB9). Collaborative approaches also provide communities with control over their contributions to coproduced work: ‘in terms of engaging the community, the critical fact of that was that we were prepared to show the work of the community and not edit it and not try and shape it or curate it to our own satisfaction’ (SC5). The result of collaborative forms of coproduction was authentic and distinctive exhibitions and public programs, as ‘the visitor experience that could result from the coproduction was richer, deeper and altogether significantly better than could be produced by standalone processes dominated by a curator’ (PB5).

The influence of new museology is evident in discussions about the stakeholder role played by communities. The appeal of collaborative forms of coproduction lies in the fact that, when the community takes on a stakeholder role, museum exhibitions and public programs become more dialectic, the complexity of cultural diversity is acknowledged and the power imbalance between the museum and its communities is addressed. The head of one professional body noted that coproduction shifts museum practice towards the ideals captured within new museology in that it:

removes the power differential between the person who owns and manages the space and the person who just fills it up and changes it to … both of us bring assets. [The community] bring a culture and knowledge, we bring the institution and that professional training—and we share it. It’s an empowerment for both of us … which is probably a new way of thinking than the olden day of museums where you’d go and take heads from dead people and display heads, or steal the Elgin Marbles and display those, and you actually didn’t care about the people you took it from. (PB3)

Within *Pacifica*, museum staff and external stakeholders acknowledged that, when filling a stakeholder role, the community was involved in collaborative forms of coproduction which resulted in a higher level of input in the development of exhibitions and public programs. One museum staff member observed that, ‘to overcome some of that “muting” of the community, I think for *Pacifica* it’s been particularly important that we allow that collaborative process as much as possible and allow the voices to come through with all the challenges that that entails’ (MS1).

Community representatives were very specific in reporting that they contributed to *Pacifica* as stakeholders. Their stakeholder role was essential because as source communities they embody the Pacific; as a number reported, ‘we are *Pacifica*’ (CR1, CR4). The complexity of cultural knowledge and skills demanded a collaborative approach to coproduction and the community’s involvement as stakeholders. As one community member noted:

Within the Pacific, we are similar and our similarity connects us as the Pacific people. But when you drill down, we are unique again. The approach has to be collaborative because within those nations are a
different culture, people, language, so you need to be aware of that and so the approach is quite different within those different communities itself. (CR7)

The community’s stakeholder involvement in *Pacifica* meant they were able to utilise the program for their own purposes, particularly to facilitate cultural practice and cultural maintenance. Museum coproduction enabled community members with cultural skills and knowledge ‘to come and share, because without sharing it’s going to just die there. It was great to do that for the community … share with them about something that we all love but we all don’t understand how it comes together’ (CR6). Because the community contributed to *Pacifica* as a stakeholder and participated in collaborative processes, they increased the museum’s capacity to deliver exhibitions and public programs that were authentic and distinctive, as the representation of diverse cultures requires ‘a third eye, you need some other viewpoint, otherwise it’s one-directional’ (CR5).

**4.4.2.2 COMMUNITY AS AUDIENCE**

When coproducing with a museum, the community can also take on the role of *audience* (section 2.4.2.1). The community’s audience role is apparent in coproduction’s links to marketing and visitation. Increasing attendance is a major motivator for museums to coproduce. At a field level one curator cited examples of coproduction that were ‘big exhibitions around students’ work and of course the first thing that they recognised was that it was one of the biggest visitation periods for non-paying shows that the gallery had ever had’ (SC5). Within *Pacifica*, staff and stakeholders also identified coproduction as a means to increase visitation and engage audiences. One staff member suggested:

> [the community] make it successful. Obviously there’s the content and all that stuff and the background and all that. But the biggest contribution if you think of it is they’re embracing it by actually coming to it. I think it was four thousand people there, it shows, but that turns around and says to us as policymakers that it’s worked. (MS7)

The assumption that the community was an audience for museum coproduction was so strong at both field and case levels that there was a tendency to conflate the concepts of audience and community. For example, the head of a professional body described the aim of coproduction as ‘increased audiences and I think the outcome would be very much about wanting to do more than present work, but I think it would be more about re-engaging and engaging with the community’ (PB6).

Community representatives also identified their audience role as a means of ensuring *Pacifica* contributed to cultural maintenance. It was suggested that audiences drawn from the community:

> need to come to *Pacifica* and it stays alive. So it’s, like, advertised throughout the community and so people that aren’t in community groups or anything get to come along and watch. Because we have a lot of Samoan people that aren’t really involved with Samoan activities anymore. (CR4)
The distinction between the community’s *audience* and *stakeholder* roles is not necessarily clear-cut. Two museum stakeholders (ES3 and ES5) offered a means by which these roles were connected and, when combined, resulted in unique experiences for museum visitors. The term ‘communitas’—the joy experienced in a shared experience and sense of fellowship (Turner 2012)—was used by one (ES5) to describe the role played by the community in *Pacifica*. Another suggested that the presence of the community as an audience ensured the exhibition or public program was culturally authentic and endorsed:

> if there was no audience from the Pacific community, then it would just be blah, a bit like interior decorating. If there was no Pacific audiences, it would be white—sorry. There’s nothing wrong with white, but it would just be exotic and it wouldn’t have any meaning beyond something different and exotic and appealing. (ES3)

### 4.4.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MUSEUM AND COMMUNITY

#### 4.4.3.1 RECEPTIVE RELATIONSHIPS

##### 4.4.3.1.1 ENHANCED ENGAGEMENT

The community’s audience role resulted in receptive relationships between the museum and community (section 2.4.3.1). A purely *spectating* relationship, in which the community passively attends museum exhibitions and public programs, was not acknowledged as a form of museum coproduction. *Enhanced engagement*—requiring conceptual engagement with an exhibition or public program (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) or some level of audience participation (Simon 2010)—was acknowledged at both field and case levels.

Two distinct approaches to enhanced engagement have emerged from this research: marketing-led and curatorial-led. Marketing-led approaches involved responsiveness to community needs and interests, and were designed to result in higher visitation. Curatorial-led approaches were responsive to the subject matter of the exhibition or public program, and designed to highlight the unique and distinctive nature of the cultural content.

At a field level, evidence of marketing-led approaches to enhanced engagement included one senior curator’s recollection of a coproduction initiative:

> these people have never been here before, they are genuinely excited to be here … and they’re coming into the gallery for the first time. Then obviously what we hoped would go on is that they will feel comfortable enough to come back and bring their friends and family back into the institution that has welcomed them. (SC5)

Within *Pacifica*, marketing-led approaches to enhanced engagement included a museum staff member highlighting the link between engagement and visitation in noting, ‘we’re kind of like a destination arts centre, which means you have to really be meaning to go here. … when we get four thousand people here on one day for Barbecue
**Pacifica**, those people are here because they’ve come here on purpose, they’ve come here in a posse, they want to have an experience’ (MS5).

Acknowledgement of curatorial-led approaches to enhanced engagement at a field level included the observation by a senior curator that, ‘we’re trying to give them experiences now that are aesthetic and meaningful, engaging, and challenging’ (SC7). Curatorial-led approaches acknowledged within *Pacifica* included discussion of the link between community engagement and the curatorial process: ‘at the ethos of what makes Casula distinctive from any other [museum] is that we try and program with and within our community, not just for [the community] (MS1).

Casula’s use of enhanced engagement reveals that this work was a tool for audience development, enabling them to deepen, broaden and diversify audiences for *Pacifica* (Harlow 2014; Mc Carthy and Jinnett 2001; Parker 2012). The notion of deepening audiences (enriching their experience of museum exhibitions and public programs) was acknowledged in that, ‘when you have that amount of time to really go deep and also you bring the audience with you and you develop them through providing opportunities to engage with something in a new way’ (MS5). Evidence of broadening audiences (encouraging them to explore different art forms) includes the suggestion that coproduction was useful for:

> getting people into the centre just in general, they discover what we have here … We’re a multi-faceted, multi-disciplinary centre that will offer a lot of things to everyone in the community. So by people being introduced to Casula Powerhouse, they can see the ongoing benefits of engaging with us. (MS8)

The emphasis in Casula’s use of enhanced engagement as a tool for audience development was on diversifying arts audiences. This involves changing the demographic profile of audiences and attracting those who are traditionally non-attenders. As one staff member noted, ‘in western Sydney in particular, because we have a completely different sort of demographic than we have in the east … [It’s] a sporting sort of a community, so it’s not the arts and culture so to speak. It is sort of bringing a foreign concept into this area’ (MS7). The value of *Pacifica* in making the museum accessible to new arts audiences was reinforced by a community member who suggested, ‘they pulled in the *Pacifica* idea because of the community … trying to broaden the horizons of art not just for the Western society, but to bring in more of that multicultural pool. They really worked on the diversity of Liverpool and the community’ (CR5).

An important emphasis made by community representatives was the complexity of enhanced engagement. Other than one senior curator [SC6], this was the only cohort that gave examples of this type of coproduction that had struggled or failed. Although it sits at the lower end of the audience involvement spectrum and is a receptive rather than participatory form of coproduction (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011), enhanced engagement is not without risk. Reasons for failed use of enhanced engagement include incorrect assumptions about community interest (SC6, CR7, CR2), need to involve community from the initial stages of a project (CR2), difficulty of making
contemporary art relevant to a community (CR3) and need to extend community interest beyond their immediate community or network (CR3).

4.4.3.2 PARTICIPATORY RELATIONSHIPS

4.4.3.2.1 CROWDSOURCING

Professional bodies and curators identified *crowdsourcing* as one form of participatory relationship between the community and museum when they coproduced (section 2.4.3.2.1). Crowdsourcing is distinct from enhanced engagement in that it involves the community as a collective, rather than individuals. It requires their involvement in the planning and development of exhibitions and public programs, rather than simply partaking in museum offerings. A professional body identified crowdsourcing as an early approach to coproduction in museums:

institutions were starting to contact communities related to cultural content in their programs. For example, if the State Gallery in New South Wales were having an Indian program … It attempted to make contact with that community to make sure that those communities that made up the local Indian community engaged with what was being put on. (PB1)

Crowdsourcing was identified as an approach to coproduction used within *Pacifica*. One stakeholder observed the range of consultation, networking and programming skills involved in crowdsourcing:

when someone like [program coordinator] and his team are going to program or develop a program for a Pacific festival, there’s no way that’s something they can dream up in their own heads alone. There’s no way this festival would happen without the consultation, talking and working with different sections of the community as well … They basically have to consult across all these different pockets of Pacific community and society in order to get the formula right. (ES5)

4.4.3.2.2 CO-CREATION

A range of co-creative approaches to museum coproduction (section 0) were acknowledged by professional bodies and senior curators. *Co-creation* involved exhibitions and public programs that incorporated cultural material from communities (PB9, PB8); family groups making works that were displayed within a gallery or shared on social media (SC7, SC4); and exhibitions of local artists or local collections (SC3, PB4, SC5, SC2). Co-creative approaches to coproduction were seen to: offer a way of negotiating controversial subjects and differing perspectives (PB9); increase museum resources (PB9, PB4, PB8); and present more complex interpretations (PB9).

Co-creative relationships were the most prevalent form of participatory coproduction used in *Pacifica*. Examples of the use of co-creation include workshops, collaborative art installations, exhibitions by community artists, displays of cultural material from the community, education programs, performances and food prepared in a traditional manner. Co-creative approaches required the community to supply ideas, support and...
involvement to the coproduced initiative. The emphasis placed on co-creation included one staff member’s observation that:

if [the community] don’t take ownership of it, it’s not going to happen, it’s going to fail … you could throw a hundred thousand dollars on a festival but if the community is not taking ownership of that festival, it’s going to fail. If it’s not coming from the community and community owned, community run, then really it will lose its relevance, it has no connection, there is no foundation for it to grow and continue. (MS2)

4.4.3.2.3 COMMUNITY-AS-CURATOR

A community-as-curators approach to coproduction (also referred to as audience-as-artist, see section 2.4.3.2.3) was described by a professional body as, ‘approaching communities and inviting them in, in a much more open way, to use public facilities in ways that they wanted to do in showcasing their cultural concerns’ (PB1). A number of professional bodies and curators (PB1, PB9, SC5, SC1, SC6, SC4, PB5) offered ‘community access galleries’ as examples of community-as-curators approaches to coproduction—spaces within museums which community groups programmed and where they could present exhibitions of their choosing.

Within Pacifica, community-as-curators approaches to coproduction were acknowledged that involved highly collaborative relationships between the museum and community. These approaches were grounded in community development work and emphasised coproduction as a means to build the community’s skills and capacity. The ability of groups to function in a community-as-curator capacity was the aim of these initiatives, rather than the starting point. The following detailed account of this approach to coproduction is echoed in a number of interviews with museum staff (MS1, MS2, MS5, MS8):

What I’m doing now with [community member], she wants to put together something like a Pacific variety show … But she had no idea where to start. So her first port of call was to come here … We give her the space, we give her the time and then just see what comes out of it, so just check up every now and then. If she needs us more she can contact us more, if she needs us less we can back off a bit. But the point is to let her and the community create the ideas that culminate in what she wants to achieve, but guide her and let her know that we are there to support her if she needs it. So it really starts off with space, it starts off with time, tech support, really anything and then guidance, and then just drop in every now and then to be like a third eye and see how it can expand and grow, and how we can support it more. That’s something that we always do and we’ve done it for a long time, but that’s just one example of how we do that. (MS3)

Casula also offers a community access space called the Marsden Gallery. This gallery is described in its Terms and Conditions Policy as being for exhibitions ‘produced by community members of the Liverpool region’ (Liverpool City Council n.d.-a, p. 1). Unlike the collaborative process described by MS3 above, emphasised in these terms
and conditions is the independent nature of communities using the Marsden Gallery space.

4.4.4 BENEFICIARIES OF COPRODUCTION

4.4.4.1 MUSEUM BENEFITS

An important beneficiary of coproduction was the museum itself. The benefits from coproduction received by the museum are emphasised in the data collected for this case study. Museum benefits from coproduction were twofold: increased cultural resources that led to higher quality exhibitions and public programs; and acknowledgement that museums deliver relevant and valued public services.

Coproduction increased the resources available to the museum, particularly cultural skills and knowledge held within the community. Access to these resources enhanced the intrinsic quality of museum exhibitions and public programs. One external stakeholder noted that *Pacifica* involved, ‘making sure that what [Casula is] presenting is of excellence and it’s reflecting the culture authentically’ (ES7).

The museum benefits that received the greatest attention in narrative interviews were those framed in terms of public value. The museum was seen to benefit from coproduction when government and funding bodies received evidence of its value to communities and audiences. An external stakeholder observed that Casula benefited from coproduction, ‘because you’re getting numbers through the door. And it’s like, unfortunately we have to look at the stats and if nobody’s coming to your institution, your institution is not going to last’ (ES4). A curator recalled the benefits of coproduction for a museum she had worked for at a time when it may have been politically vulnerable: ‘the numbers were really low and, apart from the big blockbusters of the day, the rest of the time you’ve got this massive institution, this massive staff, and realistically the numbers just were not stacking up’ (SC5).

The notion that coproduction enables museums to ‘tick the box’ in terms of government priorities and funding requirements was a recurring theme. A high level of cynicism was associated with these benefits of coproduction. The challenge for museums is therefore to have a stronger and deeper rationale for coproduction. An external stakeholder (employed by an arts funding agency) highlighted the value of *Pacifica* by noting, ‘this stuff doesn’t just tick boxes but it really encapsulates when we talk about cultural diversity, artistic vibrancy, when we talk about socially engaged work and community relevance, that’s very much what the Pacific program aims to do’ (ES5, emphasis added). A museum staff member suggested the need to do more than meet funding requirements was part of *Pacifica*’s motivation: ‘I suppose for us here at Casula and my programs I think we, you know, we tick the boxes but there’s always room for improvement’ (MS9, emphasis added). A community representative suggested that the value of *Pacifica* was that Casula’s commitment to the program was deeper than the need to meet government funding criteria. Citing poor examples of community engagement, she noted, ‘all communities have had it, they’ve been consulted ’til the cows come home. I enjoy those moments going to consultation, I
enjoy seeing how effective it is. Is this a genuine consultation or is it I need to *tick this box* because that’s what the funding requires?’ (CR2, emphasis added).

### 4.4.4.2 COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Coproduction was seen to benefit communities by providing them with access to exhibitions and public programs that were more culturally inclusive. At both a field level and within *Pacifica*, the community benefits of coproduction included broader and more inclusive cultural representation. One museum staff member noted coproduction ensured, ‘the arts are reflecting of a community and are not something that is removed from the direct experience of everyday Australians and people’ (MS5).

At a field level, the community benefits of coproduction were emphasised in terms of reforming museum practice to align with new museology. Representing diverse cultures within a professional museum space was seen to validate that community, providing it with respect and recognition, ‘the sense that the artwork produced by this community, whatever it is, that it belongs in the mainstream in the formal institution would be beneficial, it would be culturally reinforcing, I would imagine, for that group’ (PB3). Coproduction empowered the community, shifting the dynamics that have traditionally existed between museums and their communities. A senior curator suggested that advocates for museum coproduction would be ‘people who have a more democratic view of who owns gallery spaces and museum spaces and what they’re there for’ (SC2).

Coproduction also benefited the community by delivering a range of community development outcomes. In particular, it increased the skills and capacity of the community. Coproducing with museums improves general community wellbeing and connectedness in that ‘it can help establish that sense of ownership and wellbeing and the sense of feeling a genuine part of a community … and knowing that part of your community has contributed to that project will give you a stronger sense of belonging, I think’ (SC3).

For the community representatives involved in *Pacifica*, the arts and cultural benefits they received from the initiative were paramount. The opportunity to practise and maintain their culture was the key benefit communities sought from museum coproduction. One community member described her motivation as:

> really wanting to help young Pacific Islanders in Sydney find themselves, and the best way to do that is to teach the fundamentals of culture. A lot of times our parents would think that they’re teaching us the culture, but in actual fact they’re just doing these cultural activities but they’re not explaining to us properly what it actually means. (CR3)

### 4.4.4.3 MUTUAL BENEFITS (PROVIDER AND EXTERNAL PARTY)

Coproduction was also described as providing *mutual benefits* to the museum and community. This was acknowledged by a senior curator who reflected on a coproduced initiative:
It’s what we call a *mutually beneficial outcome*. Obviously the institution benefits because it’s theoretically broadening its audience and it’s contributing across a community, and that’s good for it to be seen in that way. Also the participants benefit because their cultural expression is becoming part of what people know and understand, and that’s an increasingly important part of the makeup of how we accept and take on board people from other cultures. (PB7, emphasis added)

In relation to the *Pacifica* program a museum staff member suggested, ‘[Casula benefits] first and foremost. I mean, we get audience, we get really good media, we get a project that we feel very proud of … I think the community benefit on a very tangible basis … they get to exhibit in a high-reputation gallery so they get good exposure that way’ (MS1).

### 4.4.4.4 THIRD PARTY BENEFITS

Another group that benefited from museum coproduction were third party stakeholders (section 2.4.4.4). These fell into three groups: government and funding bodies; external agencies; and audiences. Two senior curators (SC5 and SC1) observed that government and funding bodies benefited from museum coproduction. One recounted coproduction being a response, ‘at a time when governments and funding and people were starting to say, hang on a minute, we’re paying a lot of money, your numbers don’t really stack up that well, what are you going to do about it?’ (SC5). Another suggested, ‘I don’t know how much audiences benefit from coproduced products but I think that participants, the institutions, *the funders* and the community at large do’ (SC1. emphasis added).

External agencies are professionally run organisations that partner or collaborate with the museum. Within *Pacifica*, the benefits provided to external agencies were not only the shared ability to meet government funding and policy priorities, but also being associated with Casula’s reputation or brand:

> We know [external stakeholders] have their *tick boxes*, they quite often come to us because Casula Powerhouse is … small but it’s actually got a really fantastic name and brand, and so they think it’s probably a really great *tick a box* because it’s western Sydney but it’s actually high quality. So a lot of them will approach us. (MS3, emphasis added)

Museum coproduction was seen to: assist external agencies meet their strategic objectives (ES1); raise their public profiles (ES7, ES1); and increase their resources by building new skills (ES1) and accessing community networks (ES1, ES4).

Third party audiences for museum coproduction were the general public and museum visitors—as distinct from community participants. Benefits for third party audiences included the observation that coproduction involved ‘designing with the community public programs for the broader mainstream’ (SC1). Of the range of beneficiaries of museum coproduction, third party audiences received the least attention and appeared to be the lowest priority. This group received little acknowledgement or discussion at both a field level and within *Pacifica*. One of the only points at which third party...
audiences were acknowledged in narrative interviews was the suggestion from one curator that, ‘I don’t know how much visitors to the gallery benefit and I think that’s one of the barriers’ (SC1).

It was also difficult to distinguish between those benefits the community received from contributing to museum coproduction and those they may have received as an audience for these offerings. The dual stakeholder/audience role filled by the community (section 4.4.2) also manifested in discussion of the beneficiaries of coproduction. Museum staff and external stakeholders, in particular, referred to ‘audiences’ and ‘communities’ interchangeably when discussing the beneficiaries of *Pacifica*.

### 4.4.5 STRUCTURE OF EXTERNAL PARTIES

#### 4.4.5.1 INDIVIDUALS

Coproduction can involve the museum working with individual representatives of a community (section 2.4.5.1). In the simplest form, individuals participate in museum coproduction by attending; they provide an audience for museums and engage in their exhibitions and public programs. As one museum staff member observed, ‘we go and get the pulse of the community in terms of what they want … what would bring them to CPAC and bring them to attend, what would they enjoy’ (MS6).

Acknowledgement was also made of coproduction that involved individuals who were community leaders or advocates. Coproducing with individuals who filled these roles within a community was seen to be a more effective means of engaging communities, described by one professional body as ‘finding that engaging and dynamic person within the community who will talk to us and say “Why should we work with you?” and we answer their questions and they then endorse the project to their groups’ (PB4). Within *Pacifica* it was acknowledged that coproduction involved individuals who were deemed to be community leaders or able to advocate on behalf of their communities. A museum staff member acknowledged support for coproduction from community leaders in terms of:

> advocating the importance of these types of programs. I know for Pacific communities … the religious leaders would be very important and they would play an important role … I think also when you have certain peoples within a community that have profiles … I think those sorts of people are very important in advocating the importance of these types of programs. (ES2)

The community representatives who participated in this research identified their roles as community advocates and leaders. For example, one noted, ‘I represent the Tokelau. We’ve got a small Tokelau community here and we started [coproducing on *Pacifica*] the following year we arrived’ (CR1).
4.4.5.2 COLLECTIVES

Involving collective and organised community groups (section 2.4.5.2) was also acknowledged as part of museum coproduction. When coproducing, museums can work with people whose interests and influence are broader than those of an individual citizen or user of museum services. The head of one professional body offered an initiative her organisation was involved with as an ideal coproduction model:

We’re working with the Red Cross on an exhibition about the centenary of their organisation … Now we’ve got a joint committee working on that which consists of our curators, people from the archives in the Red Cross and people who have, you know, worked with the Red Cross for a very long time. Now that exhibition is a coproduction. It’s not co-funded, but it is auspiced by both the organisations and there’s a committee which is putting the exhibition together. (PB9)

Within the Pacifica program, working with community groups was common. One of the community organisations involved even presented as a group to be interviewed for this research (CR4). A number of research participants emphasised the challenges associated with coproduction that involves groups and organisations. As one museum staff member noted, ‘look, everybody wants, you know, an easy conversation, don’t they? Right. I think this is just general in life. I think it is difficult to work with communities sometimes and to be aware of that. It’s not the easiest job that you can do, right?’ (MS2). The challenge of working with community groups was not only acknowledged by museum staff and stakeholders; community representatives also discussed the tensions and lack of coordination often found in community groups (CR3, CR2).

Community representatives highlighted that coproduction involved collaboration not only with the museum, but also between various community groups. When communities are involved in museum coproduction as stakeholders, there are benefits to be gained from collaborating and sharing resources with other stakeholder community groups. For example, one group noted, ‘recently we have made contact with other Pacific communities like Fijian communities with the hope of working together with them, because I think this is what we need to do is strengthen our ties with our other Pacific communities, Tongan, Rarotongans and Tokelau and the others’ (CR4).

4.4.6 TYPE OF RESOURCES THAT ARE EXCHANGED

4.4.6.1 EXCHANGE OF OPERANT RESOURCES

The operant resource (2.4.6.1) that was most apparent in relation to museum coproduction was the community’s cultural knowledge and skills—particularly their intangible cultural heritage. Operant resources and intangible cultural heritage sit at the heart of cultural practice. Within Pacifica, the exchange of intangible cultural heritage enabled the development of unique and distinctive museum offerings:
No matter how many books you read, unless you’ve gone out there and really lived with the culture, been in the culture, then you’re not there. There’s so much you can read, so many documentaries you can watch, but living and breathing it and understanding it … that’s a real interesting thing, that’s unique. (MS7)

Operant resources in the form of intangible cultural heritage cannot be removed or isolated from the individuals and communities. Discussing traditional tattooing, one community noted, ‘there are certain families that can only perform it … No-one can just go and learn how, you got to be part of that family. You can’t learn it at university’ (CR4). As a result, coproduction and collaboration are the only means by which museums can access this operant resource. As one professional body noted:

Museums realised that they had collections and they had anthropological documentation, but they were missing the whole live descendant community, ancestral lineage interpretation and liveliness that the community that related to that material could bring to bear … they were missing whole streams of interpretation and, if I come back to your question of coproduction, in the case of indigenous communities museums realised they had to step aside and recognise that indigenous communities had right of control of their material and of its interpretation. Not just rights of coproduction but rights of determination. (PB1)

Community participants were aware that their intangible cultural heritage was an essential operant resource they brought to Pacifica. These resources comprised skills and knowledge that were unique to their community. One community group stressed:

[Preparing an umu is] not an easy task. It takes a whole two days to try and gather woods, got to try and get the stones, appropriate stones from the river. You can’t just go get small stones, you got to have big stones like this, big ones. And gather them in a way that when you make the umu you got to make sure that they do not explode. Sometimes they do. So there is a Samoan way of making sure it doesn’t explode and that way is to make sure we step on the stones with our feet and that’s why you got to treat it very carefully, otherwise people get hurt. (CR4)

The community valued working with museums because it provided an opportunity to preserve and maintain their cultural heritage. Just as cultural heritage cannot be preserved and held in isolation from the community, the community needs to practise and express its cultural heritage in order for it to continue. Coproduction offered communities an opportunity to strengthen and preserve cultural knowledge and pass on their skills and practices to other community members.

Coproduction also provides a museum with access to operant resources in the form of community networks and social capital. Particularly when the community fills an audience role and is involved in crowdsourcing, coproduction enables the museum to access community leaders and influence opinion leaders within the community. In fact these operant resources figured more prominently in narrative interviews regarding Pacifica than the exchange of cultural knowledge and practice.
Access to community networks and community leaders enabled the museum to develop programs that appealed to a larger segment of the community and therefore resulted in higher visitation. Casula valued working with culturally diverse communities because this provided them with access to community leaders. As one staff member suggested:

We now are at a point where the *Pacifica* producer can go into a meeting with several leaders of community and make decisions on when we’re going to put our festival on and “Does it clash with an event you’re doing, does it clash with a religious holiday?” There are those really direct forms of communication that we wouldn’t have if we hadn’t fostered them over the last five years. (MS3)

The reciprocal nature of the exchange of operant resources through museum coproduction received little acknowledgement. The only acknowledgement of a joint exchange of resources was from an external stakeholder who cautioned, ‘you can’t just be mining a community for cultural knowledge and cultural connections and cultural relationships and cultural product, if all you’re doing is taking. If the relationship is not co-creative even from a co-curative get-go, it’s never going to be satisfying for the community’ (ES5).

### 4.4.6.2 Exchange of Operand Resources

Operand resources (section 2.4.6.2) were also an important resource exchanged through museum coproduction. The exchange of goods and commodities in the form of artefacts and collection material remains part of the museum coproduction process. A number of professional bodies and curators acknowledged coproduction as an opportunity to access the collection material needed to document and represent culturally diverse communities (PB5, PB9, PB1). Within *Pacifica*, coproduction with the community involved the exchange of artefacts, particularly for the development of exhibitions. One stakeholder observed, ‘a lot of the materials in there have been passed on and been lent from local community members and from those from abroad, overseas, they’ve lent it to them. I think it’s a bit of a reflection of community when you go to the Casula Powerhouse, because all of the stuff is from the community’ (ES7).

*Pacifica* highlighted the interconnectedness of operant and operand resources within a museum context. As well as coproducing in order to access artefacts and collection material, the museum needed to coproduce in order to access the operant resources needed to interpret this material and reveal its full significance. An external stakeholder who provided Casula with access to an ethnographic collection noted:

Only old people would remember what things were used traditionally … for the older people it’s a connection to their ancestors and I think that’s still quite alive in the Pacific Island community. Even though it’s not visible outwardly, on a deeper level there is still a deep connection to their traditional culture and that’s a bridge to the objects. (ES6, emphasis added)
Operand resources exchanged through coproduction also took the form of funding and grants. Community members in particular identified museum coproduction as an opportunity to secure funding and grants (CR8, CR2, CR4). Coproduction provided the museum with additional funding or secured government support. As one external stakeholder noted, ‘for Casula to be funded, it needs to provide a project or projects for the next several years. They need to explain what it is they’re trying to do … and they need to engage its immediate audience, which is Pacific Island and Arabic’ (ES4).

**4.5 RQ2: WHAT DRIVES AND INHIBITS MUSEUMS TO COPRODUCE WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES?**

This section presents final findings relating to the drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museum. The *a priori* themes identified are highlighted in green in Figure 14.

![Figure 14: Summary of themes relating to drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums](image)

**4.5.1 EXTERNAL DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS**

**4.5.1.1 ETHICS AND RESPECT**

Issues relating to ethics and respect (section 2.5.1.1) are a driver of museum coproduction. A number of professional bodies (PB1, PB3, PB5, PB7) acknowledged the precedents set by museum coproduction with Australian Indigenous communities. The repatriation of cultural material and need for cultural determination of Indigenous communities were described as prompts that assisted the shift to coproduction in museums. Because coproduction was able to address ethical issues and demonstrate cultural respect, it enabled museums to tackle difficult subjects and challenging
exhibition content. One professional body (PB9) acknowledged coproduction as a way of managing ‘contested views’, while another noted that coproduction was a means to presenting ‘dark tourism … the darker side of history’ (PB8).

Ethical practice and demonstrating respect were seen to underpin Casula’s capacity to coproduce *Pacifica*. Dealing with issues relating to ethics, respect and cultural protocols was central to securing community participation in coproduction. Both museum staff (MS4, MS5, MS2, MS3, MS9) and community representatives (CR2, CR7, CR8) emphasised that community participation in *Pacifica* was contingent on these issues being addressed. One staff member noted, ‘it is my job to understand the sensitivities and cultural sensitivities that might offend other people. One of our engagement practices is, you know, not to be confrontational for our people, to have a duty of care’ (MS9). A number of research participants noted Casula’s ability to collaborate respectfully with communities as a strength of the museum and resulted in it being an exemplar of museum coproduction (MS3, MS5, ES5, CR2, CR5).

### 4.5.1.2 GOVERNMENT POLICY AND FUNDING

Government policy and funding (section 2.5.1.2) was offered as both a driver and inhibitor of museum coproduction. Some professional bodies suggested ‘all three levels of government would fund [museum coproduction] … probably also philanthropy. I reckon every funding source there is would be contributing to this’ (PB3). Others indicated a lack of funding was a barrier to museum coproduction: ‘I don’t feel terribly hopeful there will be a big bucket of money to tell these stories and put on exhibitions at this time’ (PB4).

Funding was seen to provide incentives to museums that were reluctant to coproduce. One senior curator suggested, ‘it just seems to me, if you’re running a space, the inclination to do something that you wouldn’t normally do is because there’s funding behind it and that’s the imperative. But that’s being very cynical’ (SC2). Another senior curator cautioned against museums aligning their work to funding priorities rather than their missions or skills sets: ‘I do think you have to go back to thinking about where do your motivations lie … rather than look, there’s a pot of money over there and if we slightly skew a project that we wanted to do already, we might be eligible’ (SC6).

Museums that did not coproduce were seen as having overlooked government priorities that required them to demonstrate their value and relevance to the community. The lack of coproduction therefore undermined the security of museum funding and the stability of the sector. One senior curator suggested, ‘there are still a lot of museums who I think, at their core, haven’t quite gotten to that point yet around understanding the value of things like coproduction or participation and that audiences … we’re only here because people want us to be. As soon as we lose relevance, that’s it’ (SC7).
Staff at Casula were conscious of the need for strategic policy alignment with government priorities in order to secure funding. This included aligning with state government funding priorities, as demonstrated in this quote:

In our community strategic plan we’ve actually aligned the state government’s strategies with the western Sydney regional strategies and our own. We believe that’s probably a good key to assist in trying to secure more grants. In achieving our objective, we achieve the objective of western Sydney and of Sydney. (MS6)

It was also essential for Casula’s funding and support that there was a strong strategic alignment between the museum and the Council:

When I started here … Casula was very disconnected from the Liverpool Council, despite being a Council facility and being entirely funded by Council and staff being Council employees. They were really directed not to think of themselves as part of Council. My approach has been the absolute opposite of that … Apart from anything else, if you’re not valued as part of the organisation, you’re not going to be funded, to be frank. (MS1)

A key aim of government policy and funding in relation to museum coproduction is the need to make museums more relevant. Increased community engagement and social impact were presented as the aim of government interest in museum coproduction. One senior curator suggested:

There’s a lot of funders wanting to see social impact and wanting to put money into social impact, and coproduction is a key tool for doing that. So they will direct the activities of the organisation by virtue of what they will give to it. You either agree to go along to shape and work with those funds and those funders or you don’t. Most organisations will go along with funding opportunities in the arts space and make it work. (SC1)

Government interest in social impact and public value challenges museums. Traditional evaluation and reporting mechanisms, which focus on visitor numbers, fail to adequately capture information about social impact and public value. Reinforcing findings in relation to the inadequacy of museum evaluation techniques (section 4.5.2.3), a senior curator suggested, ‘in terms of public value, we need to absolutely look for new ways to express that and hopefully therefore also influence policymakers as well around what is valuable, what does value mean and how can it be tracked and expressed’ (SC7).

4.5.1.3 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Professional practice (section 2.5.1.3) was seen to both drive and inhibit museum coproduction. A number of professional bodies and senior curators (PB1, PB5, SC1, SC4, SC6) traced the influence of university museum studies programs in preparing a generation of museum curators who were likely to embrace coproductive ways of working. One professional body suggested, ‘museum studies has also been another factor in the mix in that the professional training of museum studies graduates … I
think those people have slowly infiltrated the sector and they too have brought perhaps a more holistic way of thinking about exhibitions’ (PB5).

Research participants offered different suggestions as to the type of museum most likely to coproduce. Indicting the pressure to conform to established notions of gallery practice, a museum staff member observed, ‘[coproduction] is not what you normally do in a contemporary art gallery. You know, you don’t run the risk of anyone accusing you of being a museum because that’s, like, the worst thing you could ever be accused of is being a museum’ (MS1). Alternatively, a professional body nominated galleries as the leaders in coproduction, suggesting, ‘those that are at the edge and leading are the visual arts components, are the galleries where the programming is perhaps more frequent and more about that communication with people and between people and that responsiveness’ (PB7). Another professional body suggested coproduction would be challenging for the aesthetic sensibilities of art galleries, arguing, ‘I know in some galleries and major institutions there’s a kind of a barrier between the idea of what’s community artwork and what’s the real artwork that is presented in the museum or gallery’ (PB3).

There was also evidence that professional practice is a barrier to coproduction in museums. A senior curator suggested coproduction was in conflict with a more curatorial model of working, arguing, ‘I don’t think it comes naturally to most museums or galleries. There’s a contingent of staff who would be involved and interested in that aspect of museum work. But I think there’s also probably a greater rather curatorial model where it’s not as prevalent’ (SC2). A staff member reflected on how the professional museum sector viewed the coproduction work done at Casula: ‘in the arts itself it’s still a bit pooh pooh. You know, “they do exhibitions on sport”. So that hasn’t particularly shifted, I think our peers still find us an easy target’ (MS1).

One reason that professional practice presented a barrier to museum coproduction was the prevalence and influence of established ways of working. Evidence of the influence of established forms of curatorial practice includes the suggestion that museums avoid coproduction because it is ‘challenging and why people often don’t want to do it is that people running galleries and museums have certain ideas about what to do with standards, about what’s professional or a reasonable professional standard and what’s the kind of work you might want to show’ (PB3).

Professional bodies and senior curators also appeared to be uncertain about the professional skills required by coproduction. An innovation study published by PB1 observed:

> Many interview participants noted the key shift from publics as passive audiences of storytelling to engaged participants in a conversation and co-creators of new stories and creative content. But several participants cautioned that new skills are also required to facilitate this two-way conversation—skills which are not traditional within [museums].

Contradicting findings made at a field level, evidence suggests that Casula is a leader in this form of professional practice and has the skills and capacity needed for
coproduction. The unique nature of professional practice at Casula is therefore a driver of coproduction. As an external stakeholder suggested:

The leadership team that they have [at Casula] has been involved in community for decades … they are such experienced community arts workers … they’re seen as very much the experts on community involvement and community engagement, and speak at working events and are involved at the top level and on boards of other organisations and so on. (ES1)

Coproduction was avoided at a field level because it challenged curatorial authority and professional control. Coproduction alters the traditional hierarchy in which museum curators practice and attempts to give more power and influence to communities and audiences. As a result, coproduction requires different skills and capabilities from curators: ‘so the tension then emerges I think with coproduction that the curator sees it as their role to determine the kind of conceptual framework of a project and the message … But if you enter into coproduction you take away control’ (SC1).

One way in which the museum sector was seen to respond to the professional challenges demanded by coproduction was to change its rhetoric around the role of museums. For example, PBA’s *Innovation Study* noted the distinction between rhetoric and action in relation to the aim for:

a deep transformation, both in the [museum] sector and in the organisations’ relationship to the public. While [research] participants acknowledged a profound rhetorical shift in [museums] to address the needs of an active, informed public … many felt a deep reluctance within the sector to let go of the traditional position of authority among curators, librarians and archivists, and a simultaneous reluctance for organisations to become genuinely more porous to outside contributors and collaborators.

More unique to museum practice were barriers to coproduction based on notions of aesthetics and artistic quality. Artistic excellence, which drives practice and standards in museums, was presented by a number of research participants as a professional barrier to coproduction. One professional body suggested, ‘I think [coproduction] presents an interesting challenge to art galleries because they are first and foremost about aesthetic standards, and so the notion of cultural diversity within that sits rather uncomfortably’ (PB9). Casula was seen to be able to combine community engagement with high-quality museum offerings. A museum staff member observed that Casula’s goal was ‘not just to deliver a program but to deliver it high quality and do whatever it takes to reach that high quality, as well as other characteristics of Casula that make us great’ (MS8).

The ability to deliver both high-quality museum offerings and community engagement was credited to the diverse skills and capabilities of Casula staff members. The staff that delivered *Pacifica* brought skills in traditional museum practice as well as expertise that was unorthodox in a museum setting. Casula drew together teams that combined and complemented the skills needed for coproduction:
Our curator … her expertise is kind of that traditionally installed, traditionally founded, traditionally curated exhibitions, very contemporary art based, but traditional in its dealings. So she kind of works in contrast with the others. So we’ll have a few of these and then we’ll have one of those [community engagement staff] to complement her. (MS5)

Another staff member noted that Casula’s interest in appointing museum staff with unorthodox capabilities assisted coproduction: ‘with all of those positions we’re recruiting for a kind of cultural depth and not recruiting for a curatorial or a producer skill set’ (MS1).

4.5.1.4 PROFESSIONAL BODIES

Shared by the heads of all museum professional bodies (section 2.5.1.4) was a belief in the role they played in coproduction. Their influence was highlighted by the head of a state professional body who suggested, ‘I think we can play a critical role in terms of promoting [coproduction] as a model and then getting different galleries to explore it’ [PB6]. Another added, ‘professional bodies are the primary means to implement change. I think that’s where the thinking has to change and the lobbying has to occur, and hopefully it will not only occur but bring about changes’ [PB4]. Professional bodies also reported curators’ resistance to the work they did to encourage coproduction within the sector. One commented on a new resource that would assist the practice of coproduction: ‘I can see how [this workbook] can be relevant to our members, but if I present it in its current form they will be resistant because they’ll see it as one type of practice and it doesn’t fit their practice’ (PBF).

Curators confirmed that professional bodies promote coproduction within the sector. The leadership provided by professional bodies was acknowledged in that, ‘they’ve got a role in trying to make the sector more exciting and dynamic and better. If they do want to do that, then it’s about questioning old ways of doing things, so they should have a role in putting out new ideas or advocates’ (C3). Curators were more sceptical of the influence professional bodies had on the adoption of coproduction. One curator (who had also served as a board member for a professional body) observed, ‘over the years I’ve lost a bit of heart, they’re sort of toothless tigers a lot of the time’ (C6). Another suggested professional bodies have ‘fairly limited capability to do much other than support public galleries through the provision of a network and some advocacy and some professional development work’ (C2).

Despite articulating support for coproduction during narrative interviews, analysis of the document sources collected from professional bodies has found little tangible support for the practice of coproduction. For example, a set of national museum standards—the result of collaboration between a number of professional bodies—makes no acknowledgement of coproduction. The section in the standards entitled ‘Involving people’ does not specify collaborative museum practice or coproduction as a form of involvement communities might have. In fact, at no point anywhere in these standards is coproduction or collaboration explicitly or even implicitly acknowledged. The same lack of action in relation to coproduction is apparent in a Code of Practice developed by PBB. This code specifies work undertaken for ‘community curated’
exhibitions and ‘exhibitions proposed by community groups’ involving consultation, rather than ‘joint delivery’ of services. The lack of practical support for coproduction is also apparent in the resources made available by professional bodies. One state body includes an ‘Engagement’ category in its award program; however, coproduction, collaboration and even community engagement are absent from its extensive list of professional resources. The only practical resource offered by the professional bodies with any relevance to coproduction is a set of guidelines to develop ‘links’ with the broader community (PBG).

One exception to this trend saw professional bodies unable to offer practical support for the practice of coproduction. PBI was unique in that it also managed and operated three state museums. Included in this professional body’s Strategic Plan is the objective: ‘seek active partnerships to present and preserve diverse and regional histories and collections’. Support for coproduction is also apparent in two of its Key Performance Indicators: 1) number of community partnerships/collaborations; and 2) number of partnerships with culturally diverse communities.

Museum professional bodies were not mentioned as a driver of coproduction in relation to Casula or the work done for Pacifica.

### 4.5.2 INSTITUTIONAL DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS

#### 4.5.2.1 INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Coproduction requires a break from traditional museum practice; thus innovation and entrepreneurship (section 2.5.2.2) were identified as a driver of museum coproduction. Evidence of coproduction being an innovative form of museum practice includes the suggestion by one professional body that coproduction is, ‘more about attitude and desire than spending lots of money. I think [coproduction] shifts a gallery’s perception of its role in the community, I really do. I think [coproduction] is an opportunity to shift practice’ (PB6). Within the exemplar Pacifica, one museum staff member observed, ‘our programming is very, very different. It’s not your traditional gallery practice presentation whatsoever’ (MS2).

The corresponding resistance to coproduction was explained in terms of conformity to established forms of museum practice. The external pressures to conform to standards of professional museum practice (discussed in section 4.5.1.3) were therefore major obstacles to innovation and entrepreneurship, and as a result a barrier to museum coproduction. Resistance to coproduction and pressure to conform to traditional professional models is evident at individual, organisational and sector levels. One state body described curators who are resistant to coproduction as:

older, nearing retirement age, and don’t necessarily get the shift or want to accept the shift that’s happened over the last ten years. They just follow the same model they’re currently operating under … It’s like there’s an agreement there and they’re just following that same pattern. (PBF)
Accounts of organisational resistance to coproduction reported at a field level include the concern that ‘somehow [co-production] would bring down the reputation of this mighty institution … a whole lot of conservativeness and snobbery’ (SC5). Casula staff highlighted the pressures to conform to traditional museum practice placed on them by other colleagues and institutions: ‘it’s a double edged sword, because I hear a lot as well from my peers and the industry—are you a contemporary art centre or are you a hall for hire or are you, you know, how can you have ghost tours? Like, it’s a double-edged sword, so wherever you go you’re sort of, however you touch it, you’re going to cut yourself’ (MS2). Another staff member spoke at length about the advantages of being outside ‘elite’ museum practice and on the edges of the profession in terms of undertaking ‘risky’ and innovative museum practice such as coproduction:

When I started in this job … I had people ringing me saying, you are insane, that place is a freaking kiss of death … I think because the expectations of CPAC have been so low for so long, we’ve been able to choose what we do and we’ve been able to write our own way of doing things and make our own decisions about how you deliver … It’s terrifying, but it gives you the space to do what you want to and to take that risk to fail. And I’ve always said that the luxury of being here and everyone in the art sector pooh poohing half of what we do is that I can take a risk. If we fail we fail, no-one expected us to succeed anyway, so it’s … it gives you some space and flexibility. (MS1)

The strength of Casula’s commitment to entrepreneurial museum practice extended to a concern about the level of change and innovation within its own programming. *Pacifica* was seen to be an innovative museum offering because it resisted being locked into an internally enforced template which would see the same program repeated each year. As one museum staff member suggested, ‘I would like to see the project rethink itself each year. I hate projects that stick to a format and formula. You know, even if that formula’s working, I always like to look at other ways where you can do other things and keep people guessing’ (MS2). An external stakeholder confirmed that Casula’s work with *Pacifica* was continuously innovating and changing, noting, ‘every year they conceptualise what this year’s festival is going to be about and what angles they’re going to look at this year, what partnerships they want to make, who else they want to bring in. So I think it’s successful in that it’s always evolving, it’s always growing’ (ES5).

One of the most significant drivers for coproduction at Casula was the museum’s external focus and awareness of its community. Coproduction was seen to result in new and different museum offerings because it responded to a different type of arts audience. As an external stakeholder observed:

If you’re just talking about galleries, it’s art that you hang on the walls. I think that’s a big difference between community engagement, where it’s actually community people who you’re trying to engage … If it was just galleries, already it’s … we would say it’s highbrow art or something. So you’ve already eliminated your demographic massively to be quite an elite, informed group. (ES4)
Another external stakeholder suggested *Pacifica* was not ‘typical of gallery practice when you look at galleries in the CBD. I think it’s typical of gallery or arts centre practice in western Sydney … you cannot program without bearing in mind who lives in your five-kilometre radius and you can’t program without wanting to engage these audiences and these participants’ (ES5).

The innovation and entrepreneurship demonstrated by Casula was seen to be a feature it shared with museums across its region. The capacity for coproduction in museums across the south-west region of Sydney was highlighted by professional bodies when asked about exemplars of museum coproduction in Australia (PB1, PB2, PB7). Entrepreneurship across the region in relation to museum coproduction was acknowledged by all research cohorts. An external stakeholder suggested:

> There’s a whole way of programming in western Sydney. I believe all these arts centres have really led the way in not just community relevance, not just social engagement, but actually meeting that challenge of needing to really value rigorous, fresh, sometimes dangerous artistic ideas and balance that with really having something attractive, intriguing and appealing. (ES5)

### 4.5.2.2 ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

#### 4.5.2.2.1 LEADERSHIP AND ORGANISATION-WIDE SUPPORT

The practice of coproduction in museums requires broad organisational commitment. As one professional body suggested, ‘I’m sure it would be the same for professionals working in museums and galleries or any other cultural institution … that they have the mindset that the interests and the culture of those groups is actually relevant to their museum and from that everything else can come’ (PB3). Casula’s capacity for coproduction was seen to result from the support it received across the organisations. A staff member observed:

> I think everyone who works here is [an advocate for coproduction]. I don’t think there’s a staff member here who can’t talk about it … So from an internal organisational point of view, everyone. And they sort of have to be because [coproduction] touches every single department … so we have to be a really well-integrated team here in order to carry it off. (MS5)

Conversely, the negative effect of a lack of organisation commitment was also noted. The impact of a lack of organisational support as an inhibitor of coproduction was identified by a senior curator who commented, ‘you have to have the organisational commitment or it’s not going to fly’ (SC6).

In order for coproduction to have commitment from across the organisation, it needs to be championed by leaders and senior management. In reflecting on a successful coproduction initiative, a senior curator recalled:

> I keep harping back, but I was just so lucky that I had a director that totally supported it. Sometimes I describe it as Moses’s parting of the waters for me in the gallery, because without his support it would have got shut down
very quickly … the only reason it was successful was because I had the support of the director and as soon as there was a change of director there was also a change of support … and the whole thing shifted. (SC5)

The above quote also highlights the negative impact on coproduction caused by a change in leadership that resulted in withdrawal of support for coproduction. A community representative noted the consistency and legacy of Casula’s leadership in relation to Pacifica and coproduction and that ‘what makes a difference with them is that they’ve acknowledged that journey as each of the new directors have come in, they’ve acknowledged that journey and that collaborative partnership with the Pacific community’ (CR2).

4.5.2.2 POLICY ALIGNMENT

An organisational vision or strategic commitment that is conducive to coproduction was also seen to drive this form of museum practice. A number of professional bodies and senior curators identified the need for strategic support for coproduction and its clear links to the vision or mission of the museum (PB2, PB8, SC1, SC3, SC5, SC7). A senior curator commented:

I think it would depend on the focus of the institution and what the governance documents said, because a lot of what you do within an exhibition program and within developing that exhibition program is look at the focus of the institution and what the institution is trying to achieve and how you can help meet those goals. So if the governance and the strategic direction of the institution is to establish closer ties with communities, however that is defined by the institution, then you would expect that would flow into the exhibition program. (SC3)

Within Pacifica all research cohorts acknowledged the strategic alignment between Casula’s commitment to coproduction and the vision of both the museum and the local council that managed the facility. As one external stakeholder commented, ‘I think they’re taking their mission and vision very seriously. It’s not just a funding issue and being part of Liverpool Council. I think they’ve established themselves as an integral part of community development within their community’ (ES1). One senior curator noted that without organisation-wide support, a strategic commitment to coproduction would have little impact: ‘if it’s the organisation imposing it on staff or it being an expectation … I suppose it’s also about the staff owning their mission, which is not always easy. It also has to come down to the right individuals’ (SC6).

4.5.2.3 INSTRUMENTAL ARTS OUTCOMES

Museums that placed strategic emphasis on instrumental arts outcomes, including social, economic and environmental outcomes, were identified as leaders in museum coproduction. In a broad sense, interest in the instrumental use of the arts was associated with the need for museums to deliver public value. One professional body suggested that:
if it’s an institution or a facility situated with any governmental context—be it local, state or federal—there are recognitions in play about responsibility in management, accountability and due process in recognising responsibilities to the community in which any facility is located. (PB1)

Casula’s appreciation of the instrumental value of the arts and commitment beyond intrinsic outcomes was seen to be part of its innovation. In reflecting on the value of Pacifica a staff member suggested, ‘where I guess narrow minded people miss the goal is that it doesn’t just ultimately provide culture and arts, it provides benefits to a community, it involves a community, it brings people out of their homes into a place where they can mix, they can socialise’ (MS6).

The notion of constituent communities is inherent in this driver of museum coproduction. Coproduction with culturally diverse communities was described as a priority for museums with a commitment to access and social inclusion. The potential for Pacifica to respond to issues of social exclusion was noted by one staff member who commented, ‘it’s a potent cocktail of a lot of socio problems … you know, regardless of colour there’s a massive socio-economically diverse community out there that are very poor’ (MS9). Coproduction was also associated with a range of community development outcomes including: health, safety and wellbeing (PB2, PB8, MS6, ES4); education (PB6, SC1, SC3, CR2, CR3, CR5); settlement services (PB6, SC1); community connectedness and cultural identity (PB2, SC3, MS6, MS8, ES5, MS3, CR3); youth services (MS9, ES5, CR2, CR3, CR5); justice (MS9, CR3); and volunteering (PB8).

Museum staff raised an additional instrumental use of museum coproduction, highlighting its impact on economic development (MS6, MS7). Pacifica was seen to contribute to tourism, regional development and urban renewal programs, work that was framed within the context of Richard Florida’s ‘Creative Class’ (2003; Stevenson and Matthews 2013). One staff member argued:

It’s easy enough to say we could save two point three million dollars and we’re not funding Casula anymore, but then you’d lose so much. And if we are supposed to be a big city we need an arts centre, we need to invest more in arts centres to be honest ... But it fits into the objective of us providing these world-class facilities. We have the largest hospital in the southern hemisphere, so you can imagine five thousand employees there, you can imagine all the doctors and all the researchers, all the intellect that’s there in an institute. If you want to bring corporate Australia out here, you’ve got to be able to attract their employees too. (MS7)

A level of scepticism about the use of coproduction for instrumental purposes was also apparent. Senior curators acknowledged the rhetorical value associated with the instrumental use of coproduction; SC3 hinted that coproduction to increase attendance could be viewed with cynicism and SC6 referred to the ‘spin’ with which coproduction might be discussed by colleagues. A senior curator observed the tendency to ‘defer to the numbers and the good numbers mean good things and the low numbers mean bad
things or that we refrain from putting the low numbers in because they’re seen to be of lesser value’ (SC7).

4.5.2.3 EVALUATION AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Evaluation and reflective practice were presented as both drivers and inhibitors of museum coproduction. Where evaluation and reflective practice occurred, coproduction was more likely to be successful and to shift museum practice. In recounting an early coproduced initiative, one senior curator reflected, “we worked with a lot of people who then went on and did other things. I think it was just an important step in the progress of the way that we exhibit art and the way that we engage people, and I think there are still elements of it within the way that everybody works their exhibitions’ (SC5). Another curator highlighted museum resistance to reflective practice, while at the same time identifying the potential for coproduction to open up museums to different ways of working:

I found even with our staff, the opportunity to reflect on what you’ve done with a critical eye is really hard, because no-one wants to talk about what might have been done differently or better. They’re happy to say “I didn’t get this in time or the labels would have been better if such and such had given me this information”—the semantics of doing. But the ability to just go, “wow, what would we do differently next time?” is quite confronting. You would hope with coproduction … you’d come back thinking about things differently and that the group would think about your organisation differently. (SC6)

At both a field level and within Pacifica research participants identified the inadequacy of the evaluation tools they typically applied to their coproduction work, particularly evaluation that relied on attendance and visitor numbers. The need for more nuanced ways of evaluating museum coproduction was raised by a museum staff member who argued that Casula needs new and different measures of success:

Another measurement of success is the relationships that we foster from other cultural heads of community: “Have we fostered a successful relationship with them?” So that to me is a huge measurement of success. … Fostering partnerships with other galleries and other venues is another big one. And then for me the other measurements of success really are our actual measurements of success in website clicks and hits and email hits and that sort of thing … Do you know what I mean? Visitation is this much [measures small distance with hands]. Pacifica, it’s just such a huge package and I could think of a thousand more [measures of success] I’m sure. (MS3)

The limited evaluation techniques available to the museum undermined its ability to argue for the value of this work. In relation to Pacifica one external stakeholder suggested, ‘I think it’s an amazing event. Again it’s undervalued because we … lack the tools to be able to evaluate it properly’ (ES4). This view was echoed by a staff member who commented:
Audience development isn’t necessarily just about numbers, it’s about quality experience and that’s the hard stuff to measure. It’s the hard stuff to express as well. You can’t quantify [the impact of coproduction] but that’s one of those really sticky, difficult, convoluted questions that I think is asked of cultural workers all the time. (MS5)

The inadequacy of existing evaluation methods is particularly significant because it limits the way museums can report the value of their work to governments and funding bodies. A senior curator discussed this issue at length:

A real interest of mine … is value beyond visitor numbers. And I suppose in terms of reporting and things like that, numbers speak but they’re also the easiest way to indicate the success of something … I think we need to create new ways of talking about value, maybe new metrics for tracking success. I’m not sure what they are, but I think talking about these different nuanced approaches and to reveal the complexity of engagement really. It needs to happen, otherwise we’ll always defer to the numbers. (SC7)

While evaluation and reflective practice appear to both drive and inhibit museum coproduction, they were presented as a strength of Casula as well as established practice within *Pacifica*. All research cohorts provided extensive evidence of evaluation and reflective practice occurring within *Pacifica*. As well as evaluation and reflective practice undertaken at the conclusion of projects and programs (summative evaluation), there is evidence of front-end and formative evaluation. Evaluation work took the form of program planning (MS5, MS9), policy alignment (MS2), pilot projects (MS2), project planning teams (MS2, MS9), community consultation (MS5, MS9) and preparation of award submissions (MS9). Because *Pacifica* was not only an annual program (delivered over five consecutive years) but also an initiative that had evolved from earlier collaborations as part of the Pacific Wave Festival, it was unusual in that it provided longitudinal opportunities for organisational learning. As one staff member observed of *Pacifica*, ‘you know, it’s a lot of experience, you’ve got to go through a lot of failures … it may look successful but there’s successes built on a lot of failures, a lot of’ (MS9).

Community representatives suggested that their collaboration on the *Pacifica* program assisted Casula’s organisational learning. Highlighting the cooperative nature of *Pacifica*, they reported that reflective practice increased the cultural knowledge and cultural understanding held by the museum. One community representative suggested, ‘slowly I think the [museum is] learning every time we get together. I think they’re understanding more the culture side’ (CR1).
4.5.2.4 RELATIONAL SKILLS

4.5.2.4.1 INTERPERSONAL

Interpersonal skills were seen to have a significant influence on museum coproduction (section 2.5.2.4). The capacity to coproduce required strong relational and interpersonal skills; the lack of these skills and capacity was a significant impediment to museum coproduction. The importance of interpersonal skills was highlighted by an external stakeholder who suggested that coproduction:

shows what can be done if you start dialogues with different members of a community—of communities, I should say, because it’s diverse in itself—and what the fruits of listening can be … It’s more about what are the skills and abilities that the curator and the production team have to have in order to listen, be reflexive with, and be responsive to the creative ideas and aesthetics of that community. (ES5)

Data collected for the case study reveal four categories of interpersonal skills that are necessary for museum coproduction: trust and respect; understanding and empathy; responsiveness; and empowerment. Findings relating to these four categories of interpersonal skills are presented in turn below.

Strong interpersonal skills enable a museum to develop trust and respect with the community. As one professional body suggested, coproduction is about ‘social skills, working with people of different calibres and understanding what’s involved in storytelling effectively and understanding significance’ (PB4). Trust and respect are also influenced by an understanding of cultural protocols. The diversity of cultures and communities that were involved in Pacifica added to the complexity of dealing with issues relating to respect. As a community representative observed:

Respect for culture, which comes back to cultural sensitivity, can be a very small thing but it’s a big thing to [the community] and it can be very different from one Pacific culture to the other. For us, for example, the kava ceremony is a huge thing for us which is very ceremonial, it is done to royalty and the presenting of the whale’s tooth is part of this ceremony. For the other Pacific cultures, they don’t use a whale’s tooth in that same way and the kava ceremony doesn’t mean the same thing to them … They are important distinctions and one needs to have the skill to understand how we approach it. (CR7)

Coproduction requires a museum to be able to gain complex insights and understanding of the community. Casula’s capacity to coproduce appears to be supported by its ability to understand cultural differences and cultural protocols, as well as developing empathy with communities. As one staff member noted:

What a lot of people miss out that they can’t see is that invisible threads of representation. They’ve got leaders and if they didn’t want to be there, they wouldn’t be there under those people, they’d go join another group … So they show their allegiance to certain groups and then … that’s their key. … you’ve got to go through that hard work and that’s what it is, it includes people, personalities and it’s a given that you have an understanding of
culture. And my thing, when we talk about culture within a complex sort of so many cultures at the centre of your culture, if you understand culture and you’re dealing in culture, is respect. (MS9)

A strong understanding of communities enables the tailoring of approaches to coproduction that meet the needs and requirements of communities. Coproduction involves negotiation, diplomacy and flexibility on the part of a museum. The ways community insights were used to customise approaches to coproduction within *Pacifica* were highlighted by a staff member who commented:

There’s not a fixed model and [staff member] would be the first to say this, it’s very variable. [staff member] spends a lot of time working within communities, so he’s obviously a leader in his own right in the Samoan community, so he knows that community very well but he spends a lot of time talking to community, engaging as a leader and as a spokesperson, speaking to different community groups. (MS1)

The final relational skill required by coproduction is a museum’s capacity to empower the community. Coproduction requires the community to have a real and meaningful influence on practices that are traditionally controlled by a museum. The capacity of Casula to empower the communities with whom they coproduced was acknowledged by all research cohorts, including community representatives. As one community representative suggested:

Right from the start they’re doing that, they consult with us. It’s not just community leaders, they consult with community and then they move to the programs. Whereas some [museums] can say here’s the program … There’s no consultation, they say we’re having this, it’s Pacific, come along. But with Casula Powerhouse there is always consultation and always community engagement. We don’t always agree, but I love that they provide the space for us to voice what we feel is effective. They provide the space for us to say we should change that or do this and that kind of stuff. (CR2)

### 4.5.2.4.2 CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES

One of the drivers of coproduction in museums is the presence of an individual who is able to build bridges between the museum and the community and act as a catalyst for coproduction (section 2.5.2.5). These roles are a valuable source of innovation and change within museums; they not only facilitate coproduction but are also internal advocates for this type of museum practice. A professional body suggested: ‘you’ve got to have someone who knows how to draw people in, engage them, make it meaningful and break down all that fear. It’s a part of having a CCD person. The responsive director understands the relevance to them, the importance to them and how we have to shift the communication to not be a threat to people’ (PB6).

Casula’s organisational structure includes a number of positions titled creative producer that function as cultural intermediaries and develop the relationships that are necessary for coproduction. A museum staff member described the relational emphasis in these roles as, ‘I don’t see it as different positions working in a vertical line, each
vertical line as in different vertical lines, I see it as positions crossing over and continuously crossing back and forth and zig zagging across each other’ (MS2). Museum staff and external stakeholders acknowledged the roles filled by staff members responsible for Pacifica as a key strength in the program. They described these cultural intermediaries as embodying the interpersonal skills, cultural knowledge and community networks that are essential for museum coproduction:

One of our greatest assets is [staff member] and why he’s a great asset is not only is he in his own community an extremely well-respected mediator, negotiator, leader, support, he is within our context a very smooth and even and considerate person who is constantly weighing up the priorities of a diverse community and a diverse work culture. (MS5)

Pacifica was assisted by cultural intermediaries from other agencies and community organisations, not just museum staff. For example, a stakeholder from a professional sporting body highlighted the relational skills and community networks he was able to contribute to Pacifica:

I’ve always been a big believer that you need to have influential people within the community as almost pseudo members of the cultural facility to go out and connect their communities to the cultural centre and its programming … We’re still very much well-entrenched in our communities. We’re not outside of our communities, so it makes it a lot easier for us to connect. (ES2)

The extent to which those who collaborated on Pacifica (including museum staff, external agencies, and community representatives) are interconnected and networked is diagrammed in Figure 15. This maps the formal affiliations of the individual research participants interviewed for this research and demonstrates the extent to which Pacifica involved individuals who bridge organisations and networks. Four research participants, comprising two museum staff members (pgm-mgr and ctve-prod) and two community representatives (Maori-rep1 and Samoan-rep4), have formal connections to Casula, local communities and external stakeholders (agencies and
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organisations). In addition, ten research participants (two staff members, six community representatives and two external stakeholders) are formally connected to two of the museum, local community and external stakeholders.

Cultural intermediaries were described as not only coordinating relationships between the museum and the community, but also negotiating and advocating between the community and other cultural institutions. Cultural intermediary work occurs at an organisational or agency level, as well as between individuals. Cultural intermediaries employed by Casula were instrumental in creating partnerships with other state-based museums, thereby mediating community access to collections and resources held by other cultural institutions. One cultural intermediary described this work as follows:

[State museums have] got to remember too that they belong to the Australian people as well. They could put all the red tape in the [way of collaboration] and slow it down through conservation issues and da, da, da, da, but it belongs to the people … The [state museum] was not happy … We just talked straight to the director. Yeah, we took all our people and we went in a show of strength, all our organisations, to go to them and say, we’re ready to handle this. (MS9)

The role of a cultural intermediary is not without its challenges including the risk posed by community politics and disputes. One staff member observed:

he’s trying to provide them with a more open mind and a more open dialogue for everyone involved in the Pacific, and that comes through their history and we are aware of that, and he’s trying to play both sides of the role to try and find balance. I do not envy what he has to do, that’s for sure. (MS4)

At the same time, the unusual role filled by cultural intermediaries has the potential to bring them into conflict with established museum professionals who undertake more traditional museum work. Cultural intermediaries appear to act as entrepreneurs, being outliers in terms of usual museum hierarchies and falling between traditional roles in terms of their skills and responsibilities. For example, a staff member suggested that one of the staff responsible for Pacifica ‘oversees and advises. It’s a little bit of a different flavour than that direct curatorial forward-leading intention. [There is] a perception that it might not be proper leadership or something like that when there’s that overseeing or that advisory role. Because it’s a more collaborative style of leadership, it may be misunderstood’ (MS5).

4.5.2.4.3 COMMUNITY CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES

A new factor relating to institutional drivers and inhibitors of coproduction has emerged from the data collected for this case study. This is a link between museum coproduction and community cultural development (CCD) work. CCD (also referred to as ‘cultural development’ and ‘community art practice’) involves collaboration between professional artists and communities with the aim of creating new artwork. Its emphasis is on collective arts practice with the aim of joint practice between artists and communities—characterised as cultural practice that is ‘by, with and for
communities’ (Australia Council for the Arts n.d.). A number of research participants (PB2, PB6, PB8, SC1, MS1, MS2, MS4, MS9, ES1, ES5) explicitly noted that coproduction required the type of relational skills involved in CCD work. CCD therefore provides a model of practice and set of skills for museum coproduction to draw on. As one professional body noted:

Well, engaging with communities is a skill in its own right and the kinds of skills that you’d be looking for ... the community cultural development sector has at least thirty years of experience in this regard, so one would be expecting that that experience would be drawn on, but it includes things like knowing how to, in the first instance, be the catalyst for community interest and then working respectfully and as a facilitator to unlock the creative ideas and capabilities of people who are not working as professionals is a whole skill set. (PB2)

Casula was seen to have been a leader in CCD practice for a number of years and its commitment to this work vouched for its capacity to coproduce the *Pacifica* program. As one staff member suggested, ‘the role and responsibility for us in cultural and community engagement, I think, is evident in having two full-time positions in [identifies museum colleague], a community cultural engagement officer, as well as [identifies museum colleague] as a specific project creative producer. That speaks volumes’ (MS4). The museum’s commitment to CCD was seen to demonstrate innovative arts and cultural practice, and provides further evidence of its capacity to break from traditional and established museum practice. As one staff member reflected:

There was a period where organisations just had the, sort of, the traditional roles like registrar, like theatre director, like artistic director, like this, you know. And then … a little bit more than three years ago there was a whole change and re-evaluation and reposition. I’m talking about the community culture development sector, because that’s pretty much what leads the arts industry. It does have a huge follow-on effect. (MS2)

The link between institutional change and museum staff with CCD backgrounds is also identified at a field level. Identifying another museum that was seen to lead coproduction in her state, a professional body suggested that the museum’s capacity for this type of practice was the result of a CCD worker: ‘one thing about [names museum] is they’re already engaged with the community, unlike any other gallery in the state, because of the CCD worker who is employed by the gallery’ (PB6).

### 4.5.3 COMMUNITY DRIVERS AND INHIBITORS

#### 4.5.3.1 POLITICAL

The political drivers (section 2.5.3.1) associated with the communities involved in museum coproduction are predominantly related to the notion of a *constituent community*. The term emerged from a narrative interview with a professional body who discussed constituent communities as ‘where [the museum is] located. The immediately surrounding community … the constituent community makes up the
community that really develops an institution’ (PB1). While the term ‘constituent community’ is not commonly used within the museum sector, the concept was understood and used implicitly by a number of research participants.

Pacifica’s coproduction work was driven by an awareness of its relationship with constituent communities. As one staff member noted, ‘particularly because we are a council-run organisation and Council is in theory ideologically there for the community, it’s the most responsible thing to do’ (MS8). A stakeholder observed that local government galleries, ‘just because of their geographical locations, by default they have to engage their own community’ (ES4). The community representatives who participated in this case study were often members of Casula’s constituent communities; as one community participant in the program noted, ‘most of us are in Liverpool, six to ten families in the Liverpool area. I’m in Liverpool. Casula Powerhouse … is just up the road’ (CR1).

The political imperatives placed on constituent communities are a significant driver of coproduction in museums. Professional bodies identified museums managed by local government or with strong local community connections as likely leaders in coproduction. A number of senior curators (SC3, SC1, SC4) drew on their local government experience in discussing museum coproduction. An emphasis on local communities was seen to distinguish the work of Casula from that of other museums and cultural institutions, particularly those that are funded by other levels of government or are commercial organisations. One stakeholder observed:

Commercial galleries wouldn’t engage the community, not at all, because they’re after sales … it puts them in a different world. A public gallery by default is there for the community. So it has to resonate with its immediate audience, which makes the regional galleries here in Australia special. Whereas let’s say, MCA [Museum of Contemporary Art—federally and state funded] or Gallery of New South Wales [state funded], their audience is international, their audience is the tourism dollar, as well as the Australian market. (ES4)

Coproduction with constituent communities is valuable because it results in local relevance and meets strategic political priorities. One professional body noted:

The regional local galleries get money from Arts Victoria [state arts agency] and their local government. The good ones understand that they are critical to Council and how they’re critical to Council. So they can talk about the impact they’re having and how they gauge the impact they’re having and how they engage the community, what the benefits of that are. (PB6)

Delivering local relevance was the reason Casula coproduced with its constituent communities. Coproduction involving constituent communities ensured the museum was connected to its community, and delivered exhibitions and public programs that were relevant and valued. A museum staff member suggested:

one of the challenges the Powerhouse initially had was that it was trying to do things not for Liverpool, it was trying to do things for the city
Coproduction with constituent communities is also driven for compliance reasons. Professional bodies and senior curators suggested coproduction is something museums undertake for ‘cynical’ reasons (SC3) or because there is no way they can be ‘let off the hook’ or ‘excused’ for not coproducing (PB3). Delivering museum services that were a priority to local government and valued by the local community was essential for the museum to be supported within Council. As one staff member highlighted, ‘we need to think of ourselves as part of Council. Apart from anything else, if you’re not valued as part of the organisation, you’re not going to be funded’ (MS1).

Casula was seen to be successful in providing services that are relevant to its local community and result in cultural participation; the museum’s public value was acknowledged. As a result, Council was able to justify public funding for the museum and received public support for this expenditure. One staff member reported that Casula was ‘a cost in terms of a ratepayer input. But the benefits you can’t measure. They’re enormous ... I can’t recall getting any letters or submissions from the community criticising CPAC or wanting any cutbacks. Quite the contrary’ (MS6).

Mandatory aspects of coproduction with constituent communities were also seen to drive entrepreneurial activity and innovative museum practice. The emphasis on working with constituent communities challenged professional resistance to coproduction. It also confronted institutionalised museum practice that is particularly entrenched in museums that sit at the higher end of the government funding hierarchy (state and federally funded museums). As one professional body noted:

Because it’s more community focused ... the function of local government is to service its community. So there’s that kind of mindset already, that our responsibility is to service our community, and so therefore it’s appropriate that our institutions locally service those communities. So maybe those barriers are less challenging at local government than they are at other levels, and maybe that kind of thing works upwards. (PB3, emphasis added)

The distinction between constituent and source communities (in other words, political and cultural drivers) was not always clear-cut. The high levels of cultural diversity within the Liverpool community (Profile.id 2014) resulted in culturally diverse communities being simultaneously constituent and source communities for Casula. Casula could be compelled to coproduce with local communities because they comprised local residents and rate-payers, and also because local communities comprise the cultures and ethnic groups that make up the Pacific region. This situation was highlighted by an external stakeholder who noted:

It makes sense if you’ve got a heavily populated Pacific culture or a Mediterranean culture in the area ... to connect with them by showcasing a sense of belonging and also an opportunity for them to share with others in the community. I think it’s great what Casula Powerhouse do in terms...
of anything for the community. And there’s not many other ways better to do it than to reflect the demographics in the area through the exhibitions that they coordinate there. (ES7)

4.5.3.2 CULTURAL

Cultural drivers (section 2.5.3.2) associated with the communities involved in museum coproduction are captured in the notion of source communities—the communities from which museum collections are derived. Source communities were explicitly acknowledged by the head of one professional body (PB1), who noted that this group is recognised in the ICOM Code of Ethics (2013). This research participant was the only person who made specific use of the term ‘source community’. Most research participants were unfamiliar with this categorisation of communities.

Despite the lack of familiarity with this terminology, the concept of source communities was presented as a significant driver of coproduction. Source communities were clearly defined in the ways professional bodies and senior curators theorised coproduction. Source communities were strongly aligned with the priorities of new museology; coproduction involving these groups increased awareness of the complexity of cultural identity, and the implications of diversity and plurality in modern society. Professional bodies in particular were able to theorise the impact source communities had on museum practice, discussing ‘ethnographic multiculturalism’ (PB1), the need for museums to ‘articulate important issues … content that is multi-layered, deep and complex’ (PB5) and to present ideas that are ‘generated out of people and time and place’ (PB2). The challenges Australian museums have faced in relation to the representation of Australian Indigenous communities and the repatriation of cultural material highlight the significance of source communities (PB1, PB5, PB9, PB8, PB3). Coproduction with source communities was seen to result in exhibitions and public programs that are authentic and unique, providing an opportunity to ‘drill down to looking at the kind of work that’s generated out of particular cultures that are distinctive … to that place and that community’ (PB2).

The notion of source communities was also offered as a driver of Casula’s Pacifica program. Coproducing with source communities enabled issues relating to culture and identity to be explored. One museum staff member noted that coproduction involves, ‘what is relevant and representative and interesting to that group … to facilitate a conversation around culture and about pride in culture and about pride in tradition’ (MS5). Similarly, a stakeholder noted that coproduction with source communities involves, ‘passing on stories from generations before and I think for [source communities] it’s being authentic about their presentations and just getting that right … making sure that what they’re presenting is of excellence and it’s reflecting the culture authentically’ (ES7). Coproduction with source communities was able to achieve these outcomes because it provided access to the community’s cultural knowledge and intangible cultural heritage (operant resources): ‘the main part of the culture they’re talking about is the intangible, the languages, because the language informs the material culture, whether it’s two hundred or a thousand years ago’ (MS9).
Community participants were very aware of their position as source communities. As one noted, ‘we have to be part of that. *Pacifica* means us … And of course *Pacifica* means Pacific, you know, people in the Pacific. And we are very much part of the *Pacifica* environment and society’ (CR4). The involvement of community representatives in *Pacifica* drew heavily on their traditional cultural skills and knowledge. One community member described their preparation to participate in the festival as follows: ‘we make [costumes] out of … pearl shells, some out of coconut shells and some out of pandanas. It’s a process you have to go through in Tokelau where the women make the mat out of them and handcraft and also a uniform to perform in … It’s very, very traditional, we take care of it’ (CR1).

In the case of *Pacifica*, Casula was reluctant to commit to working with a static and highly traditional model of Pacific Island culture. The museum was very clear that it was not an ethnographic museum; the interplay between contemporary art and traditional culture was Casula’s interest. As a staff member noted, ‘we’re not doing *Pacifica* just to do contemporary art. Contemporary art is part of the conversation with the community’ (MS1). Casula also supported the role culture plays in a modern and global notion of community, as in ‘we don’t need to talk about identity because we’re way beyond that. We’re in the brave new world where identity doesn’t exist. It’s a global community, a global society right. That is the thinking’ (MS2).

Work with source communities was a means to access cultural resources such as intangible cultural heritage and cultural knowledge. However, for Casula and the *Pacifica* program—with its emphasis on contemporary art practice—this traditional cultural knowledge was not always at the centre of its interest. The place of traditional cultural practice within contemporary art is complex. As one staff member noted, ‘what we’re interested in is the partnerships that help us keep interrogating our own practice, but also being able to keep reaching into what a contemporary notion of Pacific culture is and what is the interface between traditional and contemporary, and that is really interesting’ (MS5).

*Pacifica* also highlights the difficulty of coproducing with source communities and that these challenges are potential inhibitors of this work. These challenges are largely associated with the high level of interpersonal and relational skills required by coproduction (sections 2.5.2.4 and 4.5.2.4). These difficulties have the potential to offset the resource advantages (access to intangible cultural heritage and operant resources) offered by work with source communities.

Community members highlighted skills and knowledge they brought that could be used to design and create *Pacifica*. These were resources that went beyond just providing content for exhibitions and public programs; instead, they indicated the community’s capacity to co-design or co-innovate *Pacifica*. For example, one community member detailed their community insights which enabled the development of a more inclusive and representative festival program:

Fiji, if you go there, you’ll see that there’s Samoans, Tongans, Indians, Chinese. It is very multicultural within itself, so we follow the same model. So when I put things out into the Fiji community, I understand that there’s
the Indo-Fijian, there’s the indigenous Fijian, there’s the Chinese Fijians and then there’s the other Euro-Fijians, they’ve got that kind of angle mixed into them. So being able to provide for all and yet bring in the commonalities amongst that. (CR7)

4.5.3.3 CAPACITY

Community capacity (2.5.3.3) was identified as both a driver and inhibitor of museum coproduction. On the one hand, communities with a high level of capacity were in a position to lobby or demand that museums coproduced with them. These communities had skills and resources that they could readily contribute to their work with museums. Alternatively, communities with lower skill levels and fewer resources needed to be supported or assisted if they were to be able to contribute to joint museum practice. In these situations, coproduction requires museums to modify the ways in which they work in order to accommodate the needs of the community or increase the skills and resources available to the community.

Communities were identified as advocates and influencers of coproduction, not only receivers of this type of museum practice. Community-initiated coproduction was seen to lead to particularly successful outcomes. One professional body observed:

I certainly wouldn’t want to convey the impression that [coproduction] has all been institutional changes of values which have then been conveyed to the communities. Because in many instances the communities have recognised the need for it and have put the case for it, and have sometimes been very assertive in insisting that this must be the way in which the cultural institutions work. (PB5)

It was suggested that communities which have a high level of skills and capacity and are well-resourced will be easiest for museums to coproduce with. Some research participants also identified the value of communities understanding the environment in which museums operate, described as ‘how comparable the milieu of the museum or gallery was with the life experience and culture of the community that is being shared’ (PB3). The more closely aligned the capacity of the museum and the community, and the more similar their cultural ways of operating and organising, the more likely they are to be able to coproduce. One museum staff member suggested, ‘we need to be able to be on the level. It’s not about us saying, hey, community, this is what you’re getting. We’ve got to create an atmosphere and the dynamics that allows the creativity to be driven (MS7).

Coproduction requires museums to accommodate different levels of community capacity. Casula was required to respond to various levels of community capacity by allocating resources or providing skills and training, as in ‘applying the museum’s resources to the community and getting them to do what they need to do … some [communities] are really on top of this stuff and others aren’t’ (PB4). Alternatively, the museum could tailor a project to a community by designing opportunities that were able to engage them in co-creative processes. One museum staff member observed of Casula’s approach to coproduction, ‘there’s not a fixed model and [program coordinator] would be the first to say this, it’s very variable’ (MS1). It was important
to find a balance between the capacity of the museum and the capacity of the community, identified as, ‘the fine line between leading and forcing in order to fit into your paradigm of how you collaborate and work with someone or what you’re expecting their rate of development to engagement to be. So it is a negotiation and I think that’s where we’re most sensitive towards that’ (MS5).

Data from the SEIFA (Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas) Index of Disadvantage ranks the municipality of Liverpool (in which Casula is located) at 103 out of the 153 LGAs in the state (ABS 2013). This figure places Liverpool among the third-most disadvantaged locations in NSW (lower SEIFA scores indicate high levels of relative socio-economic disadvantage). This statistic suggests that the communities that Casula works with are impacted by socio-economic disadvantage, which is defined by the SEIFA index as ‘people’s access to material and social resources, and their ability to participate in society’ (ABS 2013). Liverpool’s communities are therefore likely to be under-resourced in terms of funding, assets and skills—a situation expected to inhibit coproduction. The high levels of cultural diversity within these communities, and corresponding intangible cultural assets, may compensate for their lack of other resources. Casula’s task is therefore to support the community to coproduce so that the issue of capacity does not become an inhibitor of this work. One museum staff member observed that the communities:

have experience and they have ideas. They don’t really have a lot of resources, they don’t have any money usually. They’re always looking to us for something that they don’t have to pay for, space or something like that. This is their community arts centre, so of course we support those things as much as we can. They’re all kind of the same, I think, they’re all kind of the same in the sense that they don’t really have a lot of tangible things, but they have a lot of intangibles. (MS3)

A feature of the work done for Pacifica is its value as an opportunity for community development. Museum staff and external stakeholders reported that a strength of Casula is its ability to use coproduction to break down issues of social exclusion and enable community development. Building community capacity not only drives museum coproduction, but also delivers sustainable, long-term outcomes to that community. One museum staff member recounted a project in which ‘the point is to let [community leader] and the community create the ideas that culminate in what she wants to achieve. Guide her and let her know that we are there to support her if she needs it’ (MS3).

The complexity of cultural diversity within communities had the potential to inhibit their capacity to participate in museum coproduction. All research cohorts acknowledged the capacity of communities to ‘hijack’ or ‘sabotage’ coproduction through community disagreement and conflict. It is therefore essential for museum coproduction that communities have a basic capacity to organise and cooperate. One professional body highlighted the need for community groups to be ‘ready to work together with other groups as well as us in a cohesive way’ (PB4). Another noted the impact of community politics on museum coproduction, in that its success ‘really depends on the project and who’s driving it, whether it meets different agendas and
priorities … on what the politics of the community are or what different people’s agendas might be’ (PB8).

The capacity of the community to manage cultural conflict and community disagreement impacted on *Pacifica*. The potential for community disorganisation to inhibit coproduction was highlighted by a museum staff member:

People started to come on [to committees] because that’s what they wanted, people to join. People wanted to form an association and then once they formed the association, they wanted to take it from [the museum]. But they didn’t have the capacity to sustain it … You’ve got all of these people who talk, who mean well but don’t have the capacity and leadership and all of that stuff. (MS9)

This staff member was one of a number of research participants who spoke openly about the impact of community conflict and disagreement on *Pacifica*. He reflected on the impact a lack of community capacity has on their capacity to effectively work with museums:

One of the main sort of problems that the Pacific community have at the moment is actually coming together … they come from hierarchies, from different chieftain lines and da, da, da, and all you’ll find is chieftain clashes, all about chieftainship, but what about the arts? You know what I mean, there’s so much clutter. (MS9)

The term ‘clutter’ was used repeatedly by this research participant in relation to the complexity of coproducing with communities. He spoke extensively about the ways he designed collaborative processes that aimed to avoid these obstacles. Consulting extensively rather than working with formal advisory groups, seeking advocates in the community rather than distractors, and drawing on his cultural expertise and ancestral heritage as an orator or ‘talking chief’ were the key ways he attempted to navigate this ‘clutter’. It is possible that one consequence of this ‘clutter’ was the resignation of the program’s creative producer, resulting in the concluding of the program. When this doctoral researcher returned to Casula to undertake member checking, they were advised that the creative producer had resigned shortly after the 2014 *Pacifica Gods* program. Community conflict and dissent, for example claims the program was ‘too Samoan’ in its content, were among the reasons given for this development.

Community representatives acknowledged that the internal organisational capacity of their communities affected their capacity to coproduce with museums. One community representative highlighted recent evidence of dysfunction within key Samoan community organisations:

Their role within our community is to blend the community together, to organise independent celebration. It’s supposed to be a harmonious operation. But they had a big massive fight over money and they’ve split up. And it’s now become two separate organisations that have done nothing for the community, yet are getting hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of funding. To me that’s embarrassing and that’s within the Samoan community itself. (CR3)
The risk of museums not collaborating fully with communities was also suggested by community representatives. The need for communities to be allowed the potential to make a meaningful contribution to coproduction was highlighted by a community member who observed, ‘what kind of skills do [the communities] need to have to work with Casula Powerhouse? I was going to say a thick skin, don’t take no for an answer … you have to be assertive’ (CR2).

4.6 RQ3: WHAT IMPACT DOES COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES HAVE ON MUSEUM PRACTICE?

This section presents final findings relating to the impact coproduction has on museum practice. The a priori themes identified are highlighted in blue in Figure 16.

Figure 16: Summary of themes relating to impact of coproduction on museum practice

4.6.1 IMPACT OF COPRODUCTION ON PROCESS OF MUSEUM WORK

4.6.1.1 EXPERIENTIAL DESIGN

Evidence of coproduction processes relating to the design of experiential museum experiences (section 2.6.1.1) has not been found in the data collected for this case study. This is largely due to the fact that the definition of coproduction used in this research—joint practice involving museums and communities in the development and delivery of exhibitions and public programs—does not encompass experiential activity undertaken by audience members.
4.6.1.2 COLLABORATIVE PRODUCTION PROCESSES

There appears to be a correlation between collaboration and the production processes involved in coproduction (section 2.6.1.2). For example, the development of initial proposals for exhibitions and public programs was an important production stage; however, community input into this early work was seen to be critical to enable full collaboration. In response to this overlap in the data, collaborative and production coproduction processes are combined in this presentation of findings.

Museum coproduction requires creative collaboration, as exhibitions and public programs are inherently creative and cultural offerings. Projects need to facilitate creative processes which not only engage communities but also draw out their cultural knowledge and expertise. A senior curator described these processes as follows:

There tends to be this identification phase followed by a “getting to know you” phase … Sometimes the program design happens before you’ve really got to know each other. I think it’s tentative. I think there’s also something quite magical about it, because you see people who don’t know each other, or know of each other’s cultural heritage, discovering similarities and finding ways of communicating—sometimes across language barriers. I have recognised individuals highly value [this process] and don’t find it in other places. (SC1)

Involving the community from the beginning of the project not only facilitated their participation, but also strengthened their commitment. Being engaged early in the work enabled the community to influence the way the project was designed and shaped. One professional body suggested:

having that engagement or inclusiveness from early on can potentially alleviate some of the fears or concerns or apprehensions that may exist before they become issues. Also, through that process then perhaps information is revealed or things come to light that weren’t known previously, and it can shape the project and also help the culturally diverse communities to have a sense of ownership or input into it. (PB8)

Timely collaboration with communities was identified as a strength of the approach taken with Pacifica. As one community representative observed, ‘it is totally different when [consultation occurs after] the project’s started … this is not Casula, but I’ve worked at other organisations and the project is halfway through, it’s not well attended, they come … and say this community are really not supporting it’ (CR2).

The creative collaborative process involved in Pacifica was enabled by a multifaceted program that drew on a range of art forms and cultural practices. One staff member observed, ‘I think it’s very layered, the community involvement in the Pacifica program, because it’s not just a visual arts exhibition. It is also a range of performances, public programs and so much more than that even’ (MS4). One way of securing community participation is to tailor the project to the needs, interests and capacity of the community. When museum coproduction is approached in this manner:
the way of working is likely to be different; who makes the decisions about what happens, whether it’s a hands-on, down-and-dirty kind of process or it’s a consultation process simply asking for ideas, whether it’s a process of commissioning work that’s actually made by the community. Each of those will have its own way of being managed. (PB2)

Community representatives acknowledged the precarious and fragile nature of the cultural knowledge held by communities, and highlighted the need for a community—particularly a migrant community—to be strong and sure of its cultural practice in order to contribute to collaborative practices. As one community representative observed:

Each has their own issues going on within their communities and it’s a fight to keep their culture alive. It’s understandable because the further away they are from their islands, the harder it is to maintain and hold on to their roots. And also the more distorted it becomes and it’s manipulated in ways that aren’t in essence true representations of their culture, if you know what I mean? (CR3)

There is evidence of correlation between collaborative production processes and the drivers of coproduction (section 2.5). The absence of these conditions constrained museum collaborative production processes. For example, all research cohorts highlighted the impact interpersonal skills and relational skills had on the coproduction process. Collaboration was underpinned by the capacity of all participants to communicate, explain and share ideas, reach decisions and design outcomes. Essential to these collaborative requirements were a range of tacit interpersonal and communication skills such as empathy, cultural sensitivity, respect and negotiation. The complex range of communication skills required by coproduction was highlighted by one community representative:

With [coproduction] comes the communication of being able to articulate it in such a way, and position it in such a way, that community gets it … And when you’re coming from the arts … the language, then how it’s translated and how it’s picked up, is really, really important. That’s where I talk about that gap in terms of how this needs to be connected properly. It takes somebody who is culturally sensitive who then knows how to approach it in the language and so forth. The approach that needs to be taken depending on the group that you’re going to will then really allow you to connect with that. (CR7)

Negotiation regarding the content and presentation of exhibitions and public programs was the crux of museum coproduction. Coproduction involved the museum and community in decision-making which involved ‘that level of engagement and testing, trying, seeing how people respond. It’s an extra level of negotiation, communication, those kind of things’ (PB6). Participating in joint decision-making and working collaboratively appears to be a challenge for museums. A senior curator described coproduced decision-making processes as follows:

If you enter into coproduction you take away control, so you can’t control the message, you can’t control necessarily the outcome of the work, and you are then in this awkward space around the institution selecting what’s
Museums see the need to ensure coproduced exhibitions and public programs meet the same professional standard as non-coproduced projects. The notion of excellence has the potential to limit or constrain this work. An external stakeholder acknowledged that museums need to ‘keep this notion of excellence and keep this notion of what is interesting or what is dynamic or what is intriguing or what is engaging, keep that open and fluid’ (ES5). The same external stakeholder highlighted the influence professional roles and specialist knowledge have on museum coproduction, and the influence these demarcations have on collaboration involving museums and communities. She suggested:

I put the onus on the facilitators and the producers to manage how we negotiate relationships in a collaborative environment when one part of the collaboration might not see themselves as artists or experts. What they do see themselves as is of course people with cultural knowledge or cultural practitioners or keepers of cultural practice, but they might not call themselves a curator or a producer. So the curators and the producers really have to keep that in mind and make sure they’re not just orchestrating things, like no-one is a puppeteer if you’re working in a community context, we hope. (ES5)

The issue of control was emphasised in relation to coproduction processes, particularly the ways museums determine the content or ‘what’s in’ with regard to coproduced exhibitions and public programs. Collaboration requires that in some instances the museum defers to the communities’ preferences and desires. As one senior curator observed, ‘if it is truly coproduction, the institution isn’t always going to get their own way or the final say. And you have to be comfortable with that, it seems to me. That’s hard but … it has to be a genuine collaboration so you can’t actually say, come on in and by the way we’ll always do it this way’ (SC6). It was suggested that when undertaking joint museum practice with communities, museums maintain a lead role. The museum is the initiator of the work and, as the facilitator of the process, controls the project. One staff member indicated:

It’s always the gallery that is the initiator, definitely, and the community is the giver of content. So you’ve always got the gallery ask the questions, formulates the real questions that need to come out of this from discussion, and then ask those questions to the community and then the community feeds the information back. I would say the gallery plays the higher in the hierarchy. Actually that’s a bad way of saying it, it’s not. They would actually play the initiator of conversation more so than the community. The thing is, when I’m saying this, I’m thinking to myself it’s really snotty and it’s not snotty at all, it is very grassroots, but like everything in a committee there needs to be the one person that leads the discussion into any direction that they see. (MS3)

The museum’s need to maintain control during coproduction conflicted with the need to empower communities. Without some level of control being vested in the
community, they were unable to make meaningful and substantial contributions to the development of exhibitions and public programs. This involved issues such as having meaningful input into coproduction processes, influencing the final decision-making and giving voice to the community. One professional body identified the need to ‘have people involved right from the beginning and in leadership roles, determining roles, shall we say’ (PB7). Community empowerment also resulted from equal relationships, ‘a genuine fifty: fifty relationship where both parties are contributing and both parties are getting genuine outcomes’ (SC3).

Collaboration empowered the community when the museum accepted in full their contributions to coproduced projects without editing, enhancing or modifying their offerings. A senior curator highlighted a risk involved in coproduction which was controlled or ‘curated’ by the museum:

> What other people try to do constantly is to go into the community and pick out the very best bits that they want which actually fit into their resumes and agenda of what they want to present from that community. They want to be able to have the community engagement, but they want to be able to present work from the community that is really supportive of the curatorial push that they are engaged in. (SC5)

The impact of coproduction processes in which the museum clearly took on the advice and recommendations of the community was highlighted by a community representative, who reflected on her community’s positive response to *Pacifica* as:

> Wow, they listened. Look, we’re going to be doing this and I suggested we use the mamas in the Cook Island community and look … those were our recommendations and they’ve taken them on board and now here we go. it’s show time … That’s the success of how they engage with community in my opinion. (CR2)

Insights into museum coproduction processes were also provided in the form of the risks that are inherent in this type of work. Conflict and disputes are an ever present risk associated with museums and communities working together. One professional body suggested coproduction challenges museums because of the different backgrounds and expectations participants bring to the process:

> The process is different because it brings people together … the gallery or museum curator has the milieu of the experience of how you do things normally in a gallery and this group bring the things that matter to them and there’s a collision … a, well, colliding would be a bad thing to happen, collusion would be a good thing. (PB3)

Although Casula’s history of coproducive museum practice made it an exemplar in the field, negotiation with communities continued to challenge and make demands on the museum. A staff member observed:

> Where our priority is very much geared to a very set outcome, the community really defines how that negotiation and how that product is arrived at. [Achieving these outcomes is] through negotiation. It’s defined by culture, by interactions within the community that are extremely subtle...
Conflict within communities and the potential of community groups to hijack or sabotage coproduction were highlighted by museum staff. As one staff member noted, ‘unfortunately there’s a lot of fragmentations within different groups and that makes it hard for us to say, who do you work with? That is a challenge in itself. So I think the community itself needs to be organised … and I guess that takes an element of maturity of the community’ (MS7). The museum staff member who coordinated *Pacifica* and acted as a cultural intermediary was often at the centre of this community dispute and disagreement. As one of his colleagues observed, ‘I’ve seen that his heritage as Samoan, for instance, has caused conflict amongst the greater Pacific community’ (MS4).

One museum staff member spoke openly about the impact of community conflict and disagreement on *Pacifica*. He reflected on the fact that:

> there’s a lot of clutter within having organisations where we open them up and then they get hijacked by individuals and, you know, and then they start to play games and all of a sudden nothing’s happening. They actually, instead of attracting people, they make people go away. As you know, communities tend to be fractured, tend to have nutcases, tend to have a lot of not good people. (MS9)

He referred to this complexity as ‘clutter’ and spoke extensively about the ways he designed collaborative processes to avoid these obstacles. Consulting widely rather than working with formal advisory groups, seeking advocates in the community rather than distractors, and drawing on his cultural expertise and ancestral heritage as an orator or ‘talking chief’ were methods he used to navigate this ‘clutter’:

> What I actually do is I speak to … a group of people that I consult all the time … I have a lot of people that I speak to as community. So it kind of, like, instead of having a board or a committee and meeting and that, I select all the people to talk to and get advice as professionals. People who have community but also have skill and that also have capacity to understand visual arts as well … Plus it’s engagement through structure, through hierarchy. See, I think this is what a lot of people miss out, that they can’t see, is that invisible threads of representation … and then I know a Samoan chief too. I’ll talk to him on that level. And you know, it’s like, I’m talking to him, I’m talking to everyone. (MS9)

### 4.6.1.3 PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

The process of coproduction was also seen to require excellent project management skills. Research participants identified a range of generic project management principles that are critical to museum coproduction: time lines; budgets and resourcing; clear project aims; specified roles and responsibilities; and involvement of key networks and agencies. The project management nature of coproduction was highlighted by a museum staff member who described *Pacifica* as:
a whole process that involves consultation, development of the idea, development of a plan, development of a project, development of the concept, implementation, sourcing funding, finding the necessary resources to push this through and also to build the ownership and, you know, there’s so much involved with it. (MS2)

The long time lines and resource-intensive nature of coproduction presented logistical challenges. One professional body commented:

It’s fine to talk about doing [coproduced exhibitions] and I think you can do them as defined programs. But if you were to try and do an entire museum like that, which is essentially bringing together many, many communities … even getting consensus within one community can take a long time, you won’t necessarily achieve it. Trying to do that across sixty or seventy [communities] I think is probably beyond achieving. I doubt you’d get there in the end. (PB9)

The number of participants in a coproduced initiative was another logistical challenge. Discussion of the ideal number of participants acknowledged the conflicting need to provide an open and accessible environment while also limiting the number of people involved in decision-making. One professional body recommended a process in which:

you usually start with a massive group of people who are all talking about it and then you whittle that down to “Okay, so which of the forty people around this table need to be hands-on delivering it and how many just need to be informed of how it’s going?” You usually end up with about four people doing the work. (PB4)

Casula’s approach to coproduction also appeared to be the result of evaluation and organisational learning that drew on its extensive history of this form of museum practice. The *Pacifica* program was not presented as a new or altered form of museum practice for Casula; instead, it demonstrated the legacy of earlier innovation in the museum. An external stakeholder who had worked in the arts in western Sydney for many years observed, ‘I think of Casula back in [its early days] and even now … There’s a whole way of programming in western Sydney. I believe all these arts centres have really led the way … because it’s still going. I went to my first festival twelve, thirteen years ago and it’s just gotten bigger and better … For me it’s got longevity’ (ES5).

### 4.6.2 IMPACT OF COPRODUCTION ON OUTCOMES OF MUSEUM WORK

#### 4.6.2.1 COMMUNITY-INFLUENCED

Professional bodies and senior curators indicated that coproduction results in exhibitions and public programs that are unique and distinctive. The outcomes of museum coproduction therefore changes the profile of traditional museum offerings. One professional body suggested coproduction involves ‘moving away from museums being a white box where stuff is dumped into it. There’s more integration, there’s more public programs connected to it, there’s more overt invitations to people who should
come and see it’ (PB4). In relation to *Pacifica* an external stakeholder suggested, ‘I couldn’t imagine you could really do it without a collaboration because it just wouldn’t work, would it? You’d have one curator’s idea of something, but it wouldn’t really have anything to do with what the people think or feel or whatever’ (ES6). There was also a general sense that coproduction could produce exhibitions and public programs that are more engaging and raise the quality of museum offerings. One professional body suggested coproduction results in a:

significant change in exhibitions from being purely didactic explanations of something … where feeling, recollection, sadness, the full range of emotions were accepted as a legitimate response and a legitimate subject. I think all of those factors are part of the process. The answer is, I very strongly believe that coproduction produces a richer, more interesting, more thoughtful, deeper outcome than any non-coproduction process can achieve. (PB5)

For staff at Casula, large and diverse audience were the most valuable outcome gained from coproduction. The value of this work in building a large audience was highlighted by a staff member who observed, ‘I think it was four thousand people there. That turns around and says to us as policymakers that it’s worked’ (MS7). Another staff member emphasised the importance of coproduction in increasing the diversity of the audience, suggesting, ‘there’s so many measurements for success … You’ve got visitation, obviously, and ticket sales, but you also have new audience, so what sort of new audience are we getting, and within that you then have are the audience of Pacific background or are they of other background or what type of audience they are’ (MS3).

Persistent doubt existed about the quality of the results of coproduction. Coproduced exhibitions and public programs were not expected to meet the standards of professional museum practice. One professional body acknowledged there were:

people who feel that artistic standards might be compromised by giving the space and attention to people who weren’t professional arts ... art workers would probably be opposed to it and there is that culture of what’s called excellence. I mean, excellence for many of us is in the eye of the beholder, but for some people the idea of excellence is reserved for the professionals within our field. They would be likely to be opposed to seeing any compromise of those standards of excellence by involving people who aren’t trained as arts producers and as arts professionals. (PB2)

4.6.2.2 MUSEUM-INFLUENCED

All research cohorts offered insights into the ways museums have the potential to limit or restrict the impact of coproduction on their exhibitions and public programs. In fact there is evidence of coproduction processes having no impact on the outcome of museum work. The distinction between coproduction processes and outcomes means there was possibly no need for a formal or public presentation of work to which the community had contributed. One view held by research participants was that the value of museum coproduction lay in the process of collaboration and community
engagement, rather than the creation of an exhibition or public program. As one senior curator observed:

> When we’re coproducing with a community … there’s an enormous amount of benefit and interest through the process of making through to the opening night and a couple of public program events beyond that. Those not involved don’t necessarily become involved or engaged with the work … That’s the question … does there need to be [an audience] and should there be? (SC1)

Conversely, the process of coproduction might have no apparent impact on the exhibitions and public programs that result from this work. In reflecting on a major coproduced exhibition, a senior curator commented, ‘I thoroughly disliked the show and I don’t know if that was because it didn’t give a sense of the nature of those collaborations. Because in the end it was a very contemporary art context in which it was displayed. It looked like a kind of straight contemporary art show’ (SC6).

One method through which coproduction was controlled and limited involved the demarcation of spaces within the museum. For example, a number of research participants identified museums that offer a community access gallery—space which is distinct from other gallery or exhibition spaces within the museum and controlled or programmed entirely by the community. One professional body noted that a ‘lot of galleries are already providing community access spaces but they have a clear delineation between community access spaces and their programming’ (PB6). Casula offers such a space in the form of its Marsden Gallery and artists from the local community were exhibited in this space as part of *Pacifica’s* programming. The distinction between demarked and integrated spaces for communities—and the operational issues that arise—was acknowledged by a senior curator:

> The other issue is designated spaces for community and coproduced product with the community, as opposed to integration in the broader activities of the museum. We’re in a position now where we’re designing a new museum … one of the big things that we’re going to have to grapple with … is this idea of designated spaces versus integration in the existing spaces. I think probably the answer is both. [Demarcated spaces mean] you’ve created in a sense the inside/outside kind of policing. Already my curator is saying things to me like, “there’s the community gallery in the new museum, that’s where that can happen”. Yes, it will happen there, but there may also be professional work in that space and community-oriented projects outside that space. I think we probably will need to have spillover in both public programs, artists’ residency, production, collection development strategies and the cultural development strategies. It’s all kind of got to intermarry in the way you move forward. (SC1)

Professional museum practice appears to be aware of a hierarchy between exhibitions and public programs—exhibitions being the more professional and therefore important museum offering. The distinction was then made between coproducing exhibitions and public programs, and the notion emerged of ‘wrapping’ a coproduced element around a professional offering. As a senior curator suggested:
If you’re actually embarking to set out and make an artwork with a community group and then that’s going to be on display in your museum at the expense of other things being on display. There’s a sense of will it perform as a destination for audiences? Whereas for public programs you’re value-adding and there’s this sense of the quality of community engagement is highly valued by audiences in public programs. They get this incredibly professional presentation of exemplary art that you will never see in Australia again, and alongside that you get this wonderful local person with enormous pride telling you or showing you some insight into it. That’s quite different to being the reverse, which is you’ve got a situation where there’s the community non-professional artist who’s produced something that’s on show and you’ve got a professional academic curator trying to extract meaning to the public out of it. (SC1)

While a strength of *Pacifica* was that it involved a range of program components (exhibitions, public programs, education programs, *Pacifica* festival) as well as a number of art forms and cultural practices (visual art, heritage, performing arts, literature, traditional food preparation), there appeared to be a hierarchy within the various aspects of the program. Some aspects of these diverse programs were more important, and more professional, than others. One staff member reported:

On the first level the exhibitions inform the rest of the program, such as the public and education program, and it then thematically informs also the special events, which could include from performance to theatre production such as theatre companies coming from New Zealand, artists coming from the region and different other than visual arts. It is a model that has worked for us and the model strategically exposes the people to contemporary art and by updating new artists, new thematics and keeping it within the festival frame that the community are used to celebrating and coming together to celebrate. (MS9)

Within this apparent hierarchy it appears that exhibitions, particularly of contemporary art, were the most important offering within the *Pacifica* program, yet the least subject to coproduction. The following two sections of interview transcripts (Table 12), one involving a staff member and one with a community representative, suggest that community involvement in exhibitions is limited, if not absent.
Community input appears to have been consolidated around the festival and traditional cultural practice. One staff member indicated the community’s ‘main contribution is during the festival where they contribute the food and the people who diligently cook the food, which is a huge task, and so it’s very generous, as well as the performers and basically the entire programming, all the participants in the program on the day of the festival’ (MS8). Similarly, a senior curator described a programming structure which she termed ‘wraparound’ in which ‘the actual exhibition was an international show of exemplary Japanese artists, but the program wrapped around it was based on who was here and what their interests and talents were, and then designing with the community public programs for the broader mainstream’ (SC1).

As well as a hierarchy between different components of Pacifica, it was suggested that a hierarchy existed between the various artists involved in the program. In particular, a distinction was made between professional (and contemporary art) artists and artists who collaborate with communities. A staff member suggested:

You have two spectrums of the artist that work on the Pacifica program. One is the contemporary, well known, usually you’ve got the [names Samoan contemporary artist], they’re massive now. And then you have those that are emerging, working with a group in the local community. (MS3)

The critical artistic decisions about Pacifica were those that involved the subject matter and form of the program. These were the ‘thematics’ of the exhibition, and their

### Table 12: Community involvement in exhibitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview with museum staff member (MS9)</th>
<th>Interview with community representative (CR1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: So who chooses the themes?</td>
<td>Interviewer: Have you been involved in the exhibitions at all? They usually have an exhibition at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: I do.</td>
<td>Interviewee: We haven’t been involved in that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Okay. And who chooses the artists?</td>
<td>Interviewer: Okay, just the festival so far?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: I do, but I allow for input.</td>
<td>Interviewee: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: So then who chooses the artworks that the artists exhibit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: I do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Okay. And the hanging, the actual presentation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: Okay, the presentation and all of that I negotiate with [museum colleague] so he can do it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Okay, yep. And then writing the catalogues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: I do, then we move to public and education. So for the public and education [museum colleague] depending on how she’s travelling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development appeared to be the responsibility of the museum. One staff member reported:

So the model that works for now is the exhibitions, we get them up, I pretty much do all the curatorial groundwork for the Pacific exhibitions, I create the thematics … it’s my job to think how we would structure things. So it was, I’ve been basically working off a thematic for every year for all the exhibitions are central. The thematic is central to all the exhibitions. (MS9)

As well as not being involved in the development of the thematics, evidence suggests that the components of the program which the community did contribute to were not strongly aligned to the thematics of Pacifica. A community representative reflected on one year in which:

the theme was navigation but there was no real obvious sign of this navigation theme [in the festival]. I know for our [performance] company we came in with the theme, that’s what sort of drove our program. So we went from Samoan to Māori and we talked a little bit about the navigation through that in our own way … I thought this theme could have been tied in a lot better. (CR3)

An external stakeholder who collaborated with local communities on a performing art program for Pacifica also indicated that the community had little impact on the creative and cultural design of the program. Although this performing art initiative involved a collaboration with the local community, key artistic decisions regarding the project were made exclusively by the external partnering arts organisation. For example, the project involved no variation to their usual repertoire in that it drew only on popular pieces from a European operatic canon. In recounting the project her arts organisation developed for Pacifica she recalled its operatic nature, rather than a program tailored to the Pacific Island communities involved:

[The repertoire was largely operatic], yes. It’s from very well-known operas. It was from Carmen and Madame Butterfly and different operas that the audience would recognise and it was picked because of that … I think it made it very accessible for a lot of the groups who didn’t really have a lot of singing experience and they would just recognise the tunes. (ES1)

Evidence was also provided of museums editing or manipulating the outcomes of exhibitions and public programs that were the result of coproduction processes. Despite the use of collaborative processes, on occasion museums retained final decision-making and as result controlled the outcome of coproduction. As a senior curator commented:

You could cite many failures where community engagement programs have not been able to succeed because you’ve got curators who are determined to massage the community’s work into a palatable production. You kind of just have to face up to that reality. You have to make a decision, are you prepared to actually exhibit work that you would not necessarily consider to be of the highest standard that your particular institution might represent, or are you prepared to actually make some
allowance and to build, as we did, another agenda around why this work is significant? (SC5)

There were indications of the community’s limited engagement in Pacifica. While contemporary art and visual art exhibitions were the aspects of Pacifica on which museum staff placed most weight and significance, the community was not instinctively drawn to these components of the program. One staff member acknowledged this challenge:

with the Pacific people, you know, there’s, in general, you know, there can be attitudes like, oh well, what’s that, what is contemporary art, who cares? You know what I mean. The job is for us to present contemporary art and Pacific people doing contemporary art. We’re hopeful that it can become a resource for them to educate themselves about their own culture, reconnect with their culture and to play a part in sharing their culture and their experiences and hence refuelling other people’s aspirations … But it’s very difficult … even just explaining what contemporary art is, you know, like the masses of our audience are not gallery-going people. (MS9)

The selective interest the community had in Pacifica was indicated by their preference for the cultural aspects of the program and those components of the program that they directly contributed to. A museum staff member observed:

The festival is the launch of the exhibition, so the exhibition is launched by a festival and we promote that all the time. But I don’t necessarily feel that those messages really connect, because to them they’re coming for a festival, for food, for family, for performances, singing is a big thing as well, and art is the only thing at the festival that needs to be constantly reminded; ‘don’t forget you also have an exhibition here’. (MS3)

It was also suggested that community interest and involvement in Pacifica did not extend beyond their immediate community or culture. Despite the large numbers and diverse audience that attended the program, participants may have had a narrow focus on the aspects of Pacifica in which they were engaged even as audience members. One community representative recalled:

[The audience was] mostly Pacific Island and Māori people … and I think mostly they were relatives of people that were entertaining. There was a whole front section that were the families of the kids that we brought in [to perform]. As soon as we’d finished, they all cleared out and the other spectators were the families of the other groups. (CR3)

4.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Presented in this chapter are the final findings from this case study investigation of coproduction in museums. These findings integrate data from the field-level case of coproduction in Australian museums and the embedded exemplar of Casula’s Pacifica program. Findings have been presented according to the three research questions examined in this study.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers the implications of the key findings and embeds these findings within existing literature. The chapter presents constructionist and subjectivist conclusions resulting from the research and is structured according to the three research questions.

5.2 A POSTERIORI MUSEUM COPRODUCTION FRAMEWORK (CONSTRUCTIONIST CONCLUSIONS)

The review of literature relating to coproduction in museums has produced an *a priori* museum coproduction framework (Table 7). The consideration of empirical data from this case study has resulted in an *a posteriori* museum coproduction framework (Table 13). This *a posteriori* framework of coproduction in museums forms the constructionist findings of the research.

The *a posteriori* framework extends the *a priori* model in three ways. First, it is tailored to the research context incorporating language and terminology from the museum field. Second, the framework provides sub-constructs. These sub-constructs have either been identified in the literature and reinforced by empirical data, or emerged from the data collected from the case study. Third, empirical data is used to clarify the structure of constructs and sub-constructs.

**Table 13: The *a posteriori* museum coproduction framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Sub-construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How does museum coproduction manifest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notions of value</strong></td>
<td>Value as exchanged</td>
<td>Co-creation (value-in-use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value as experiential</td>
<td>Co-production—value-in-use (museum and audience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-production—within a service ecosystem (museum and stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public value</td>
<td>Delivered to upstream audiences (government and funding bodies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered to downstream audiences (service users)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community role</td>
<td>Delivered to downstream audiences (citizens or the public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community as stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community as audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of interaction</strong></td>
<td>Receptive relationships</td>
<td>Marketing-led engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory relationships</td>
<td>Curatorial-led engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crowdsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community-as-curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Sub-construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries of coproduction</strong></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual (museum and community)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third party stakeholders</td>
<td>Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government and funding bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisations and agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure of external parties</strong></td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td>Community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource exchange</strong></td>
<td>Operant resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operand resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ2: What drives and inhibits museum coproduction?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External drivers and inhibitors</th>
<th>Ethics and respect</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government policy and funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal drivers and inhibitors</td>
<td>Evaluation and reflective practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation and entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment and leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental arts policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational capabilities</th>
<th>Interpersonal skills (trust and respect; understanding and empathy; responsiveness; and empowerment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community drivers and inhibitors</th>
<th>Political (‘constituent’ communities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (‘source’ communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme | Construct | Sub-construct
--- | --- | ---
RQ3: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on process</th>
<th>Experiential design</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration and production processes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on outcomes</th>
<th>Community-influenced</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum-influenced</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 RQ1: HOW DOES MUSEUM COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY COMMUNITIES MANIFEST? (SUBJECTIVIST CONCLUSIONS)

5.3.1 MUSEUM COPRODUCTION FRAMEWORK

This case study of coproduction in museums has identified six constructs through which museum coproduction manifests (Table 13). Evidence confirming the relevance of each of these constructs in the manifestation of coproduction in museums is found at both a field level and in the exemplar case *Pacifica*. Modelling coproduction through these constructs contributes to existing knowledge by addressing the need for conceptual clarity in relation to coproduction (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Osborne et al. 2016; Ostrom et al. 2010). Unlike previous coproduction models and typographies, which are grounded in a single discipline—most commonly public administration (for example Bovaird 2007; Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Evers 2006; Osborne et al. 2015; Osborne and Strokosch 2013) or marketing (Frow et al. 2015; Frow et al. 2011)—the coproduction framework developed through this current research offers an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on management, marketing, public administration and museology literature. Being the product of an abductive research strategy (drawing on both theory and empirical research), this framework fills a gap in management and marketing literature in terms of empirical research into coproduction (Echeverri and Skålên 2011; Ranjan and Read 2016).

5.3.2 MUSEUM COPRODUCTION HIERARCHY

5.3.2.1 SPECTRUM OF COPRODUCTION APPROACHES

Within each of the constructs that determine the way museum coproduction manifests, there are factors which may compromise the notion of museum coproduction as joint practice between museums and communities. Emerging from these findings is a spectrum of coproduction and a corresponding hierarchy in the ways museum coproduction manifests.

Museum coproduction manifests according to three typographies, determined according to the level of influence and control that is afforded to the community. Drawing on the participation hierarchies proposed in Arnstein’s seminal ‘ladder of citizen participation’ (1969), this research terms these typographies ‘non-
participatory’, ‘tokenistic’ and ‘citizen power’ coproduction (*Error! Reference source not found.*). The three typographies are distinguished according to the level of symmetry in the relationship between the museum and the community (Fisher and Smith 2011), the proximity between museum and community (Brandsen and Honingh 2016) and the extent of value congruence between museum and community (Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010). The following sections provide conceptual descriptions of the coproduction spectrum and associated hierarchy that have emerged from this research.

This provides an alternative to existing marketing and public administration literature, which has been criticised for being overly positive about coproduction and giving inadequate attention to its conceptualisation (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Fisher and Smith 2011; Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Heidenreich et al. 2015; Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010; Voorberg et al. 2014). This finding also helps to explain the complexity of coproduction that has been observed in museums and the public sector (for example Ang 2005; Bovaird 2007; Iervolino 2013; Keith 2012; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Varutti 2013).

### 5.3.2.1.1 NON-PARTICIPATORY COPRODUCTION

Lower order forms of coproduction are those that involve consultation and communication, and in which the community’s role is that of a passive ‘audience’ requiring a ‘receptive’ relationship with the museum (Australia Council for the Arts 2010). This research categorises these approaches as ‘non-participation’ (Arnstein 1969) because they allow the community a very low impact on decision-making. These forms of coproduction align with ‘inform’ and ‘consult’ on the public participation spectrum (IAP2 2014), Simon’s (2010) notion of ‘contributory’ museum participation and Evers’s (2006) description of ‘consumerism’ user involvement in public services.

As a passive audience, the community receives value through an exchange with the museum. The community plays a receptive role, ‘spectating’ (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) the exhibitions and public programs offered by the museum. The museum is the key beneficiary of this approach to coproduction because its visitation is increased, which secures its public funding; in other words, non-participatory coproduction provides evidence of public value to the museum’s upstream audience (government and funding bodies) (Wensley and Moore 2011). Operand resources in the form of government funding are the key resources exchanged. The community participates as individuals in the form of audience members. The emphasis on promotion and consultation in non-participation coproduction highlights its links to marketing activity. Ranjan and Read (2016) suggest that market research is the simplest and also most distant form of coproduction between the firm and consumers.

Within non-participation coproduction, the relationship between museum and community is weighted towards the museum (Fisher and Smith 2011) and there is no value congruence between the two parties (Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010). While non-participation coproduction is less demanding because it does not require major alterations in museum practice or challenge the role of museum professionals (Ang
2005; Bovaird 2007), it is not without risk. Given the lack of agency this approach
gives to the community, it is likely to alienate and frustrate community members who
may expect to have greater influence on coproduction (Lynch 2011).

5.3.2.1.2 TOKENISTIC COPRODUCTION

Tokenistic coproduction falls towards a mid-point on the coproduction spectrum and
involves activity such as participation, audience development and community
engagement. Tokenism offers a more dynamic and audience-centred form of museum
attendance than non-participation (Simon 2010). It aligns with ‘involve’ in the public
participation spectrum (IAP2 2014) and falls within Evers’s (2006) ‘participationism’
category of coproduction. Osborne et al.’s (2016) definition of coproduction may fall
within this category; if community members make a substantial contribution to the
service experience and resulting public value, they will have exceeded the
requirements of tokenistic coproduction.

Within tokenistic coproduction, the community’s involvement is still that of
‘audience’, but with increasing agency and active engagement (Australia Council for
the Arts 2010; Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). Their involvement in
‘crowdsourcing’ sees the community activated in choosing or contributing to the
creation of an artistic product typically curated or produced by professional artists and
curators (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). The museum and community work
together to co-create value and, because the community is also involved in the
consumption of museum offerings, this co-creation takes the form of value-in-use
(Vargo and Lusch 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2008). As a result, tokenistic coproduction
provides benefits for both the museum and the community. The community is still
involved as individuals, but community leaders are increasing sought out to represent
broader segments of the community and facilitate access to community networks. The
community provides operant resources (cultural knowledge or design and curatorial
ideas) as well as operand resources in the form of community contacts and networks
(Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013).

While participation and engagement require more proximal approaches to
coproduction, tokenistic coproduction still considers consumers to be outside the firm
and a resource to be exploited (Ranjan and Read 2016). The relationship becomes more
symmetrical (Fisher and Smith 2011) and their values congruent (Plé and Rubén
Chumpitaz 2010) due to the contribution of resources from both parties and the mutual
benefits provided. While tokenistic coproduction sits at the lower end of a
coproduction spectrum, it is not without complexity or difficulties. For example,
crowdsourcing (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011) and audience development (Mc
Carthy and Jinnett 2001; Parker 2012; Wiggins 2004) require insight into the complex
nature and make-up of a community, which can only be gained on the basis of an
ability to form strong relationships with communities (Durrer and Miles 2009).
5.3.2.1.3 CITIZEN POWER COPRODUCTION

Citizen power coproduction is a higher order form of museum coproduction that emphasises collaboration and comes closest to the notion of joint practice involving museums and communities. Osborne et al.’s (2016) concepts of co-design, co-construction and co-innovation of public services fall within citizen power coproduction. This category of coproduction also aligns with the notion of ‘collaborate’ within the public participation spectrum (IAP2 2014), Simon’s (2010) definitions of ‘collaborative’ and ‘co-creative’ museum participation, and Evers’s (2006) notion of ‘participationism’ if there is an emphasis on ‘empowering’ users.

These approaches to coproduction acknowledge co-creation of value occurring within a network or service ecosystem (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Within citizen power coproduction, the community takes on a stakeholder role and works with museum staff in the capacity of co-creator (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011). Through collaborative approaches to coproduction, the community makes significant contributions to the development of exhibitions and public programs, with the result that these museum offerings become more dialectic and complex, creating unique and distinctive offerings for third party audiences. These distinct offerings mean the museum delivers greater public value to its users (downstream audiences) (Wensley and Moore 2011). Citizen power coproduction benefits both museum and community because it results in exhibitions and public programs that neither would be able to create on their own (Huxham 2003). The community not only brings cultural resources to coproduction, but also contributes their tacit or ‘sticky’ knowledge (Osborne et al. 2015) through involvement in the initial concepts, themes, design and curatorial decisions regarding exhibitions and public programs (Davies 2010; Davies 2011). The community may contribute to this work as individuals, but they are more likely to be representatives of a community collective (Brudney and England 1983; Pestoff 2009).

Citizen power forms of coproduction involve proximal (Brandsen and Honingh 2016) and symmetrical (Fisher and Smith 2011) relationships between the museum and the community, and so are more challenging of traditional museum practice. The museum requires highly developed dynamic capabilities in order to access and utilise resources from the community (den Hertog et al. 2010; Greer et al. 2016). Citizen power coproduction requires strong value congruence between the museum and the community (Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010) and as a result value propositions (Akaka et al. 2013; Frow et al. 2014; Laud et al. 2015) are likely to be a valuable tool for negotiating this work.

The requirement that influence and authority are also invested in the community means that citizen power forms of coproduction present the greatest challenge to curators and museum staff (Fisher and Smith 2011; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010). However, citizen power forms of museum coproduction are more encompassing of the practical changes to museum role and function called for in new museology (McCall and Gray 2014; Ross 2004; Stam 1993; Vergo 1989a).
5.3.2.1.4 COPRODUCTION OUTLIERS

Some approaches to coproduction are so empowering that they result in the community working independently of professional museum staff. In these approaches, coproduction does not involve joint practice between museums and communities because the community works self-sufficiently. Examples of these outliers to coproduction include initiatives that could be classified as ‘citizen control’ and ‘delegated power’ (Arnstein 1969) or ‘empower’ (IAP2 2014). Bovaird’s (2007) category of ‘self-organised user/community provision’ is such an example, as is Simon’s (2010) ‘hosted’ exhibitions and public programs (Simon 2010).

In a museum context, these extremes in coproduction involve activity such as community access gallery spaces (acknowledged at a field level by PB1, PB9, SC5, SC1, SC6, SC4, PB5) and are evident within the exemplar in the form of Casula’s Marsden Gallery. These approaches to coproduction do not require collaboration between the museum and community and are usually spaces, programs or content from which the museum consciously or unconsciously separates itself. Rather than involving joint practice, these approaches can be described as ‘an unbridled creative free-for-all and require little organised and collaborative effort’ (Brown and Novak-Leonard 2011, p. 18). Although these approaches to coproduction seem to be highly empowering of the community, they in fact present limited risk or challenge to the museum because they are at arms length from the museum and not necessarily part of the work it authorises or endorses (Phillips 2003).

5.3.2.2 MAPPING MUSEUM COPRODUCTION AGAINST COPRODUCTION SPECTRUM

The coproduction spectrum and associated hierarchy that have emerged from this research also highlight differences in the way various research cohorts understood museum coproduction to manifest. Professional bodies and senior curators acknowledged the potential for coproduction to manifest as citizen power coproduction, describing this type of work in narrative interviews. Narrative interviews with museum staff and external stakeholders emphasised non-participation or tokenistic approaches to coproduction, with the assumption that this is the form in which museum coproduction occurs. Community representatives involved in *Pacifica* very clearly described their work as manifesting as citizen power coproduction and identified their involvement in joint practice with the museum.

*Error! Reference source not found.* illustrates the coproduction spectrum and associated hierarchy that have emerged from the current research. Mapped against this table is the assessment made by museum staff and external stakeholders of the way in which *Pacifica* manifested. Also mapped here is the assessment of community representatives in relation to the manifestation of *Pacifica* and their involvement. Highlighted in this mapping of these two perspectives is the gap between the ways museum staff and external stakeholders accounted for the manifestation of coproduction within *Pacifica* and the ways community representatives perceived this work to occur.
### Table 14: Structure of coproduction hierarchy and its implications for *Pacifica*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coproduction typology</th>
<th>Non-participation [lower order]</th>
<th>Tokenistic [middle order]</th>
<th>Citizen power [higher order]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative approaches</strong></td>
<td>Consultation, communication</td>
<td>Community engagement, audience development, participation</td>
<td>Collaboration, co-innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum manifestation constructs</th>
<th>Notions of value</th>
<th>Community role</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Structure of external parties</th>
<th>Nature of the exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value exchanged/public value (for upstream audiences)</td>
<td>Audience (passive)</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Operand resources (government funding)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value as exchanged/public value (for downstream audiences)</td>
<td>Audience (engaged)</td>
<td>Crowdsourcing/active audience</td>
<td>Museum and community</td>
<td>Individuals and community leaders</td>
<td>Operant and operand cultural resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creation of value (value-in-use) / public value (for downstream audiences)</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Co-creators</td>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-production of value (within a service ecosystem) / public value (for downstream ‘body politic’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X = Museum staff’s and external stakeholders’ descriptions of the manifestation of coproduction within *Pacifica* |
| X = Community representatives’ description of the manifestation of coproduction within *Pacifica* |

Increasing symmetry, proximity and value congruence between museum and community
When *Pacifica* is mapped against this coproduction spectrum according to the accounts provided by museum staff and external stakeholders, it appears Casula’s work steers towards ‘lower’ or ‘middle order’ forms of coproduction. While *Pacifica* involves the museum working with culturally diverse communities, Casula avoids ‘higher order’ forms of coproduction which would require it to share control and authority with the community. *Pacifica* does not involve ‘museum practice conducted jointly with communities’; instead it manifests as the museum working with audiences to tailor offerings that result in increased community attendance.

The community described their involvement in *Pacifica* very differently. According to the accounts given in their narrative interviews, community representatives understood themselves to be involved in citizen power coproduction, demonstrated by their observation that they ‘are the Pacific’ (CR1 and CR4) and the assumption that a program like this could only occur with the fundamental involvement of people with the necessary cultural knowledge, traditions and practice. Community representatives highlighted their stakeholder role and the collaborative undertaking to which they saw themselves contributing in terms of joint practice. Museums avoid or constrain coproduction by prioritising approaches that skew the symmetry in the relationship towards them, maintain the distance between them and the community, and prioritise their values. However, the community assumes it contributes to museum coproduction in terms of joint practice; the community understands its work to be proximal to the museum, sees symmetry in its relationship with the museum and believes the values of the two parties to be congruent. This gap in perceptions between the museum and the community highlights the different perspectives the two parties have of museum coproduction. It also demonstrates a structural means through which museums create a ‘myth’ of coproduction, while maintaining their control over museum practice and the development of exhibitions and public programs.

This finding contributes to the level of detail about the manifestation of coproduction. In addition to addressing the need for greater conceptualisation of coproduction (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Fisher and Smith 2011; Heidenreich et al. 2015; Osborne et al. 2016; Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010; Ranjan and Read 2016; Voorberg et al. 2014), it adds to the complexity with which coproduction is understood by examining the impact of power and authority on the practice of coproduction. This research also adds to the conceptualisation of coproduction by incorporating the perspectives of external parties which have generally been overlooked in empirical research into coproduction (for exceptions see Davies 2010; Davies 2011; Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Fisher and Smith 2011; Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Lynch 2010; Thyne and Hede 2016; White et al. 2009).

### 5.3.2.3 Impact of coproduction discourse on its manifestation in museums

The lack of conceptual clarity about coproduction (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Fisher and Smith 2011; Osborne et al. 2016) appears to work to the advantage of museums. Because the term functions as an umbrella concept covering a range of consultative, participation, engagement and collaborative processes (section 2.2),
museums are able to talk about their coproduction work without being specific about what this entails. Museums can use the rhetoric of coproduction and claim to practise coproduction regardless of where this work sits on the coproduction spectrum. This enables museums to present a discourse of their coproduction work irrespective of whether it is ‘lower’ or ‘higher’ order coproduction. Despite the definition of coproduction used within this research (including its emphasis on joint practice) being clarified at the commencement of all narrative interviews, museums discussed examples of coproduction that fell well outside this definition. For example, two curators (C4 and C8) discussed at length their work in participation and community engagement even though this form of museum practice is far from a joint practice approach to coproduction. In other words, museums can present themselves as coproducing with communities whether or not they are shifting from traditional museum practice and empowering the communities they work with. The ambiguity and lack of clarity in coproduction discourse assist museums to create a ‘myth’ about their coproduction practice, a process that Foucault’s genealogical method and notion of power/knowledge (section 3.3.2.3.2) alerts us to (Burrell 1998; Clark et al. 2011; Foucault and Gordon 1980).

5.3.3 MUSEUM COPRODUCTION AND RESOURCE EXCHANGE

5.3.3.1 COPRODUCING TO ACCESS RESOURCES

The use of coproduction as a means to exchange resources is an established principle in coproduction theory (section 2.4.6). The most specific attention to coproduction and resource exchange comes from marketing literature and S-D logic’s shift in emphasis to operant resources (skills and knowledge), which are seen to be essential to service and the fundamental unit of exchange (Lusch and Vargo 2006; 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2008). Other disciplines are less specific about the type of resources that are involved in coproduction. Management literature emphasises the dynamic capabilities an organisation requires in order to access and make use of resources through coproduction (den Hertog et al. 2010; Greer et al. 2016). Public administration sees coproduction as a means to access both the work required to deliver public services and the decision-making required to improve the design of these services (Alford 2009; Osborne et al. 2016). Museology literature acknowledges that museums work with communities in order to access both artefacts and cultural knowledge (ICOM 2013; UNESCO n.d.). Despite the exchange of resources being a consistent theme within coproduction theory, the current study of coproduction in museums has found that the complexity of resources exchanged through coproduction, and the means through which this exchange occurs, have not been fully considered in previous research. This research clarifies the conceptualisation of coproduction and the way it manifests by undertaking a more detailed investigation of the resources that are involved, the nature and impact of these resources, and the means by which they are exchanged.
5.3.3.2 DIVERSITY OF RESOURCES INVOLVED IN MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

The findings highlight the diversity of resources that are exchanged through museum coproduction. Despite S-D logic’s emphasis on operant resources, the exchange of both operant and operand resources is evident in findings from the case study (section 4.4.6). The diversity of resources involved in museum coproduction is highlighted in the recognition of resources in the coproduction spectrum (Error! Reference source not found.). The resources exchanged when museums and communities coproduce include operand resources in the form of government funding (non-participation coproduction), operand and operant cultural resources in the form of artefacts and intangible cultural heritage that the community provides to the museum (tokenistic coproduction), and operant resources in the form of tacit and ‘sticky’ knowledge (Osborne and Strokosch 2013) required for co-design and co-innovation of exhibitions and public programs (citizen power coproduction).

While coproduction in museums is not restricted to the exchange of operant resources as S-D logic would suggest (Lusch and Vargo 2006; 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2008), operant resources are more apparent in higher order forms of coproduction, particularly citizen power coproduction. These types of operant resources distinguish between community participation as ‘designers’ from that as ‘producers’ (Dong 2015), and are required from the community if it is to contribute to co-design, co-construction and co-innovation (Osborne et al. 2016). Coproduction that draws on a community’s ‘sticky’ or tacit knowledge (Osborne and Strokosch 2013) is complex. While operand resources involve allocative capabilities, securing operant resources requires dynamic capabilities (Arnould et al. 2006). These are the ‘coproducing and orchestrating’ (den Hertog et al. 2010) dynamic capabilities museums need if they are to secure resources from the community that lead to strategic advantages (Ambrosini and Bowman 2009; Barney 1991; Hunt and Donna 2012; Suseno and Ratten 2007; Teece et al. 1997) and service innovations (den Hertog et al. 2010). These may be the coproduction skills that Bovaird (2007) suggests public sector professionals are lacking and require in a new ‘coproduction development officer’ role.

Access to the operand and operant resources that museums would be expected to value—collection artefacts and cultural knowledge—do not feature as strongly in narrative accounts of museum coproduction as expected. The emphasis on the community’s role as ‘audience’ and relationships characterised as ‘enhanced engagement’ and ‘crowdsourcing’ reveal instead the museum’s interest in using coproduction to access social networks, including community leaders and influencers. Museums coproduce in order to gain access to consumer operant resources in the form of social connections (Arnould et al. 2006) and encourage the work of surrogate consumers (Etgar 2008; Solomon 1986). Market-specific knowledge rather than firm-specific knowledge is the aim of coproduction (Suseno and Ratten 2007). These resources are used by museums to increase attendance and visitation, resulting in more government funding and support. These are the resources exchanged in middle order forms of coproduction, particularly tokenistic coproduction. In limiting the
coproduction approach involved in *Pacifica*, Casula therefore limited the community resources that were made available.

5.3.3.3 INTERCONNECTEDNESS OF OPERAND AND OPERANT RESOURCES IN MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Despite S-D logic’s emphasis on operant resources as the key to service and the fundamental basis of exchange (Lusch and Vargo 2006; 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2008), evidence from this case study of coproduction in museums attests to the importance of operand resources. Operand resources continued to be an important exchange within museum coproduction; in the museum context, the operand resources exchanged through coproduction took the form of artefacts and collection material. More detailed consideration of the resources exchanged in museum coproduction indicates that the distinction between operant and operand resources is more complex than S-D logic theory suggests. The fact that operand resources continue to be exchanged through museum coproduction reveals the inter-related nature of operand and operant resources.

Although intangible cultural heritage (section 2.4.6.1) initially appears to be an operant resource—drawing on cultural knowledge and skills—museum coproduction uses intangible cultural heritage as an operand resource. Intangible cultural heritage provides a ‘raw material’ from which museums shape their exhibitions and public programs. When the community provides true operand resources, these are its tacit and ‘sticky’ knowledge needed to contribute to the design, program and interpretation of exhibitions and public programs as exchanged in citizen power coproduction (Error! Reference source not found.). Museum coproduction that only secures the exchange of intangible cultural heritage in effect serves to draw the community into the museum as an extension to its collection (an operand resource).

The dilemma for the museum is that, while it can collect material cultural heritage (physical artefacts and collection material) and remove this from its source community (Peers and Brown 2003), intangible cultural heritage is inherent to people and communities and cannot be collected and managed by museums. This situation was highlighted by the community representative who spoke of the complex ownership of intangible cultural heritage, noting in relation to traditional tattooing practice, ‘there are certain families that can only perform it … No-one can just go and learn how, you got to be part of that family. You can’t learn it at university’ (CR4). Because intangible cultural heritage is embedded in the community, coproduction and collaboration are the only means by which museums can access this resource. Because intangible cultural heritage is a complex social phenomenon that cannot be owned by the museum, it is an excellent example of a ‘imperfectly imitative’ resource that offers strategic competitive advantage (Barney 1991). Coproduction with source communities is the only way intangible cultural heritage can be accessed by the museum.

Without relevant collection material (operand resources), museums are unable to document or represent culturally diverse communities. It is through cultural
knowledge and intangible cultural heritage (operand resources) that the significance and meaning of this material is accessed. Acknowledgement that *Pacifica* was an opportunity to reconnect traditional artefacts and cultural knowledge was made by an external stakeholder who noted in relation to intangible cultural heritage, ‘it’s not visible outwardly, but on a deeper level there is still a deep connection to their traditional culture and that’s a *bridge to the objects*’ (ES6, emphasis added).

A similar blurring of boundaries between operand and operand resources was apparent in the museum coproduction in relation to the value of social networks. Museums use coproduction to access community networks in order to increase visitation to the museum and then benefit from the rewards that are offered when it uses this attendance to demonstrate public value to funding bodies. Fyrberg (2013) noted a similar phenomenon in the way football clubs use fan communities to gain operand resources from sponsors. Museum coproduction provides further evidence that the classification of operand and operand resources is not static (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Peñaloza and Mish 2011) and can vary according to the way the resource is used and the interests of different actors within a service ecosystem.

5.3.3.4 USE OF RESOURCES IN MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Evidence that coproduction does not involve operand resources as conceptualised by S-D logic can be found in the way resources function within museum coproduction. S-D logic emphasises coproduction as a resource integration process (Lusch and Vargo 2006; 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2008). This study of coproduction in museums suggests that coproduction is a resource-gathering process conducted by the museum, rather than an integration of operand resources. Coproduction in museums is better understood as an exchange.

The accounts of museum coproduction offered at a field level and within the embedded case are almost exclusively descriptions of unidirectional sharing of knowledge and resources; the community provided resources to the museum—in the form of either access to social networks or intangible cultural heritage. The integration of resources, or even the reciprocal exchange of resources, was not emphasised in accounts of museum coproduction. In particular, the community’s involvement in the design of exhibitions and public programs was not acknowledged. As indicated by the museum coproduction hierarchy (Table 14), the limited integration of resources and unidirectional sharing of resources are further evidence that *Pacifica* manifested as lower to middle order forms of coproduction. In order for citizen power coproduction to be evident, the community and museum need to both contribute tacit and ‘sticky’ knowledge to the design and innovation of exhibitions and public programs. This has not been found in the data collected for this case study. In fact, one of the few acknowledgements of the reciprocal nature of coproduction was an external stakeholder’s warning about ‘mining a community for cultural knowledge and cultural connections’ (ES5). It appears that *Pacifica* manifested in a manner in which resource sharing led to learning in the form of ‘sidelining’ (learning from or with partners is not important) or selfish (we take from you without giving to you) (Huxham and Hibbert 2008).
The lack of evidence of either bi- or multidirectional flow of knowledge and resources in this study has implications for the creation of knowledge through coproduction. Coproduction that involves relationships between professionals and citizens is expected to result in organisational learning and create new knowledge (Argote and Miron-Spektor 2011; Brandsen and Honingh 2016). This is because organisational learning involves a change in the organisation which is initiated as it acquires experience and knowledge (Argote and Miron-Spektor 2011). Findings from this study indicate that, when they coproduce, museums are either ‘selfish’ in terms of exploiting knowledge held by the partner (community) or ‘sideline’ learning and knowledge exchange by excluding it from the collaborative agenda (Huxham and Hibbert 2008). Evident in this finding is the unequal status held by the museum and community, as the exchange of knowledge is seen to be unlikely between groups that have different levels of power (Bunderson and Reagans 2011). Examining the use of resources during museum coproduction therefore highlights the lack of agency given to communities. The ways communities are ‘contained’ by the manifestation of museum coproduction include the manner in which the museum limits the influence of the resources they have to offer.

### 5.3.3.5 Constructed Nature of Knowledge and Operant Resources

The means by which operant resources such as knowledge and expertise are defined, the sources they are assigned to and the importance placed on various forms of knowledge are themselves constructed and an expression of power and control in the relationship between a museum and its communities. Just as there appears to be a hierarchy in the various approaches that can be taken to museum coproduction, a hierarchy also exists in relation to the skills and knowledge that are involved in coproduction. For example, Mason et al. acknowledge museum resistance to knowledge that comes from outside the institution, noting “co” precisely signals the interaction between different individuals and their knowledge and skills. Curatorial expertise is not made redundant by the introduction of new types of knowledge’ (Mason et al. 2013, p. 173). Similarly, in public sector coproduction more generally, Branden and Taco (2016) make a distinction between citizen and professional knowledge. They note that coproduction involves ‘different types of knowledge—the one general knowledge of the core (primary) process of the organization and the production of service, and the other situational or local knowledge’ (Brandsen and Honingh 2016, p. 430). The same dichotomy exists in relation to resources exchanged through museum coproduction, which distinguish between the community’s ‘traditional’ knowledge and the ‘professional’ (Varutti 2013) or ‘museum’ (Krmpotich 2011) knowledge held by the museum.

It is important to realise that the categorising of knowledge, creation of knowledge hierarchies and assigning of knowledge to specific sources is a subjective process. The knowledge and expertise that constitute the operant resources exchanged through museum coproduction are themselves constructed and the subject of power—a process...
acknowledged within Foucault’s ‘archaeological method’ (Clark et al. 2011; Foucault 1979; McKinlay et al. 2012; Scheurich and McKenzie 2005).

5.3.4 PUBLIC VALUE AND MANIFESTATION OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

5.3.4.1 COPRODUCTION IN PUBLIC SECTOR

This case study has found that coproduction manifests in a distinctive manner when it occurs in the public sector. The influence of public value (section 2.4.1.3) on the work of public sector organisations means that the manifestation of coproduction in the public sector is very different from that in the commercial sector. From evidence collected for this current case study it is apparent that there are three groups that benefit from museum coproduction: communities; museums; and third party stakeholders (such as government and audiences). These three beneficiaries—and the interdependent nature of the benefits they receive from museum coproduction—were identified by the head of a professional body:

> It’s what we call a mutually beneficial outcome. Obviously the institution benefits because it’s theoretically broadening its audience and it’s contributing across a community and that’s good for it to be seen in that way. Also the participants benefit because their cultural expression is becoming part of what people know and understand, and that’s an increasingly important part of the makeup of how we accept and take on board people from other cultures. (PB7, emphasis added)

The emphasis in the above quote—that it is ‘good for it to be seen in that way’—alludes to the influence government and funding bodies (third party stakeholders) have on the receipt of benefits from coproduction. Demonstrating that the museum has relevance to the community and contributes to society vouches for its claims on the ‘public purse’ and receipt of government funding.

The finding that there are three beneficiaries of museum coproduction aligns with the Public Value Strategic Triangle (Moore 1995; Moore and Benington 2011) (Figure 2). Benefits received by the museum relate to operational capacity (the museum, including staff, board, collections, networks and relationships); benefits received by external stakeholders relate to the authorising environment (government, funders, professional bodies, artists); while benefits received by the community or third party audiences relate to public value outcomes (audiences, communities, active citizens).

Public value highlights the need for innovative public managers to align or negotiate trade-offs between the three points on this triangle (Benington and Moore 2011; Hartley et al. 2015; Moore 1995). Public value involves ‘looking upward towards the political authorising environment that both provided resources and judged the value of what they were producing, and outward toward the task environment where their efforts to produce public value would find success or value’ (Moore 2013, p. 7). Museums therefore have two imperatives: to provide public value to audiences, communities and the broader public; and also to demonstrate to government that they...
are delivering this public value. Evident in these dual imperatives is the dilemma that is inherent in the public sector. Unlike the private sector, public sector marketing involves both downstream marketing (to clients and users) and upstream marketing (to elected members and public authorities) (Wensley and Moore 2011).

5.3.4.2 INFLUENCE OF PUBLIC VALUE ON MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Contradicting the intention of public value theory (Moore 1995; Moore and Benington 2011), findings from this case study indicate that not all points in the Public Value Strategic Triangle carry equal weight. Museum coproduction manifests in a manner that privileges some points on the Public Value Strategic Triangle over others. From this case study it is apparent that museums approach coproduction in a manner designed to emphasise to the authorising environment the public value they deliver.

One of the critiques of public value is that the entrepreneurial capacity of public managers can manifest in the use of public value for self-interest, rather than the delivery of public outcomes. The complexity of relationships within the public sector allows public managers to influence politicians and use their authority and expertise to enhance decision-making processes (Alford and O'Flynn 2009; Hartley et al. 2015). When used as a rhetorical tool or to lobby for public subsidy, the point of connection on the Public Value Strategic Triangle between the authorising environment (government) and organisational capacity (public sector organisation) dominates the attention of public managers. The third point on the triangle (public value outcomes) is needed to vouch for government funding and support. The risk in this situation is that public value is used as ‘entrepreneurial advocacy’ or a form of public sector marketing that could be described as ‘propaganda’ (Alford 2008). Its self-serving potential and use as a rhetorical tool have led public value to be described as ‘the latest buzz-phrase that can peddled as the most modern version of public sector management snake-oil’ (Gray 2008a, p. 211) and an ‘objective for public service modernisation, [that] gives motherhood and apple pie a good run for their money’ (Crabtree 2004).

The study of coproduction in museums provides empirical evidence of this use of public value for ‘entrepreneurial advocacy’ (Alford 2008). This research has found that museums undertake coproduction in order to demonstrate their public value to governments and funding bodies. When museums coproduce, their priority is upstream marketing and the demonstration of public value to funding bodies, rather than downstream marketing to communities and service users (Wensley and Moore 2011). Museums are identified as the key beneficiary of coproduction; however, rather than these benefits being the result of enhanced museum services, coproduction aids museums by enabling them to ‘tick the box’ in relation to the expectations of funding bodies. The use of museum coproduction to gain public values benefits is therefore evidence of the political astuteness of museum managers, demonstrating their ability to influence external decision-makers and secure a mandate for the museum (Hartley et al. 2015). The resources public authorities provide to museums (funding and grants) are those that the museums are most keen to secure by coproducing with communities, not the skills and expertise (operant resources) available from communities.
When community and museum experiences of coproduction are mapped against the coproduction hierarchy (illustrated in Table 14), the lack of value congruence is highlighted. While the community believes it is contributing to museum coproduction as a stakeholder with valuable cultural resources that contribute to unique and distinctive museum offerings, the museum understands coproduction to involve working with the community to ensure large numbers of culturally diverse communities visit the museum and engage in its programs. This lack of value alignment appears to be a major impediment to collaborative forms of coproduction (Huxham 2003; Plé and Rubén Chumpitaz 2010). The Public Value Strategic Triangle indicates that, while the values held by the museum and community are not aligned, there is strong value congruence between the museum and the authorising environment.

The museum’s preference to align with the values of the authorising environment rather than the community suggests the different levels of power and influence held by the various points on the strategic triangle. Upstream and downstream audiences for coproduction and the demonstration of public value have different levels of influence on museums. Upstream audiences (politicians, senior public managers) are powerful and articulate their desires through voice or agency, while downstream audiences (clients/service users) are less powerful and limited to exerting their influence through ‘exit’ (Wensley and Moore 2011, pp. 136-137). Museums appear to be less concerned about the risk of communities disengaging with a project than government withdrawing its funding and support.

The potential for public value to corrupt the way museum coproduction manifests is evidence of Foucault’s ‘governmentality’ (Burchell et al. 1991; Foucault and Gordon 1980). While the definition of a museum identifies its purpose as ‘a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public … for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment’ (ICOM 2007), museum coproduction manifests for the purpose of meeting government priorities and securing their support and funding. Museums are a public service that seek to improve the quality of life of individuals, while at the same time increasing the strength and influence of the state.

5.3.4.3 PUBLIC VALUE AND CONSTRAINT OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Within public administration and museology literature, coproduction is purported to increase the quality and effectiveness of public services. Coproduction secures the work done by clients to enhance or ensure the delivery of services (Alford 2009; Alford 2011; Loeffler et al. 2008) and enables the redesign of public services and the systems through which they are offered (Boyle and Harris 2009; Osborne et al. 2016; Osborne and Strokosch 2013; Stephens et al. 2008). Within museology literature, coproduction is seen as a means to engage communities (Lynch 2010; Simon 2010) and produce exhibitions and public programs that acknowledge the complexity of cultural diversity and empower communities (Ang 2005; Gurian 2006; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Phillips 2011). However, this case study identifies that these advantages of coproduction are not those sought by museums. Because the authorising environment and upstream
audiences—sources of funding and support—dominate the attention of museums, museum coproduction manifests in a manner that distorts the model proposed by existing theory.

From this current study it is apparent that the need to demonstrate public value to the authorising environment limits the use of coproduction in the public sector. Within each of the constructs that make up the museum coproduction framework, there is evidence of the ways this work can be manipulated to ensure the demonstration of museums’ public value to government and funding bodies. The overriding influence of the authorising environment and upstream audiences within the Public Value Strategic Triangle accounts for the preference of lower to middle order forms of coproduction within museums (Table 14). ‘Non-participation’ and ‘tokenism’ forms of coproduction are most effective in demonstrating public value to the authorising environment, adding a further deterrent to museums’ undertaking ‘citizen power’ forms of coproduction.

Within the museum coproduction framework, the need to demonstrate public value to government results in an emphasis on the community’s role as audience, because visitor numbers are the basis on which the public value of museums is assessed by the authorising environment. Public value influences the relationship between the museum and the community by prioritising enhanced engagement approaches to coproduction. Casula was identified as an exemplar by the museum field because of its skills in engaging communities and audiences, particularly those that were not typical museum visitors. Rather than implementing curatorial-led approaches to enhanced engagement (which would increase the distinctive character of its exhibitions and public programs), Casula coordinated *Pacifica* in a manner that prioritised marketing-led approaches designed to increase visitation. Its emphasis was also on the use of enhanced engagement to diversify audiences, rather than opportunities to deepen or broaden audience experiences. The effectiveness of attendance rates and visitor numbers as a means of demonstrating public value to government means that museum coproduction emphasises the participation of individuals, rather than working with collectives or community groups. Operand resources, in the form of government funding, are the focus of museums when they coproduce. The primary beneficiary of coproduction is the museum itself, because coproduction enables the institution to demonstrate to government and funding bodies that it is meeting their requirements. This situation is evident in the many references made to the notion of ‘tick a box’—museums adhering to government priorities and requirements.
These new insights into the ways museums’ preoccupation with demonstrating public value to the authorising environment constrains the manifestation of coproduction is illustrated in Figure 17. Rather than museum coproduction being undertaken to reach a new third party audience (as would occur in a joint parties or collaborative/citizen power coproduction models), museum coproduction is undertaken to strengthen the museum’s connection with the community, with the aim of gaining from the community an increased and diversified audience. In effect, museum coproduction is a closed system. The community is both a participant in museum coproduction and the recipient of this work. Third parties are excluded from the process.

**Figure 17: Impact of public value on manifestations of museum coproduction**
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### 5.4 RQ2: WHAT DRIVES AND INHIBITS MUSEUMS TO COPRODUCE WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES? (SUBJECTIVIST CONCLUSIONS)

#### 5.4.1 PUBLIC VALUE AND COPRODUCTION DRIVERS

##### 5.4.1.1 PRIORITY COMMUNITIES FOR COPRODUCTION

The constraining influence of public value can be traced not only in the manifestation of museum coproduction. When the drivers and inhibitors of museum coproduction are considered, an additional impact of public value is revealed. The desire for government funding influences which communities museums are motivated to coproduce with. As a result, the level of stimulus to coproduce differs between different types of communities.

The Code of Ethics determines that museums should collaborate with ‘the communities from which their collections originate as well as those they serve’ (ICOM
Two forms of community are identified here: source communities from which museum collections have been derived, and served or constituent communities to which museums have a civic responsibility. The Code of Ethics places greater emphasis on collaboration with source communities due to the ethical responsibilities they entail:

Museum collections reflect the cultural and natural heritage of the communities from which they have been derived. As such, they have a character beyond that of ordinary property, which may include strong affinities with national, regional, local, ethnic, religious or political identity. It is important therefore that museum policy is responsive to this situation. (ICOM 2013, p. 10)

The social profile of Liverpool (section 4.3) indicates that the community is characterised by high levels of cultural diversity, suggesting its residents are source communities for the museum. At the same time, the community is impacted by high levels of socio-economic disadvantage, making it a priority constituent for the receipt of public services. Source and constituent communities are therefore equally present in Liverpool. As a result, *Pacifica* provides an opportunity to compare source and constituent communities as drivers for museum coproduction.

The way museum staff accounted for the manifestation of *Pacifica* (Table 14) demonstrates that constituent communities have the greatest influence on Casula’s approach to coproduction. Evidence that constituent communities offer the strongest drivers for coproduction include: the communities’ audience rather than stakeholder role; their receptive rather than co-creative relationship with the museum; and the participation of individuals rather than organised groups. Although the Liverpool community includes residents that could be categorised as both source and constituent communities (section 4.3), Casula’s preference is to coproduce with residents in their role as constituent communities.

The prioritising of coproduction with constituent communities determines the resources that this work makes available to museums. Casula is not motivated to work with local communities in order to access their cultural expertise and deliver authentic and distinctive exhibitions and public programs. Instead, *Pacifica* sought to engage communities in order to increase and diversify museum audiences. Contradicting the emphasis made in the Code of Ethics (ICOM 2013), Casula’s priority is to coproduce with *constituent* communities. Where it does attend to the unique cultural profile of its municipality, the tendency is for Casula to use the local community as a means of ‘thematicising’ or ‘branding’ Liverpool (Stevenson and Matthews 2013), particularly in light of the negative image traditionally associated with the community. Stevenson and Matthews (2013) highlight the economic development drivers that inform this use of the arts within cultural planning processes. Museum coproduction is therefore used for instrumental rather than intrinsic purposes. Coproduction is employed as a means to meet the requirements of government and funding bodies, rather than to produce authentic and distinctive exhibitions and public programs. Casula coproduces because of its own funding priorities, rather than the ethical and moral reasons set out in the Code of Ethics or the principles of new museology.
These two decision-making paths for museum coproduction are illustrated in Figure 18. Coproduction with constituent communities is highlighted in this figure to identify the findings from this research. The driver of coproduction to which museums respond is government funding, resulting in its prioritising of coproduction with constituent communities and the use of coproduction for instrumental purposes.

![Diagram of Liverpool community social profile: Representative of both culturally diverse (source community) & socio-economically disadvantaged (constituent community) residents]

**Figure 18: Comparison of source community and constituent community drivers of coproduction in *Pacifica***

The distinction between source community and constituent community drivers of coproduction also highlights that coproduction takes a unique form when it occurs within public sectors. When coproduction involves joint practice, the provider of the service has the opportunity to access resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Barney 1991; den Hertog et al. 2010). This is the model of coproduction enabled by the drivers offered by a source community. Within, the public sector is remodelled due to the impact of public value. The resources museums seek from coproduction are not those available from the community but instead those available from government and the authorising environment. This is the model of coproduction that results from the drivers offered by a constituent community. Figure 19 illustrates the way resources are exchanged in these different coproduction models, extending the earlier model of the beneficiaries of museum coproduction (Figure 17).
Casula’s use of coproduction for instrumental purposes might not only be the result of public value. Coproduction in museums also appears to be constrained by the limited discourse available to talk about the outcome of this work. Public value and the instrumental value of coproduction are often easier for museums to describe and evidence than the intrinsic value which results from authentic and distinctive exhibitions and public programs (Gibson 2008). This rhetoric therefore focuses attention on the instrumental use of coproduction, and its instrumental value comes to dominate attention both within the institution and externally in terms of government interest.

Research participants acknowledged that museums are lacking the means to talk about the impact of coproduction in ways other than attendance and visitor numbers. The limited discourse available to evaluate museum coproduction is an issue both externally in terms of the influence of government policy (section 4.5.1.2) and internally in terms of a strategic emphasis on the instrumental use of coproduction (section 4.5.2.2.3). The intricacies and challenges in determining public value have been acknowledged (Moore 2013), as has its rhetorical value (Alford and O'Flynn 2009). McCall and Gray (2014) note the way museum staff manipulate the monitoring of ambiguous policy to their own advantage. The emphasis in public value on the public’s judgement of public services—the idea that the ‘public knows best’—has also been queried (Gray 2008a; Lee et al. 2011). Furthermore, the need for a performance framework that accompanies public value has been highlighted (Alford and O'Flynn 2009). Because notions such as visitor numbers are a simple way to determine public value, they provide an obvious and easy means for museums to report their impact to government and funding bodies. This case study indicates that a more complex and nuanced discourse regarding the intrinsic value of coproduction might alter not only the way coproduction in museums manifests, but also its drivers.
5.4.2 INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

5.4.2.1 INSTITUTIONAL THEORY AND RESISTANCE TO COPRODUCTION

Professional bodies and senior curators highlighted the limited extent to which coproduction is practised by Australian museums and also active avoidance. Coproduction requires a fundamental shift to established museum practice (Ang 2005; Lynch 2011; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Sandell 2003)—change which is avoided at individual, organisational and sector levels (Adler and Kwon 2013). The reluctance of museums to coproduce is apparent within this study, despite detailed and nuanced accounts of its benefits from both professional bodies and practising curators. This contradiction in museum practice raises questions about the extent to which museum professional bodies are drivers or inhibitors of coproduction.

One lens through which to understand this apparent disjuncture is institutional theory, which accounts for the ways organisations resist change and conform to the ways of working which have been accepted by their field (Greenwood et al. 2002; Greenwood et al. 2014; Lawrence 1999; Suddaby and Greenwood 2005). Organisations strive to follow the models and expectations of their profession or sector, regardless of the practicalities of these ways of working (Meyer and Rowan 1991). The mechanisms by which this conformity is achieved are referred to as an institutional logic or template (Battilana et al. 2009; DiMaggio and Powell 1983); or path dependency, in which an established sequence of events comes to constitute a self-reinforcing process (Garud and Karnøe 2013). An inhibitor to coproduction in museums is therefore institutional inertia or resistance to new ways of operating (Battilana et al. 2009; DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Suddaby and Greenwood 2005).

5.4.2.2 PROFESSIONAL BODIES AS DRIVERS OR INHIBITORS OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Professional bodies have been described as ‘an intriguing possibility of conservatism blended with reform’ (Greenwood et al. 2002, p. 62). They are largely seen to have a conservative role, aimed at maintaining organisational and professional practice rather than encouraging change and innovation (DiMaggio 1991). The notion of ‘theorising’ (Greenwood et al. 2002) suggests that professional bodies can also enable change by proposing new professional models for emulation. As a result, they ‘both reflect and shape’ (Adler and Kwon 2013, p. 950) the culture and values of their profession.

The limited practice of coproduction in museums (section 4.2) indicates the inability of professional bodies to legitimise coproduction and (re-)institutionalise it as an accepted form of museum practice. The failure of professional bodies to drive coproduction in museum can be traced through Greenwood et al.’s (2002) process of institutional change (Table 15). Of particular relevance to this research are the outcomes that are expected at the ‘theorisation’ and ‘diffusion’ stages in the shift to coproduction. Theorisation (stage four in Greenwood et al.’s (2002) six stages of institutional change) is a means whereby institutional change is conceptualised, modelled, tested and debated. Theorisation involves three steps: specification of a
general ‘organisational failing’; ‘justification’ of an abstract solution to the organisational failing; and giving ‘moral or pragmatic legitimacy’ to a solution. If the proposed change ‘passes’ these tests, it has the potential to be endorsed and implemented—referred to as diffusion. Diffusion (stage five) involves making coproduction a concrete and legitimate form of museum practice, and is necessary for change to be accepted and adopted by the field (Smets et al. 2012; Tolbert and Zucker 1983).

Table 15: Inability of museum professional bodies to institutionalise coproduction (Greenwood et al. 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in Institutional Change</th>
<th>IV Theorisation</th>
<th>V Diffusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Step 1: Specification of organisational failings</td>
<td>Step 2: Justification of abstract possible solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing objectification and pragmatic legitimacy given to innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Findings</th>
<th>Achieved (Rhetoric)</th>
<th>Not achieved (Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence from professional bodies</td>
<td>Museum crises. Need for: • democratic practice • efficiency and effectiveness • public value</td>
<td>Co-production offers: • resource benefits • larger and more diverse audiences • distinctive exhibitions and programs Framed within theory of ‘new museology’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compelling legitimacy for co-production not established. Co-production is absent in: • National museum standards; • Code of Practice; and • professional resources and practice guides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This case study has found that professional bodies are able to successfully theorise coproduction in museums (section 4.5.1.4). They specify (step one) ‘organisational failings’ through the rationale they develop for coproduction. The drivers to coproduce—improved democratic practice, more efficient and effective museum services, delivery of greater public value—are responses to perceived crises in museums. These crises ‘jolt’ established museum practice and frame the ways museum coproduction is approached. ‘Justification’ (step two) of coproduction is offered in the resource benefits presented by coproduction. Increased government funding; larger and more diverse audiences; and distinctive exhibitions and public programs are the ‘lure’ for museums to coproduce. Framing this justification within the theoretical framework of new museology tailors it to the museum field (Adler and Kwon 2013). Moral and pragmatic ‘legitimacy’ (step three) of coproduction is realised in the ways professional bodies celebrate and profile curators and museums that are leaders in coproduction, and provide a professional platform and forum in which to discuss coproduction.

5.4.2.3 INHIBITORS OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE AND DIFFUSION OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Despite successfully theorising coproduction, professional bodies appear unable to diffuse this work. They fail to objectify coproduction and gain its acceptance as a legitimate form of museum practice (Smets et al. 2012). Coproduction is not compellingly presented as more appropriate than existing museum practice. The process required for coproduction to be adopted as a new form of museum practice is interrupted and the institutional change is left incomplete (Greenwood et al. 2002). Table 15 also illustrates this gap between professional bodies’ theorising and diffusion of coproduction. By identifying the steps in the institutional change process that are achieved and not achieved, it reveals the incomplete institutional change process supported by museum professional bodies.

One explanation for the inability of museum professional bodies to promote coproduction lies in the gap between rhetoric and action. The distinction between change in rhetoric and change in practice (Suddaby and Greenwood 2005) means that coproduction has not been highly institutionalised; its value is not yet communicated or received as an objective fact (Zucker 1991). Hence the observation in PBA’s Innovation Study of ‘a profound rhetorical shift’ accompanied by ‘a deep reluctance within the sector to let go’. Meyer and Rowan (1991) suggest this gap is a ‘decoupling’ mechanism that enables organisations to separate their formal structures from their actual work, a way of building the myth of their organisation while ensuring the efficiency of their work. Bovaird (2007, 857) observes that, when required to coproduce, professional groups are likely to exhibit professionally dominated or provider-centric behaviour, often alongside a rhetoric of user orientation.

The insights provided by professional bodies into resistance to coproduction offer a second explanation for the incomplete institutional change process. Professional bodies’ awareness of the ways museums resist change may be the result of many thwarted attempts to theorise and then diffuse change within the sector. It is possible
that professional bodies do not hold enough status within the museum field to persuade practitioners to shift their practice. While the field-wide perspective held by professional bodies can drive institutional change (DiMaggio 1991; Greenwood et al. 2002; Smets et al. 2012), individuals and organisations do not share this perspective. Resistance to change is influenced by the extent to which existing and proposed practice has been institutionalised (Zucker 1991), that is, incorporated into institutional logics (DiMaggio 1991). At a curatorial level, for example, change to established museum practice involves complex reassessment of an individual’s autonomy, expertise, values, identity and ties (Adler and Kwon 2013). Attempts by professional bodies to change established museum practice are unlikely to be successful and more probably result in curators’ reassessment of professional bodies rather than their own practice (Zucker 1991). PBF’s reluctance to endorse a coproduction handbook because of anticipated curatorial resistance may therefore be a self-limiting response to the diffusion of institutional change. Smets et al. (2012) propose that institutional change requires reflection on practice. It is possible that PBI’s greater level of success in enabling coproduction is due to the fact that both theorising and diffusion are possible within its own practice.

A third explanation for the limited action in relation to coproduction lies in the role played by professional bodies. In attempting to explain the dynamics of institutional entrepreneurship, Battilana et al. (2009) suggest actors bring specific characteristics that enable (or inhibit) their capacity for institutional entrepreneurship. These characteristics present as either field-level conditions or social positions. Of particular relevance to this study is the lack of regulatory or legislative power museum professional bodies have to make change within the sector. Without the clout to coerce museums to coproduce, professional bodies are limited to advocating for this type of practice (Adler and Kwon 2013). In other sectors, mandated reforms have been found to result in a higher rate of organisational change, ahead of eventual institutionalised change (Tolbert and Zucker 1983).

The diversity within the museum sector provides a fourth explanation for the lack of diffusion of coproduction by professional bodies. While Battilana et al. (2009) argue diversity within a field encourages institutional entrepreneurship, this research suggests the opposite. Differences between museums in terms of funding (ranging from federally funded to community-run museums), the distinction between professional and volunteer staff, and the diverse disciplines that are reflected in museum collections (ranging from contemporary art to natural history) make the adoption of coproduction a more complex process. McCall and Gray (2014) reach a similar conclusion regarding the impact of the diversity of the sector on the practice of new museology more broadly. The diffusing of institutional change within this field, and the means by which professional bodies objectify and gain legitimacy for coproduction, are likely to vary between different museum sectors and types of museums. Therefore idiosyncratic approaches tailored to the various sub-sectors within the field are needed to diffuse coproduction in museums.

A fifth and final explanation for the inability of professional bodies to diffuse coproduction in museums is a lack of understanding about this type of practice.
Professionals who coproduce need a new set of skills and attributes (Bovaird 2007; Ryan 2012). In a museum context, this also requires clarity regarding the implementation of new museology (McCall and Gray 2014). Bovaird notes the need for a new type of public service professional who can ‘overcome the reluctance of many professionals to share power with users and their communities and who can act internally in organisations (and in partnerships) to broker new roles for coproduction’ (2007, 858). As PBA’s Innovation Study highlights, coproduction involves ‘skills which are not traditional within museums’.

### 5.4.2.4 CASULA’S INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

While professional bodies struggle to promote the field-level change required by coproduction, evidence relating to Casula suggests its entrepreneurial nature and ability to break from traditional and entrenched assumptions about museum practice (section 4.5.2.1). Casula’s nomination as an exemplar in museum coproduction reflects the extent to which it has able to diverge from established and institutionalised templates of museum work (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). The museum is therefore an institutional entrepreneur (Battilana et al. 2009).

Many of the entrepreneurial characteristics demonstrated by Casula align with findings from previous research. Casula’s capacity for institutional entrepreneurship results from its low status in the field (Battilana et al. 2009), evident in the way it is ‘pooh poohed’ by the arts sector. The population that forms Casula’s constituent community is culturally diverse and socio-economically disadvantaged (section 4.3), meaning its residents do not fit the profile of regular museum attenders (Bennett and Frow 1991). The demands of a community that has non-traditional expectations of museums and cultural facilities appear to be a source of innovation for Casula, supporting the argument that heterogeneous user needs drive invention and coproduction (Von Hippel 2005). The museum’s entrepreneurial capacity also results from being embedded in a number of networks (Battilana et al. 2009); as well as being part of the museum field, Casula is connected to local government and a network of innovative cultural centres across western Sydney (Knight 2013). It appears to have benefited from a long legacy of leadership that offers strong support for innovation and coproduction (Douglas et al. 2012; O’Leary et al. 2012). Innovation and entrepreneurship were also demonstrated at an individual level, particularly in the form of the cultural brokers that facilitated *Pacifica*. These staff were embedded in a number of networks due to their boundary-spanning role and extensive use of social capital (Battilana et al. 2009; Oh and Bush 2016). Further, they were embedded into professional practice from outside the museum field in terms of their links to CCD practice and cultural planning (Stevenson 2005; Stevenson and Matthews 2013).

This case study also extends existing theory by finding that Casula’s entrepreneurship and commitment to innovation were used internally, providing a means to ensure the museum does not become wedded to internally monitored institutional templates. The entrepreneurship demonstrated by Casula was not only expressed at a field level. Casula was also conscious of the need to resist internally applied programming templates and organisational processes. In other words, Casula’s innovation included...
the need to reinvent its own practice. As one museum staff member suggested, ‘I hate projects that stick to a format and formula. You know, even if that formula’s working, I always like to look at other ways where you can do other things and keep people guessing’ (MS2). This internally focused innovation involves the museum’s dynamic capabilities and the ability to identify new ways of working or modifications to existing services and processes (Ambrosini and Bowman 2009; Teece et al. 1997), as well as identifying opportunities to exploit new resources (Webb et al. 2011).

Despite this evidence of Casula’s capacity for coproduction, there were limitations to its ability to innovate and break from institutional models of museum practice. While Casula’s use of coproduction within Pacifica broke from traditional museum practice, it fell short of the requirements of new museology. The Pacifica program shifted museum practice, but it did not involve the community contributing as a stakeholder in co-creative processes in which their operant resources were used to co-design or co-innovate museum offerings for the benefit of third party audiences (Error! Reference source not found.).

5.4.3 IMPACT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL ON MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

5.4.3.1 SOCIAL CAPITAL AND WORK OF CULTURAL BROKERS

This research identifies that highly developed relational capabilities are a significant driver of coproduction within museums (sections 2.5.2.4 & 2.5.2.5). Museum coproduction requires: interpersonal skills (in the form of trust and respect; understanding and empathy; responsiveness; and empowerment); the presence of cultural brokers; and the ability to apply CCD principles. The exemplar nature of the work done by Casula for the Pacifica program is largely the result of the museum’s relational capability (section 4.5.2.4).

Museology and management theory acknowledges that an important source of the relational skills required by coproduction is cultural brokers (Kurin 1997) or cultural intermediaries (Bourdieu 1984; Durrer and Miles 2009), brokers (Kleinbaum et al. 2015) or mediators (Agostino et al. 2013). Kurin describes cultural brokers as able to ‘coordinate horizontally in webs of relationships, rather than vertically and hierarchically through chains of command. [Recognising] cultural representations … are negotiated and emergent, the result of strong knowledge, respect, a bedrock of good practice, and a lot of luck’ (1997, p. 23). Similarly, Bovaird highlights the need for new professionals in public sector organisations who are able to ‘share power with users and their communities and who can act internally in organisations (and in partnerships) to broker new roles for co-production’ (2007, p. 858).

The distinguishing characteristics of cultural brokers is that they are individuals who have agency although embedded within institutional logics (Agostino et al. 2013) due to their capacity to operate within social networks (Kleinbaum et al. 2015). As such they are individuals who act as institutional entrepreneurs in a manner that is similar to Casula’s organisational demonstration of institutional entrepreneurship (Battilana and Leca 2009; Battilana et al. 2009). Key examples of cultural brokers in Pacifica are
the staff at Casula who were employed in creative producer roles. The cultural broker roles filled by these museum staff can be seen in the relationships they formed that ‘cross over’ and ‘zig zag’ (MS2); their strong interpersonal skills founded on trust, respect, community understanding and empathy; ability to tailor their work to the needs of specific communities; and work practice that drew from CCD. The work of cultural brokers also requires the flexibility to meet the competing demands of the cultural planning sector (Stevenson and Matthews 2013).

Insights into the work of cultural brokers are offered through social network theory. The use of social network mapping to illustrate the affiliations of research participants from *Pacifica* (Figure 15) identifies that Casula’s cultural brokers had close affiliations with the museum, the community and external agencies. This attribute mapping indicates the social networks in which the cultural brokers involved in *Pacifica* operated. Social networks are a means by which goods and favours can be exchanged, providing a source of social capital to the brokers and the museum. Social capital is the goodwill offered to us by friends and acquaintances. It results in information, influence and solidarity being made available to the recipient of this goodwill (Adler and Kwon 2002; Portes 1998; Smith-Doerr and Powell 2005). The links between social capital and community-based entrepreneurship have been highlighted (Ratten and Welpe 2011). Social capital plays a significant role in facilitating collaborative work such as that involved in joint practice museum coproduction (Oh and Bush 2016). It is also a source of innovation and change (Agostino et al. 2013; Carnabuci and DiÓSzegi 2015; Ratten and Welpe 2011).

When viewed from the perspective of the museum, Casula’s cultural brokers enabled both bridging (also known as communal) social capital and connecting (or linking) social capital. Bridging social capital refers to external ties or connections the broker makes between previously unconnected social structures, in this case between the museum and the community. Connecting social capital identifies internal ties or social connections between individuals and groups within a social structure, such as those between staff of the museum (Adler and Kwon 2002; Gargiulo and Benassi 1999). The resources made available through social networks and social capital include: information; influence and power; and solidarity (Adler and Kwon 2002). Access to these resources increases the competitive advantage of the museum (den Hertog et al. 2010; Hunt and Donna 2012; Newbert 2008).

Social networks involve a range of actors, not only the ‘ego’ or broker at the centre of the network. Social networks also contain ‘alters’ or other members of the network. Previous research has tended to overlooked the alters with whom the ego interacts and from whom social capital is received. Existing theory is therefore limited by a tendency to view alters as passive members of the social network, exercising no agency in their relationship with the ego (Kleinbaum et al. 2015). The case of *Pacifica* highlights the critical need for cultural brokers to have strong interpersonal skills in order to operate effectively with alters in social networks and facilitate community-based entrepreneurship (Ratten and Welpe 2011).
5.4.3.2 DRIVERS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN PACIFICA

Access to social capital is dependent on the structure of a social network, the various structures being categorised according to strength, formality, openness and density (Oh and Bush 2016). Sparse networks offer the greatest social capital benefits, because information circulates the most within groups. Brokers or gatekeepers who are in a position to operate between groups that are not otherwise connected (a network with structural holes) are in a position to access this source of social capital (Adler and Kwon 2002; Carnabuci and DiÓSzegi 2015; Oh and Bush 2016). Within Pacifica, cultural brokers were able to connect structural holes between the networks associated with three groups: the museum, community and external stakeholders. By brokering between these groups, Casula’s cultural brokers were able to access resources that would not otherwise be available to the museum.

A strength of the work done by Casula’s cultural brokers is that, rather than just connecting structural holes in networks, they created boundary spanner structures or collective bridges (Zhao and Anand 2013). They offered a connection that is stronger than can be enabled by a single individual. Cultural brokers worked with individuals who were themselves brokers or connectors within their own communities and whose commitment to the networks involved in Pacifica made them ‘pseudo members’ (ES2) of the museum. They also designed network models that involve organisations and agencies as well as individual staff.

The relational skills that were highlighted as a driver of museum coproduction play a critical role in social capital. In addition to social networks, trust and norms are the components that comprise social capital (Oh and Bush 2016), both relying on strong relational and interpersonal skills. Trust (an individual’s perception of others) and norms (collective or shared values) influence the social relations between members of the network. Brokerage roles are commonly associated with specific types of personality traits, particularly self-monitoring individuals who are able to modify their behaviour according to the expectations of different social settings (Kleinbaum et al. 2015). This attribute enables actors to undertake boundary-spanning work and build relationships with distant others.

The relational capabilities of Casula’s cultural brokers was largely a consequence of their ethnic cultural backgrounds, which provided them with ready access to valuable groups and networks, and at the same time equipped them with a range of tacit skills—such as cultural knowledge and community protocols—that were needed to operate within these networks. These cultural skills assisted Casula’s cultural brokers to develop self-monitoring and empathetic qualities which aided them in securing social capital through networks with culturally diverse communities (Kleinbaum et al. 2015). For example, they were able to see the ‘invisible threads of representation’ (MS9) and demonstrate ‘respect for the culture, which comes back to cultural sensitivity’ (CR7). Pacifica also demonstrates the value of brokers that bring ‘homophily’ effects (Conner 2016), the notion that organisations or actors with similar characteristics are more likely to interact and collaborate than organisations and actors that are less similar.
Shared cultural representation is seen to increase value congruence, facilitate trust and enable cooperative relationships (Conner 2016).

Being able to understand the cultural contexts of both the museum and the community enabled cultural brokers to design coproduction in a manner that aligned the norms of the museum with those of the community. This finding highlights the impact norms have on coproduction, in other words, the need for the museum and the community to have shared values or norms (Inkpen and Tsang 2005; Oh and Bush 2016). Evidence of how cultural brokers achieved this alignment of norms includes their ability to negotiate between different leadership and management paradigms. Coproduction more broadly has been found to have particular value for dealing with collaboration in cross-cultural contexts, such as Māori organisations and authorities in New Zealand (McKenzie et al. 2008). In their comparison of European and Māori management practices, Mika and O’Sullivan (2014) note that, whereas authority is ‘achieved’ within Western organisations, it is ‘inherited and achieved’ within Māori organisations. The emphasis in Māori organisations is also on kinship and blood ties, rather than merit and non-kinship ties as in Western organisations.

Social capital is not only relevant to networks and the exchange of resources between the museum and the community. Networks also exist within the institutional structure of the museum. Part of the work done by cultural brokers is to span boundaries between disparate ‘communities of practice’ (Wenger 1999) that operate within the museum, for example the communities that are centred around curatorial, educational and marketing functions. The broad base of support for coproduction and Pacifica found within Casula may be the result of these brokering roles.

The way in which social networks shaped Pacifica, and the skills and capabilities used by cultural brokers to access the social capital available from these networks, offer empirical evidence that can extend S-D logic’s understanding of resource integration within a service ecosystem (section 2.4.1.2). For example, this study of coproduction in museums offers a useful extension to Laud et al.’s conceptual study of the intersection between social capital and S-D logic (Laud et al. 2015) and explains the role and function of various actors within a service ecosystem (Akaka et al. 2013; Akaka and Vargo 2015; Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011).

5.4.3.3 INHIBITORS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN PACIFICA

Despite the positive framing usually given to social capital, a number of scholars have highlighted its potential ‘dark side’ (Adler and Kwon 2002; Gargiulo and Benassi 1999; Portes 1998; Smith-Doerr and Powell 2005). Laud et al (2015) specify that social capital can constrain as well as facilitate access to resources within a service ecosystem. Evidence of the negative impact of social capital can be seen in the discussion of ‘clutter’ in relation to Pacifica. ‘Clutter’ was used to describe the sabotaging of coproduction or ‘collaborative thuggery’ (Huxham 2003) by community members: ‘there’s a lot of clutter within having organisations where we open them up and then they get hijacked by individuals and, you know, and then they start to play games and all of a sudden nothing’s happening’ (MS9).
This reference to ‘clutter’ is evidence of the negative side of social capital. As well as being a source of goodwill, social capital can manifest as a social liability that is accompanied instead by ill will. Social relations that have the potential to endow an individual with resources are just as capable of hindering their work and leaving them without favour.

Gargiulo and Benassi (1999) suggest that the dark side of social capital has been overlooked because its negative effects only become apparent after a period of time during which the initial contacts and social networks are beneficial. This may be the case with *Pacifica*, as the notion of ‘clutter’ appears to have grown over the five years of the program, possibly leading to the eventual resignation of the cultural broker responsible for the program. Portes (1998) suggests the negative consequences of social capital have four themes: exclusion of outsiders; excess claims on group members; restrictions on individual freedom; and downward levelling norms. The impact of these negative consequences on the work done by Casula’s cultural brokers is considered below.

The following discussion reveals that social capital and brokering roles have a significant impact on coproduction both externally and internally. Cultural brokers not only bridge gaps externally between the museum and its community, but also between different functional and professional groups within the museum. The potentially negative consequences of social capital are evident in both external and internal contexts. Social capital can concurrently inhibit coproduction through the internal practice of museums and external community networks—evidence that provides additional weight to Park and Lim’s (2017) finding that social networks are vertical, rather than flat.

### 5.4.3.3.1 EXCLUSION

Adler and Kwon (2002) note that hierarchical relations shape social networks. These forms of social ties come with formal positions and are not voluntarily chosen. Evidence of the influence hierarchies have on social capital include MS9’s social status as an orator and Samoan chief, a role assigned to him by his family lineage. The social capital entailed in this status is not voluntary, is unattainable by others and brings very high expectations and responsibilities. It is also a form of social capital that has limited dynamic capability, challenging the notion that social capital has dynamic capabilities (Oh and Bush 2016).

The influence of hierarchical relations also works to exclude cultural brokers from social networks within the museum. As ‘non-traditional’ (MS2) museum roles which are ‘a little bit of a different flavour than that direct, curatorial, forward-leading intention’ (MS5), the potential exists for cultural brokers to be excluded from social networks within the museum. Cultural brokers are likely to be institutional entrepreneurs because they are lower status and less embedded within the institutional environment of the museum; however, this lower status will impact on their social capital within the organisation and institutional pressures will be exerted on them to conform to established museum practice (Battilana et al. 2009).
5.4.3.3.2 EXCESS CLAIMS

Adler and Kwon (2002) note that social networks make claims on cultural brokers as part of the reciprocity on which social capital is based. Determining what is reciprocated might not be apparent and requires negotiation (Adler and Kwon 2002). Particularly in communities with strong norms of mutual assistance, social capital can lead to excessive claims of return (Portes 1998). Within Pacifica an example of how excessive claims on a broker could manifest comes from the Samoan community group, who emphasised the funding they got through coproduction: ‘[staff member is] Samoan and we want to support [Pacifica] … So this is our bit. But you also got your bit for us, give us more money in order to function, you know?’ (CR4). The claim that Pacifica was ‘too Samoan’, which was given as one of the final stresses placed on the cultural broker before his resignation, is potentially evidence of excess claims the community was making on this actor.

Excess claims on the cultural broker came not only from the community, but also from the museum. Within Pacifica the social network through which coproduction occurred hinged on the cultural broker, who was a boundary spanner between the museum and the community. Social capital was therefore overinvested in one staff member. When the museum faced community conflict or dissatisfaction, the cultural broker was likely to be the focus of this dispute. The cultural broker’s cultural background might also mean that their recognition of this dispute was much greater than that of other museum staff.

5.4.3.3.3 RESTRICTIONS

Social capital can demand conformity rather than enabling individual agency. Portes (1998) suggests that the Pacific communities that Casula works with are likely to be influenced by traditional ‘village’ expressions of social relations and community solidarity, in which social capital is restrictive of individual freedom. While cultural brokers had social status within the community that was a valuable source of social capital, it was also restrictive and a potential source for community conflict, as captured in the quote, ‘I’ve seen that [museum colleague’s cultural] heritage … has caused conflict amongst the greater Pacific community and he’s trying to provide them with a more open mind and a more open dialogue for everyone involved in the Pacific’ (MS4).

Established relationships and social networks are also a source of relational inertia in that they lock an actor into assumed ways of operating and have an easiness that increases the cost of investing in new networks and relationships (Adler and Kwon 2013; Gargiulo and Benassi 1999). In this way the agency of the cultural broker is restricted by the legacy of their social networks. Adapting or altering the composition of a social network is not easy, particularly if there was initially a strong fit between the actor/broker and the resources the network provided. This situation is referred to as the social capital paradox. While an actor may have originally been a broker of a network with structural holes which therefore held strong resource opportunities, over time these structural holes are filled through the development of relationships through
the network; in other words, over time a loose network becomes a close network. The stronger the relationships and ties, the less able an actor is to renew their social capital (Adler and Kwon 2002; Gargiulo and Benassi 1999).

This lack of dynamic capacity of social capital is the result of the very reciprocity on which the concept is based. Reciprocity requires certain behaviours from those who have received favours through social capital; failure to reciprocate is likely to result in sanctions and reputational damage (Gargiulo and Benassi 1999). A previously successful and fruitful network may cease to provide the resources necessary, but potentially breaking the bonds of this network may prove difficult. Cultural brokers who bring closure to networks with structural holes and therefore involve third parties are more likely to respond to the pressure of reciprocity because their rule-breaking and the enacting of sanctions would be witnessed by these third parties (Gargiulo and Benassi 1999).

Social capital restrictions are also placed on the cultural broker in the form of their social networks within the museum. The ‘innovation paradox’ (Carnabuci and DiÓSzegi 2015) also highlights the distinction between creating and implementing novel ideas. Cultural brokers are able to come up with new and innovative ideas through the social capital available from the ‘open’ community networks they broker. Implementing these ideas requires closed networks, particularly within the museum. Cultural brokers may face challenges when trying to implement innovations without a ‘closed’ network.

5.4.3.3.4 DOWNWARD-LEVELLING NORMS

Not all communities or individuals have equal access to social capital. A dearth of social connections also exists in certain communities (Portes 1998), which narrows the opportunities and resources available to these communities. This situation is suggested by the City of Liverpool’s low SEIFA index (Profile.id 2014), which indicates a low level of access to social resources (ABS 2013). If social capital theory is combined with the notion of cultural capital as proposed by Bourdieu (1984), it also becomes apparent that culturally diverse communities are excluded from the type of art that is Casula’s raison d’etre as a museum with an emphasis on contemporary art. Cultural capital determines ‘taste’ within a community and generally limits an individual’s capacity to access ‘high’ art and culture. There is evidence that Pacific Island communities were not generally interested in contemporary art, highlighted by the quote: ‘with the Pacific people there can be attitudes like … “what is contemporary art, who cares?” You know what I mean … even just explaining what contemporary art is, you know, like, the masses of our audience are not gallery-going people’ (MS9). Cultural capital is established by role models within a person’s family or early influences and is strongly aligned with class and education (Bourdieu 1984; Portes 1998). Cultural capital and the unequal distribution of social capital between communities also serve to highlight the lack of dynamic capability available through social capital.
Community solidarity may also hinder the potential of cultural brokers to use social capital in order to broker networks between the community and the museum (Adler and Kwon 2002). Particularly in ethnic communities there is evidence of individuals being threatened with ostracism if they become too successful (Portes 1998; Smith-Doerr and Powell 2005).

5.4.3.4 ‘CLUTTER’ AND COMMUNITY RESISTANCE

An alternative lens to bring to bear on the notion of ‘clutter’ is Foucault’s interest in resistance. As well as understanding power as repression or constraint, resistance—in other words, thwarting the operation of power/knowledge—is itself an expression of power (Caldwell 2007; Feder 2010). Resistance is a common and legitimate expression of power. Clark et al. note that ‘power is exercised through networks. Foucault finds no relations of power without resistance’ (Clark et al. 2011, p. 1252). Resistance is the demonstration of human agency.

According to the Public Value Strategic Triangle (Benington and Moore 2011), museums have two audiences: the authorising environment (government and funding bodies); and the community or general public who determines public value. The authorising environment is the upstream audience and is able to exercise control and influence on museums. The community, however, is the downstream audience for the museum and has no influence or authority. Because the community lacks influence, resistance and the right of exit are its only means of expressing power (Wensley and Moore 2011). ‘Clutter’ may be the expression of this resistance and the means by which the community exercises its right of exit.

Museum interest in coproduction has a strongly pragmatic and instrumental purpose, hence instrumental policy and strategy were seen to be drivers of coproduction (section 4.5.2.2.3). Rather than using coproduction for intrinsic purposes (the development of authentic and distinctive exhibitions and public programs), coproduction was a means to achieve instrumental outcomes (community development and economic development). Coproduction was also used to gain resources for the museum: operant resources such as intangible cultural heritage and operand resources such as government funding. The social capital accessed by cultural brokers was part of this resource-gathering process. A similar resource-gathering, pragmatic purpose has been found in the rationales given for workforce diversity, which Casula’s cultural brokers can be seen to demonstrate (Bleijenbergh et al. 2010; Sandell 2000; Zanoni et al. 2010). Senior curators indicated an awareness of the self-interested nature of coproduction; SC3 hinted that the use of coproduction to increase attendance could be viewed with ‘cynicism’ and SC6 referred to the ‘spin’ with which coproduction might be discussed by colleagues. ‘Clutter’ may be a sign of community backlash to the instrumental use of cultural brokers and coproduction, highlighted in the warning from an external stakeholder against ‘mining a community for cultural knowledge and cultural connections and cultural relationships and cultural product. If all you’re doing is taking … it’s never going to be satisfying for the community’ (ES5). Community resistance to cultural brokers and coproduction therefore signals their awareness of the
use of social capital as devious, manipulative and self-serving (Kleinbaum et al. 2015), resulting in a lack of trust within the social network (Adler and Kwon 2002).

‘Clutter’ also demonstrates the diversity and complexity of communities. This finding reminds us that the notion of community is not as innocent or wholesome as might be commonly accepted; the concept of community also has negative and polarising potential. As one museum staff member reflected, ‘you know, communities tend to be fractured, tend to have nutcases, tend to have a lot of not good people’ (MS9). In the case of culturally diverse communities, the notion of ethnicity is a motivating force for political power and change. Museums simultaneously maintain and strengthen prevailing cultural identities, while exploring cultural diversity in order to accommodate postmodern museological practice. Anico refers to this as a museum’s capacity to simultaneously act as a ‘cultural bunker’ and ‘cultural centre’ (2008).

It would be naïve of the museum to think that representing and exploring ethnic identity is non-political. Museum representation of all identities is highly political and contentious (Kaplan 2007). Overlooking the complexity of communities and their polarising potential is a demonstration of Foucault’s ‘governmentality’ and the dilemma between individual and public good (Burchell et al. 1991; McKinlay et al. 2012). ‘Clutter’ may occur when other individuals in the network—who may be brokers for their own communities—aim to achieve outcomes that are beneficial to themselves or their communities, rather than providing resources for the museum. As Adler and Kwon note, ‘there is no invisible hand that assures that the use of social capital resources in competition among actors will generate an optimal outcome for the broader aggregate’ (2002, p. 31).

5.4.3.5 MUSEUM RESISTANCE

There is also evidence museums resist manipulation and avoid being used for instrumental purposes by the community in terms of the political process by which cultural identity is contested. The ‘clutter’ evident in Pacifica is also part of the community’s struggle for identity and thereby political power. The museum is needed to authenticate the community’s image and its claim to a traditional and long-established identity. In hosting and facilitating Pacifica Casula became a forum for a political agenda in which cultural identity was both defined and contested (Anico 2008; Kaplan 2007). Kaplan emphasises that traditional and static notions of culture have the strongest political purpose, noting ‘material representation of traditionality and age help to legitimate an ethnic group’s claim to a unique identity and political power and to their attempts to create a sense of unity amongst themselves’ (2007, p. 153). Hence the community’s interest in traditional cultural practice rather than contemporary art or dynamic manifestations of culture. In a demonstration of counter resistance, the community thwarted the museum’s attempts to engage them in contemporary art, captured in the observation, ‘with the Pacific people, you know, there’s, in general, you know, there can be attitudes like, oh well, what’s that, what is contemporary art, who cares, you know what I mean?’ (MS9). Casula adheres to its role and purpose as an art gallery with an emphasis on contemporary art practice. The museum resists being the site for contested cultural identity, highlighted by the
suggestion, ‘we don’t need to talk about identity because we’re way beyond that, we’re in the brave new world where identity doesn’t exist. It’s a global community, a global society, right?’ (MS2).

The risk in museum resistance to community ‘clutter’ is that it becomes an excuse to not practise coproduction. If the impact of community ‘clutter’ is too great, the cost benefit of accessing community resources through coproduction might be lost (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Brudney 1984; Teece et al. 1997). It is possible that the Pacifica creative producer was not replaced after their resignation because the extent of community ‘clutter’ had deterred the museum from continuing the program.

5.5 RQ3: WHAT IMPACT DOES COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES HAVE ON MUSEUM PRACTICE? (SUBJECTIVIST CONCLUSIONS)

5.5.1 ‘CLUTTER’ AND COLLABORATION

The notion of ‘clutter’ may also encapsulate a museum’s assessment of the collaborative processes involved in coproduction. Coproduction that enables the museum to achieve something that it would not be able to produce on its own involves collaboration (Huxham 2003) and is a higher order or ‘citizen power’ approach to coproduction (Error! Reference source not found.). This work requires community empowerment, thereby removing the authority and control museums have traditionally held. While collaborative coproduction offers significant resource benefits and the opportunity to revolutionise museum practice through the realisation of new museology, it also requires the greatest change to established museum practice. The notion of ‘clutter’ therefore provides insights into the difficulties associated with collaborative practice (for example Agranoff and McGuire 2003; Conner 2016; Gelfand et al. 2008; Huxham 2003; Lee 2007; Moussouri 2012; Pestoff 2012; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2000) and museum resistance to the implementation of new museology (for example Ang 2005; Boast 2011; Golding 2013; Janes 2009; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010; McCall and Gray 2014; Onciul 2013). ‘Clutter’ also adds to the complexity with which S-D is conceptualised, particularly in relation to the nature of work within a service ecosystem and the way value propositions are not only developed but also managed and implemented (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Frow et al. 2014; Greer et al. 2016; Laud et al. 2015; Payne and Frow 2014).

Coproduction in museums requires joint creative processes. The elusive nature of these processes is highlighted by their being described as ‘tentative’ and ‘magical’ (SC1). The complexity of this work involved collaborative approaches being tailored to the needs, interest and capacity of each community the museum worked with, each of these bespoke collaborations requiring specific management approaches (PB2). Collaboration also required highly developed communication skills. This communication involved a cultural element due to the need to understand community processes and protocols.
Decision-making is more complex in coproduction because the museum is no longer in control and as a result it ‘can’t control necessarily the outcome of the work and you are then in this awkward space around the institution, selecting what’s in and what’s out, and it’s difficult to navigate those conversations’ (SC1). Because the museum is not in control, it may end up with an outcome that does not meet its expectations or assumptions about professional standards, because ‘if it is truly coproduction, the institution isn’t always going to get their own way or the final say’ (SC1). At this point the museum is likely to resist the urge to manipulate the outcome of the collaboration, because in order to make sure the community is empowered through the collaborative process, it is important the museum is not ‘just orchestrating things, like, no-one is a puppeteer if you’re working in a community context, we hope’ (ES5). This work is risky, with the museum ‘colliding’ with the community as likely an outcome as a productive ‘collusion’ (PB3).

The difficulty involved in coproducing with communities is likely to make the museum resort to ‘collaborative thuggery’ (Huxham 2003). It is important to realise the creative potential of conflict. The complex processes involved in coproduction—resulting in ‘resistance’ (Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013) and ‘dispute’ (Lee 2007)—are the very conditions under which optimum resource integration occurs, resulting in the creation of new knowledge (Argote and Fahrenkopf 2016; Fyrberg Yngfalk 2013; Lee 2007) and service innovation (Camarero and Garrido 2012; den Hertog et al. 2010; Frow et al. 2015; Matthing et al. 2004; Webb et al. 2011). The notion of ‘clutter’ is not necessarily a negative consequence of collaboration; Gelfand et al.’s (2008) acknowledgement of ‘collaborative conflict cultures’—which they describe as ‘active and agreeable’—indicates the positive potential of conflict.

These insights into the complexity of collaborative coproduction processes address gaps in existing knowledge in relation to the ‘micro-practices’ and ‘intricacies’ of coproduction (Bovaird 2007; Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Fisher and Smith 2011), as well as its management and governance issues (Lusch et al. 2010; Ostrom et al. 2010). These findings also have the potential to challenge S-D logic theory; while the notion of a service ecosystem acknowledges that generic actors and stakeholders, as well as customers, are involved in co-creation (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Greer et al. 2016), its focus on value propositions as the tool for negotiating co-creation between actors and stakeholders (Akaka et al. 2013; Frow et al. 2014; Payne and Frow 2014; Vargo et al. 2008) is likely to underestimate the complexity of this work. Furthermore, understanding the nature of the complexity involved in collaborative coproduction enables new insights into the large body of museology literature that highlights the difficulties museums experience when they attempt to coproduce (for example Ang 2005; Fouseki and Smith 2013; Iervolino 2013; Kahn 2000; Keith 2012; Lynch and Alberti 2010; Onciul 2013).
5.5.2 CONSTRAINT OF COPRODUCTION OUTCOMES

Coproduction theory expects higher order forms of coproduction to result in outcomes that are influenced by both the museum and the community (Boyle and Harris 2009; Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Dong 2015; Osborne et al. 2016). Museology research that is critical of museum capacity to collaborate with communities has identified the museum’s capacity to decouple coproduction process from the outcomes of this work (Ang 2005; Lynch 2010; Lynch and Alberti 2010). This study extends previous scholarship which has identified that museums resist sharing power and authority with communities, but not fully understood the means by which museums constrain and limit the input that communities have on coproduced exhibitions and public programs (for example Ang 2005; Fouseki and Smith 2013; Iervolino 2013; Kahn 2000; Keith 2012; Onciul 2013). Voorberg (2014) has also highlighted the limited attention given to the outcomes of coproduction in public administration literature.

This study not only identifies the capacity of museums to control and manipulate the outcomes of coproduction, but also identifies the means by which museums achieve the separation of coproduction process and outcomes. Findings from this research reveal the capacity of museums to constrain the influence communities have on coproduced exhibitions and public programs. This constraint is exercised professionally, programmatically, intellectually, spatially and regionally.

5.6.2.1 PROFESSIONAL CONSTRAINT OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Museum coproduction is facilitated by cultural brokers (Durrer and Miles 2009; Kurin 1997). Evidence from this research indicates that cultural brokers are institutional entrepreneurs (Battilana et al. 2009), able to diverge from established museum practice because of skills and capabilities they have gained from the CCD sector (Australia Council for the Arts n.d.). However, CCD skills and capacity are distinct from the museum and the expertise traditionally associated with curators. Therefore the skills of a cultural broker—and by association responsibility for coproduction—is distinct from the role filled by museum curators. Cultural brokers hold ‘other’ roles within the museum sector and so are seen to be not only separate from museum professionals, but also lower within the museum hierarchy (McCall and Gray 2014).

5.6.2.2 PROGRAMMATIC CONSTRAINT OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

This study reveals a hierarchy between museums offerings. Exhibitions were presented as highly professional offerings instilled with the authority of the museum, whereas public programs profiled community participation and highlighted community knowledge and local celebrations. Exhibitions were developed by the museum and community involvement was limited to public programs. The trend of museum-developed exhibitions and community-developed public programs is also apparent in a review of the Pacifica program (Table 16). This indicates that higher order forms of coproduction (Table 14) are most commonly associated with Pacifica’s public programs. Pacifica’s exhibition components—particularly those involving contemporary art—were delivered by the museum.
Table 16: Comparison of coproduced program elements in *Pacifica*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program component</th>
<th>Exhibition/public program</th>
<th>Level of coproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pacifica</em> Festival</td>
<td>Public program</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pacifica</em> Barbecue</td>
<td>Public program</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops: clay, drawing, weaving, printmaking</td>
<td>Public program</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programs: talk and tour with producer, workshops</td>
<td>Public program</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic/historical material from private collection</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Samoan artist (community access gallery)</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional contemporary Pacific artists</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Islands myths and popular legends (touring exhibition)</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bell film installations</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A model emerges of coproduced public programs being ‘wrapped around’ or used to augment curator-developed exhibitions. In the case of *Pacifica* this took the form of coproduction being used to augment Casula’s contemporary art ‘core’ as illustrated in Figure 20. The term ‘wrap around’ was used by a senior curator who also triangulated evidence relating to the distinction between high-quality exhibitions developed by museums and less significant public programs developed through community participation.

![Figure 20: Relationship between exhibitions and public programs in *Pacifica*](image-url)
Von Hippel would describe this wrapping of coproduced public programs around museum developed exhibitions as a firm’s adaptation to ‘users’ encroachment on elements of their traditional business activities’ (2005, p. 15). He argues that, in acknowledgement of increased user innovation, firms have begun to develop products and services that are ‘complementary’ to user-developed innovations (2005). However, the dynamic was reversed in *Pacifica*; user-developed innovations were instead complementary to museum innovations, thereby maintaining the central role museums play within coproduction.

Brandsen and Honingh (2016) include the proximity of coproduced tasks to the core services of the organisation in their typography of coproduction. Museums limit coproduction to public programs and keep community involvement distant from their core service—the development of professional exhibitions. In the case of *Pacifica*, the distance at which coproduction was kept from contemporary art activities is further evidence of the museum constraining or limiting coproduction.

5.6.2.3 ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE CONSTRAINT OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Museums use academic disciplines and domains of knowledge as a means to constrain the impact communities have on the outcome of coproduction. They do this by: making distinctions between different types of knowledge; determining who holds specific forms of knowledge; and assigning roles, rights and responsibilities to the holders of this knowledge. One example of this manipulation of knowledge is the distinction made between museum knowledge and community knowledge. Similarly greater value is placed on ‘facilitated participation’ directed by the museum compared to ‘everyday participation’ which is community driven (Gibson and Edwards 2016). Evident here is the ‘not invented here syndrome’, which relates to knowledge acquired outside the firm (Govindarajan and Gupta 2001 cited in Pérez-Nordtvedt et al. 2008). Knowledge and ideas that originate from outside an organisation or professional discipline have difficulty gaining approval and support (Anderson and Crocca 1993). When museums collaborate with communities, knowledge presented by communities comes from outside the museum and curatorial profession. As a result, it is assigned less authority and struggles to influence the outcome of coproduction.

The same distinction between different types of knowledge, and their varying levels of authority, can be traced in the various academic disciplines on which museums are founded. While the official museum definition makes no distinction between types of museums or their collections (ICOM 2007), in practice the variation between these organisations is significant. Art galleries, social history museums, natural history museums and ethnographic museums all use the academic disciplines on which they are founded to define and contest their influence within the museum field. Hence the differing views offered by research participants regarding the types of museum most likely to coproduce (section 4.5.1.3).

This museum staff member’s observation that coproduction occurs in museums rather than contemporary art galleries aligns with Clifford’s (1988) art-culture system model.
of the relationship between art and culture (Figure 4). Clifford suggests that the way art connoisseurship and art museums are defined is in marked comparison with ethnographic museums and their attention to culture and folklore practice. The fact that the case study examined in this research is from a contemporary art gallery has ramifications for its use of coproduction. The art-culture system highlights the dichotomy between art and culture, and the designation of culture as a collective activity while art is a singular task. According to this model, the practice of coproduction—which relies on some extent of shared activity—can only ever be associated with culture (museums), not with art (galleries).

The way museums and galleries are defined and constrained through the construction of knowledge and academic disciplines is a process that warrants the attention of Foucault’s archaeological method (Foucault 1972; Foucault 1974; McKinlay et al. 2012; Scheurich and McKenzie 2005). The emergence of these academic disciplines, and the way they structure thinking about what is possible (or permissible) within the professional practice of museums and galleries, are evidence of the social effects of knowledge. It is important to realise the constructed nature of these assumptions about different types of knowledge, the progress of knowledge and notions of ‘truth’.

5.6.2.4 SPATIAL CONSTRAINT OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Evidence collected through this case study suggests that museum offerings which are coproduced with communities are spatially constrained by museums. The notion of coproduction being used to ‘wrap around’ work that is ‘core’ to the museum is also evident in the gallery spaces where coproduced exhibitions and public programs are placed. The aspects of *Pacifica* that were coproduced were presented on the perimeter of the museum (even outside it in the case of *Pacifica* Barbecue) rather than in its central gallery spaces (illustrated in Figure 21). To draw on the temple metaphor commonly associated with museums (Duncan 1995; Rentschler et al. 2012), coproduction is isolated from their inner sanctum.

In the only *Pacifica* offering where the community had input into the exhibitions, this work was spatially isolated within the museum in a space that was demarcated as a community gallery. According to the coproduction hierarchy proposed by this research, community galleries are in fact outliers on a coproduction spectrum (section 5.3.2.1.4). The choice between integrating or demarcating coproduced offerings—both spatially within the museum and as part of its programming—was highlighted by one curator in relation to discussion regarding the design of a new museum (SC1).
5.6.2.5 REGIONAL CONSTRAINT OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

This research also identifies that museum coproduction is restricted to particular regions and areas. *Pacifica*’s exemplar status and demonstration of institutional entrepreneurship was seen to be part of a trend in museum practice focused around western Sydney. The distinctive nature of museum practice in this region was noted at both field level and in the narrative interviews in relation to *Pacifica*.

This regional entrepreneurial capacity seemed to result from the high levels of cultural diversity within the region, as well as a high level of local government–managed arts and cultural infrastructure supported by strong networks and collaboration (Knight 2013). Macdonald (2016) offers an alternative reading, suggesting that the prevalence of coproduction in western Sydney is evidence of a ‘museumscape’ in which museums and museum programming that are responsive to cultural diversity are ‘contained’ within certain areas of the city. Similarly, Stevenson and Matthews (2013) associate regional ‘branding’ using cultural diversity and cultural activity with an economic development agenda.
This chapter discusses the findings of research into museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities that have been presented in Chapter 4. The themes that have arisen in this discussion are the influence of public value on museums, evidence of a hierarchy of museum coproduction, the means by which resources and knowledge are exchanged, innovation and entrepreneurship, the impact of social capital, avoidance of conflict and disagreement, and the constraint of coproduction outcomes.

This discussion has found that coproduction in museums and public organisations is distinct from that in private or commercial settings because of the influence of the authorising environment (government) and museums’ need to secure funding and government support. This distinctive context influences both the manifestation of museum coproduction and the drivers which encourage museums to coproduce. The way museums coproduce and the reasons they commit to this form of museum practice are determined by the need to demonstrate their public value to government and funding bodies.

This chapter also offers a new hierarchy of coproduction that introduces the notions of non-participatory, tokenistic and citizen power forms of coproduction. When museum coproduction is mapped against this hierarchy, it becomes apparent that museums undertake lower order forms of coproduction which are less empowering of communities while maintaining museum control over the development of exhibitions and public programs.

The complexity of resources involved in coproduction is also explored in this chapter, particularly in relation to knowledge-transfer processes. Findings from this research query the emphasis on operant resources that underpins the shift to SD logic in marketing literature. It is also revealed that museums ‘short change’ the resources communities make available through coproduction, because government funding and support are the resources they are actually seeking from coproduction.

Because coproduction involves a profound change in the relationship between a museum and its communities, it requires innovation and institutional entrepreneurship on the part of the museum. While Casula’s Pacific program is an exemplar of museum coproduction that demonstrates institutional entrepreneurship at individual and organisational levels, it appears that museum professional bodies have been unable to secure the same extent of institutional entrepreneurship at a field level.

Social capital and social networks play a critical role in the collaborative processes involved in museum coproduction, yet also have a dark side that manifests as social liability and ill will. Within museum coproduction, there is evidence of resistance on the part of both the community and the museum as they avoid being used for instrumental purposes by the other party.

Museums maintain a clear demarcation between coproduction processes and outcomes. When coproducing with communities, museums control the outcome of this work through processes of containment that are expressed professionally,
programmatically, academically, spatially and regionally. Because the process of coproduction involves collaboration, it is challenging for museums and they seek ways to avoid the conflict it involves. However, the disagreement and dispute involved in collaboration are the very source of the new knowledge and ideas that coproduction offers.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION
6.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

This research has sought to examine the drivers, inhibitors and manifestations of museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities. The a priori framework developed in Chapter 2 (Table 7) synthesises existing knowledge relating to museum coproduction, drawing on literature from management, marketing, public administration and museology. Subsequently, three research questions are formulated which have been examined using the case study methodology presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 has presented the key findings drawn from the data collected for this case study, integrating these into existing literature to produce an a posteriori framework of coproduction in museums (Table 13). The implications of these findings and the contribution they make to existing knowledge are then discussed in Chapter 5. This chapter summarises the conclusions reached in relation to the research aim (distinguishing between constructionist and subjectivist findings) and considers the implications of this research for both theory and practice.

6.2 SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCTIONIST FINDINGS

6.2.1 RQ1: HOW DOES MUSEUM COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES MANIFEST?

Museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifests according to six themes and associated constructs: notions of value (exchange, relational or public value); community role (stakeholder or audience); forms of interaction between museum and community (receptive or participatory); beneficiaries of coproduction (museum, community, mutual, or third party audiences/stakeholders); structure of external parties (individual, community leaders/influencers or collective); and type of resources exchanged through coproduction (operand or operant).

The form of interaction between the museum and community can be understood in greater depth by identifying the options that are available within receptive and participatory relationships. Receptive relationships between the museum and community can involve either marketing-led or curatorial-led forms of engagement. Participatory relationships can take the form of crowdsourcing, co-creation or community-as-curator.

6.2.2 RQ2: WHAT DRIVES AND INHIBITS MUSEUMS TO COPRODUCE WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES?

Drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums take three forms: external to the museum; institutional (i.e. internal to the museum); and community-based. The influences that are external to the museum are: ethics and respect; government funding and policies; professional practice; and professional bodies. The influences that are internal to the museum are: innovation and entrepreneurship; organisational commitment and leadership; evaluation and reflective practice; and relational skills.
addition, organisational commitment and leadership can comprise leadership, internal policies and adoption of instrumental arts policy. Relational capabilities can also be understood in terms of interpersonal skills, cultural intermediaries and use of community cultural development approaches. Community-based influences on museum coproduction are: cultural, political and community capacity.

In many cases these factors can function interchangeably as drivers or inhibitors of museum coproduction, or are interconnected issues. The critical point is whether the museum opts to make these elements a strength or weakness of its coproduction work. For example, strong relational capabilities can drive coproduction while poor relational capabilities inhibit it. Government funding and policies can drive coproduction, but failure to embed these priorities into the museum inhibits it.

6.2.3 RQ3: WHAT IMPACT DOES COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES HAVE ON MUSEUM PRACTICE?

Coproduction impacts on museum practice in two ways: processes and outcomes. The impact on processes can be distinguished between the design of experiential museum offerings, and the collaborative production of exhibitions and public programs. The outcomes of coproduction on museum practice can be distinguished between outcomes that are influenced by the community and outcomes that are influenced by the museum.

6.3 SUMMARY OF SUBJECTIVIST FINDINGS

6.3.1 RQ1: HOW DOES MUSEUM COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES MANIFEST?

Within each of the themes that determine the way museum coproduction manifests are a number of constructs and sub-constructs offering a range of approaches to coproduction. The way museum coproduction manifests within each of these constructs can vary according to proximity, asymmetry and value congruence. As a result, a hierarchy of coproduction emerges that distinguishes between non-participatory, tokenistic and citizen power forms of coproduction. When museum coproduction is mapped against this hierarchy, it becomes apparent that museums undertake lower order forms of coproduction which are less empowering of communities while maintaining museum control over the development of exhibitions and public programs. The lack of conceptual clarity regarding coproduction has enabled museums to work with communities without being specific about the approach they take and the extent to which communities are empowered by this practice.

Coproduction in museums and public organisations is distinct from that in private or commercial settings because of the influence of the authorising environment (government) and museums’ need to secure funding and resources. This distinctive context influences both the manifestation of museum coproduction and the drivers of it. The way museums coproduce and the reasons they commit to this form of museum practice are determined by the need to demonstrate their public value to government
and funding bodies. Coproduction manifests in a manner designed to emphasise the size and diversity of museum audiences. As a result museums ‘short change’ the resources available from the community.

6.3.2 RQ2: WHAT DRIVES AND INHIBITS MUSEUMS TO COPRODUCE WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES?

The desire for government funding influences which communities are prioritised in museum coproduction. While museum ethics acknowledge coproduction can occur with both source and constituent communities, museums favour work with constituent communities in order to demonstrate public value. The value of source communities lies in the fact they demonstrate the diversification of museum audiences rather than their unique cultural resources.

Because coproduction involves a profound change in the relationship between a museum and its communities, it requires innovation and institutional entrepreneurship on the part of the museum. While Casula’s *Pacifica* program is an exemplar of museum coproduction that demonstrates institutional entrepreneurship at an individual and organisational level, it appears that museum professional bodies have been unable to secure the same extent of institutional entrepreneurship in relation to coproduction at a field level. The extent of Casula’s capacity for institutional entrepreneurship has its boundaries, demonstrated by its preference for lower order forms of coproduction (Table 14).

Social capital and social networks play a critical role in the collaborative processes involved in museum coproduction. However, social capital also has a dark side that manifests as social liability and ill will. Within museum coproduction there is evidence of resistance—on the part of both the community and the museum—as they avoid being used for instrumental purposes by the other party.

6.3.3 RQ3: WHAT IMPACT DOES COPRODUCTION WITH CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES HAVE ON MUSEUM PRACTICE?

Museums maintain a clear demarcation between coproduction processes and outcomes. Because the process of coproduction involves collaboration, it is challenging for museums and they seek ways to avoid the conflict it involves. The disagreement and dispute involved in collaboration are the very source of the new knowledge and ideas that coproduction offers. Although coproduction outcomes should be equally influenced by museums and communities, museums control the outcomes. They do this through processes that constrain the communities’ influence. These processes of containment are expressed professionally, programmatically, academically, spatially and regionally.
## Table 17: Overview of research questions and findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RQ1: How does museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifest?</th>
<th>RQ2: What drives and inhibits museums to coproduce with culturally diverse communities?</th>
<th>RQ3: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructionist findings</strong></td>
<td>Coproduction in museums manifests according to six constructs:  - Notions of value (exchange, relational or public value)  - Community role (stakeholder or audience)  - Form of interaction between museum and community (receptive or participatory)  - Beneficiaries of coproduction (museum, community, mutual or third party)  - Structure of the external party (individual or collective); and  - Type of resources exchanged through coproduction (operand or operand)</td>
<td>Drivers and inhibitors of coproduction in museums are:  - External to the museum (ethics and respect, government funding and policies, professional practice, professional bodies)  - Internal to the museum (evaluation and reflective practice, innovation and entrepreneurship, organisational commitment and leadership, relational capabilities); and  - Community based (cultural, political and capacity)</td>
<td>Coproduction impacts on museum practice in two ways:  - Impact on processes (experiential design or collaborative production)  - Impact on outcomes (community-influenced or museum-influenced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How does museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifest?</td>
<td>RQ2: What drives and inhibits museums to coproduce with culturally diverse communities?</td>
<td>RQ3: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction manifests according to a hierarchy or spectrum of approaches. Museums preference lower order forms of coproduction which are less empowering of communities but maintain museum control and authority. The lack of conceptual clarity regarding coproduction has enabled museums to be non-specific about their approach to this work.</td>
<td>Museums preference coproduction with constituent communities in order to demonstrate public value. Rather than being a source of unique cultural resources, source communities are valued because they demonstrate the diversification of museum audiences. While Casula’s <em>Pacifica</em> program is an exemplar of museum coproduction demonstrating innovation and entrepreneurship, museum professional bodies have been unable to secure the same extent of institutional entrepreneurship at a field level.</td>
<td>The disagreement and dispute involved in collaboration are the source of innovation offered by coproduction. However, museums attempt to avoid the confrontation these processes involve. Museums maintain a clear demarcation between coproduction processes and outcomes. They also control the outcome of coproduction through processes of containment that are expressed:  <em>professionally</em>  <em>programmatically</em>  <em>academically</em>  <em>spatially</em>; and  <em>regionally</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to demonstrate public value and secure government funding, coproduction manifests in a manner designed to emphasise the size and diversity of museum audiences. As a result museums ‘short change’ the resources available from communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital plays a critical role in museum coproduction and has a dark side. Museum coproduction is impacted by resistance from both museum and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How does museum coproduction with culturally diverse communities manifest?</td>
<td>RQ2: What drives and inhibits museums to coproduce with culturally diverse communities?</td>
<td>RQ3: What impact does coproduction with culturally diverse communities have on museum practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological method: • Power manifests through the hierarchy placed on the knowledge exchanged through museum coproduction and the assigning of this knowledge to different groups</td>
<td>Genealogical method: • Distinction between rhetoric and action, and the illusion of change that can be created by a change in rhetoric without a corresponding change in action • Resistance is demonstrated by both community and museum, with each avoiding being used for instrumental purposes by the other party</td>
<td>Archaeological method: • Reveals distinctions between different types of knowledge • Assigns knowledge to different academic disciplines, thereby reinforcing the distinctions between professional groups/academic disciplines and limiting access to knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genealogical method: • Ambiguity relating to the conceptualisation of coproduction assists museums to create a ‘myth’ about their coproduction practice</td>
<td>Governmentality: • Museums adopt an overly simplistic view of communities in order to simplify coproduction processes and avoid conflict and disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmentality: • Coproduction manifests in a manner that secures funding for the museum, rather than offering more impactful exhibitions and public programs to audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4 INFLUENCE OF POWER ON COPRODUCTION IN MUSEUMS

As discussed in Chapter 3, underpinning this research was attention to the influence of power on coproduction in museums, drawing on the work of Foucault. Foucault’s methodologies suggest ways to identify the means by which museums might construct the ‘myth’ or ‘illusion’ of coproduction, and the mechanisms through which they maintain power and control when working with culturally diverse communities. This study was therefore interested in the impact of relational forms of power on museum work with culturally diverse communities (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2010; Lawrence 2008; McNay 1994), particularly the link between discourse, power and knowledge (Clark et al. 2011; Feder 2010; Foucault and Gordon 1980). Three of Foucault’s methodologies have influenced the subjectivist findings from this research into
museum coproduction: the archaeological method; the genealogical method; and
governmentality. Findings that demonstrate the influence of each of these are
summarised below.

6.3.4.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHOD
The influence of Foucault’s archaeological method (section 3.3.2.3.1) can be seen in
findings relating to the way the knowledge that comprises the operant resources
exchanged through museum coproduction is created and influences the practice of
coproduction. Power manifests through the hierarchy placed on knowledge involved
in museum coproduction and the assigning of this knowledge to different groups
(section 5.3.3.5). The archaeological method also reveals distinctions between the
function and capacity of knowledge that is assigned to various academic disciplines
(highlighted in the notion of the art-culture system illustrated in Figure 4) and the
limiting influence these constructions have on the capacity of the museum field to
realise the aspirations of new museology.

6.3.4.2 GENEALOGICAL METHOD
Foucault’s genealogical method (section 3.3.2.3.2) is highlighted in this case stu
dy through the distinction between a change in rhetoric and a change in practice (Roberts
1995; Suddaby and Greenwood 2005). This finding is demonstrated in the limited
extent to which museum professional bodies were able to diffuse coproduction and the
principles of new museology within the museum sector (section 5.4.2). It is also
apparent in the ambiguity relating to the concept of coproduction, and the way
museums foster this lack of clarity in order to present themselves as coproducing with
communities whether or not they undertake this practice (section 5.3.1). There is also
demonstration of resistance, with both the community and the museum avoiding being
used for instrumental purposes by the opposite party.

6.3.4.3 GOVERNMENTALITY
The notion of governmentality (section 3.3.2.3.3) is evident in the influence of public
value on museum coproduction (sections 5.3.4 & 5.4.1). Despite compelling aesthetic
and ethical drivers for coproduction in museums, museums coproduce in order to meet
government priorities and secure their funding and support. The influence of
governmentality can also be seen in museum assumptions that communities are
apolitical and exploitable resources (section 5.4.3.4). Despite museums’ awareness of
the complex nature of communities, they work to a simplistic view of communities in
an attempt to simplify coproduction processes and avoid the conflict and disagreement
that might result from the complex nature of communities. Overlooking the complexity
and polarising nature of ‘community’ (section 1.5.2) demonstrates the conflict
between individual and public good.
6.4 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A number of theoretical contributions are made by this research into coproduction in museums. As an interdisciplinary study drawing from management, marketing, public administration and museology, it adds to existing knowledge by synthesising theory and insights from across these four disciplines. This synthesis initially shaped the *a priori* framework used by this research, which was then elaborated into an *a posteriori* framework through an abductive strategy.

The museum coproduction framework developed by this research offers greater conceptualisation of coproduction and the manner in which it manifests. This contribution fills a gap that has been identified in marketing (Ostrom et al. 2010; Ranjan and Read 2016), public administration (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Osborne et al. 2016; Voorberg et al. 2014) and museology (Mason et al. 2013) literature. This case study has found that museum coproduction manifests according to six constructs, and identifies the range of forms that coproduction can take. Moreover, the subjective nature of this case study reveals the hierarchy that is inherent in this spectrum of approaches to coproduction. The ways in which coproduction manifests can be differentiated according to the level of symmetry in the relationship between participating parties, proximity between the lead firm and other contributors, and the extent of value congruence between participants.

A new contribution made by this research—the direct result of its interdisciplinary nature—is the addition of notions of value to the manner in which coproduction manifests. While marketing literature that takes an S-D logic approach is founded on assumptions of co-creation of value (Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004; Vargo and Lusch 2008), the notion of the exchange of value (Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Holt 1995) continues to underpin theoretical investigations in other disciplines. Because museums are public sector organisations, the concept of public value (Moore 1995; Scott 2013) is also relevant to the context in which they operate.

The influence of an organisational behaviour approach also enables this research to contribute to theory. Examining the drivers and inhibitors of coproduction across external, institutional and community contexts reveals the complexity of this work. The use of a critical theory paradigm means these insights are particularly sensitive to museum resistance to coproduction and ways in which museums maintain their control and authority while undertaking joint practice or collaboration with communities. These insights address gaps in existing knowledge in relation to the complexities and intricacies of coproduction (Bovaird 2007; Echeverri and Skålén 2011; Fisher and Smith 2011), management and governance issues (Lusch et al. 2010; Ostrom et al. 2010), and the organisational change required by coproduction (Lynch 2010). The breadth of this investigation, considering micro, meso and macro practices, is also unique within coproduction research.

There is a large body of museology literature that highlights the difficulties museums experience when they attempt to coproduce—particularly when coproduction involves collaboration. Previous scholarship has identified that museums resist sharing power
and authority with communities, but not fully considered the means by which museums constrain and limit the input that communities have into coproduced exhibitions and public programs (for example Ang 2005; Fouseki and Smith 2013; Iervolino 2013; Kahn 2000; Keith 2012; Onciul 2013). Scholars and practitioners have noted that the principles encapsulated in new museology theory have resulted in minimal change within the sector (Janes 2009; McCall and Gray 2014). Little is understood about the ‘micropractice’ of coproduction and its management implications (Bovaird 2007; Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Echeverri and Skålen 2011; Greer et al. 2016; Osborne et al. 2016; Ostrom et al. 2010; Voorberg et al. 2014). Voorberg (2014) has highlighted the limited attention given to the outcomes of coproduction in public administration literature. This study addresses this gap by investigating the impact coproduction has on museum practice, including both the process and outcomes. The collaborative processes involved in coproduction commonly result in conflict and disagreement. Museums perceive this conflict to be evidence of failure, yet this disagreement and dispute are the very source of innovation and new knowledge that coproduction enables. Revealed by this study are the ways museums separate coproduction processes from the outcomes, and the ways museums constrain the influence communities have on the exhibitions and public programs that are the result of coproduction.

Understanding the complexity of the collaborative processes involved in coproduction also extends S-D logic’s understanding of co-creation in a service ecosystem. While the notion of a service ecosystem acknowledges that generic actors and stakeholders, as well as customers, are involved in co-creation (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Greer et al. 2016), its focus on value propositions as the tool for negotiating co-creation between actors and stakeholders (Akaka et al. 2013; Frow et al. 2014; Payne and Frow 2014; Vargo et al. 2008) is likely to underestimate the complexity of this work.

Underpinning the contributions this study makes to existing theory is its case study research design. This research extends the largely conceptual nature of marketing research (for example Etgar 2008; Grönroos 2006; Lusch and Vargo 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004) through an empirical study. As well as undertaking a field-level investigation, it investigates an exemplar embedded case. The involvement of five research cohorts in this case study enables a broader research context than would be provided by a dyadic study of the museum and community participants. Importantly, this study includes external parties and community representatives, groups whose perspectives are missing from much coproduction literature.

### 6.5 PRACTICAL CONTRIBUTION

This study of museum work with culturally diverse communities has also resulted in the following guidelines for coproduction in museums. These guidelines describe the ways coproduction should be approached, designed and implemented to ensure that the museum and community work together as joint partners on the development of museum exhibitions and public programs. Providing these general recommendations ensures adherence to the principles of CMS and the requirement that research results in changes to the way museums are managed. This feature of CMS is progressive...
performativity (Spicer et al. 2009; Wickert and Schaefer 2015) or transformative redefinition (Alvesson and Ashcraft 2009), and ensures that this critical research moves beyond an ‘anti-managerial’ stance. These guidelines also assist the change in museum practice required by the implementation of new museology.

### 6.5.1 RATIONALE AND APPROACH TO MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

Museums should coproduce with culturally diverse communities in order to create exhibitions and public programs that are authentic, distinctive and innovative. Exhibitions and public programs that result from coproduction will: be pluralistic; acknowledge and represent diversity within as well as between communities; tackle potentially controversial subjects on which consensus is not possible; and present different voices, perspectives and stances.

These guidelines assume coproduction is difficult for museums. It involves changes to established curatorial practice and requires museums to share power and control with communities. The recommendations made here are influenced by the theory espoused in new museology (McCall and Gray 2014; Vergo 1989a), which seeks to make museums more democratic and empowering of their users by acknowledging and responding to the diverse and pluralistic nature of modern Western society. Underpinning these guidelines is an assumption that communities are complex, multifaceted and involve disputed identity and leadership. It is necessary that museums acknowledge and work within this complexity, rather than using the problematic nature of communities to avoid coproduction, practise less challenging forms of coproduction or excuse poor coproduction processes and outcomes.

### 6.5.2 ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS

To ensure the optimal practice of coproduction in museums, the following factors need to be addressed within external, institutional and community contexts.

**6.5.2.1 EXTERNAL INFLUENCES**

The theory of new museology and the ethics of museum practice acknowledge the value of coproduction as a means of addressing the cultural rights of communities and demonstrating respect. A commitment to coproduction requires a change to traditional museum and curatorial practice. This change needs to be adopted at a field level and ‘re-institutionalised’ as established museum practice.

Coproduction can be enabled through government funding and policies. However, government should value museum coproduction not only for the range of instrumental benefits it offers (such as community-building and economic development), but also because it enables unique and distinctive exhibitions and public programs. To embed coproduction into museum practice, government and funding bodies must deliver long-term rather than short-term initiatives, and develop nuanced reporting mechanisms that monitor coproduction through measures other than attendance figures.
6.5.2.2 COMMUNITY INFLUENCES

The communities that museums work with take two forms: source communities (from which museum collections are derived); and constituent communities (to whom museums are accountable as publicly funded institutions). Source communities are more significant in museum coproduction because of their unique cultural assets, knowledge and practices. Cultural practice is not static and cultural identity is often highly political and contested. While source communities offer strong drivers for museum coproduction in terms of ethics and resources, they may also bring complexity to the process of coproduction which the museum needs to accommodate.

Communities differ in terms of the skills, experiences and resources they bring to coproduction with museums. It may be necessary for the museum to resource and support communities to fully engage in the community of practice required by coproduction. The two parties also need a shared work culture in which they collaborate—one that is likely to differ from traditional museum practices.

6.5.2.3 INSTITUTIONAL INFLUENCES

A range of antecedent conditions are required within the museum in order to effectively coproduce and embed this form of practice into its organisational culture. A commitment to evaluation and reflective practice will enable the museum to develop and refine its capacity to coproduce. Innovation and entrepreneurship at an organisational level—characterised by disregard for status within the museum field, a responsiveness to non-traditional arts audiences, and extensive networks both within and beyond the museum field—will assist museums to break from traditional models of museum and curatorial practice. Organisational support and commitment will be necessary, particularly in terms of leadership and organisational policies that prioritise coproduction both intrinsically and for instrumental purposes.

A key influence on coproduction will be the museum’s relational capabilities. These are influenced by the use of CCD approaches which assist the museum to undertake community collaborative initiatives. Cultural intermediaries and cultural brokers also play an important role in facilitating coproduction and developing social networks both across the community and within the museum.

6.5.3 MANIFESTATION OF MUSEUM COPRODUCTION

6.5.3.1 VALUE

Museum coproduction enables exhibitions and public programs to be developed by a range of stakeholders and actors operating within a service ecosystem. The museum and community will participate as joint and equal partners within this service ecosystem through the co-creation of value propositions. The unique and distinctive nature of the exhibitions and public programs that result from this coproduction will enable the exchange of value with third party audiences. They may also offer experiential value to third party audiences if they include audience participation or
audience development design elements. Public value will be delivered by these initiatives if they offer third party audiences access to high-quality and authentic museum offerings. This work should not be motivated by public value in the form of museum funding and support.

6.5.3.2 COMMUNITY ROLE

Communities who coproduce with museums are stakeholders in this work. They contribute resources, expertise, knowledge and skills to the development of exhibitions and public programs. The exhibitions and public programs created through coproduction are joint initiatives of the museum and the communities. Unless specifically stated and agreed beforehand, the community will contribute to all aspects of the exhibition and/or public program.

6.5.3.3 INTERACTION BETWEEN MUSEUM AND COMMUNITY

To ensure the community’s role as a stakeholder in museum coproduction, the relationship between the community and museum will be that of collaborators. In particular, the community will be involved in participatory and collaborative processes that emphasise co-creation and incorporate their curatorial, interpretive and inventive contributions into the coproduced initiatives.

6.5.3.4 BENEFICIARIES

Coproduced exhibitions and public programs will provide mutual benefits to the community and the museum. Co-created value propositions will be the collaborative mechanism used to negotiate and document these benefits. However, the primary receivers of the coproduced exhibitions and public programs will be third party audiences that have not been involved in the development of these offerings. Coproduction should not be undertaken solely for the benefit of the museum, for instance to increase visitation or guarantee government funding and support.

6.5.3.5 STRUCTURE OF EXTERNAL PARTIES

Museum coproduction may involve external parties as either individuals or community groups. The museum should ensure that individuals who are involved in coproduction as representatives of a broader community have the authority of the community to represent their collective interests.

6.5.3.6 RESOURCE EXCHANGE

Museum coproduction will involve the exchange of both operand and operant resources. In the first instance these resources are likely to take the form of artefacts and collection material (operand resources) and intangible cultural heritage and cultural knowledge (operant resources). In order to ensure the community participates in museum coproduction as a stakeholder, it must also contribute operant resources in
the form of imagination and interpretation to ensure it contributes to the co-design of exhibitions and public programs.

### 6.5.4 IMPACT OF COPRODUCTION OF MUSEUM PRACTICE

When communities contribute to museum coproduction as stakeholders or joint partners, their involvement must be seen to influence both the processes and outcomes of museum exhibitions and public programs. In terms of process, this requires their involvement in collaborative or citizen power approaches to coproduction. In terms of outcomes, communities must influence the exhibitions and public programs that result from coproduction to the same extent that museums shape these offerings. This influence of the community should not be compartmentalised or constrained.

The complex nature of communities and the different communities of practice that exist in museum and community contexts are likely to make collaborative processes difficult. The museum must relinquish its need for control and authority when collaborating with the communities. A critical risk is museums limiting the ‘active agency’ of communities; in other words minimising the extent to which coproduced exhibitions and public programs are influenced by communities. A façade of coproduction can be created through processes of: false-consensus; ‘rubber stamping’; limiting communities to the role of ‘passive beneficiaries’; treating museums as ‘invited spaces’; and placing communities on the ‘periphery’ of the museum. Museums are motivated to create this false illusion of coproduction because they are fearful of the disagreement and conflict that it almost inevitably involves. In fact the disagreement and conflict that are likely to arise during coproduction should be embraced as a condition through which new knowledge and new forms of museum practice are developed.

### 6.6 DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This museum case study has produced findings relating to the manifestation of coproduction, its antecedent conditions and impact on practice. These findings are relevant not only to museums, but also to coproduction in a range of organisations and sectors. The initial comparison to be considered is the practice of coproduction in other museums, particularly those not considered exemplar coproduction cases. It would also be valuable to undertake similar investigations into coproduction in other sectors, including both public and private sector organisations. Comparative investigations in the private or commercial sector would be particularly valuable in order to investigate the moderating effects that public value and the authorising environment have on the practice of coproduction. Additional case studies would also address the lack of generalisability offered by this single case research. More comprehensive member-checking processes in future case studies, particularly involving external parties, would enhance the credibility and maintenance of social meaning of research findings.

Social capital and the networks through which it manifests have been found to both drive and inhibit coproduction in museums, as well as influencing coproduction processes. These findings draw in part on affiliation mapping of research participants
in the embedded case that forms part of this study. This was an exploratory use of social network research in relation to coproduction. Use of social network mapping, particularly to identify the structure of networks involved in coproduction, would enable further insights into the role of cultural brokers and impact of social capital on coproduction.

An important area for further investigation is the study of negotiation and conflict during coproduction, and the potential for these to lead to the creation of new knowledge and ideas. This research is needed in relation to not only museums, but all types of organisations that coproduce. The detailed process nature of this research means that it is likely to require ethnographic or observational research methods.

A recent development in S-D logic research is a broadening of attention from the interaction between a firm and its customers to consideration of a service ecosystem and value networks (Akaka and Vargo 2015; Archpru Akaka and Chandler 2011; Lusch et al. 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Within this research, value propositions appear to be the key mechanisms for negotiating the co-creation of value between actors and stakeholders (Akaka et al. 2013; Frow et al. 2014; Payne and Frow 2014). The extent to which this practice involves collaboration is not clear, but it is possible that theory relating to collaboration could extend literature relating to co-creation of value between stakeholders or within a value network.

6.7 CONCLUDING STATEMENT

Coproduction presents an opportunity for museums to practise the theory espoused in new museology. It offers a way to radically alter the relationship between museums and their communities, thereby: increasing and diversifying the resources available to museums; enabling unique and distinctive museum offerings; and empowering communities. Although based on different theoretical framings, the same desire to radically reorientate organisations’ relationships with their consumers/users can be seen in management (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004b), marketing (Grönroos 2006; Vargo and Lusch 2004) and public administration (Boyle and Harris 2009; Brudney and England 1983; Ostrom 1996).

There is a large body of museology literature, however, that highlights the difficulties museums experience when they attempt to coproduce—particularly when this work involves museum practice conducted jointly with communities or other external parties. Museums resist sharing power and authority with communities, and struggle to deal with the negotiation and conflict that coproduction almost inevitably involves. The same difficulties are likely to be experienced by other public and private sector organisations as part of the shift in practice required by coproduction.

This critical theory research examines the implications of power for the practice of coproduction in museums and the corresponding shift from traditional institutional models. It examines the ways museums maintain authority while coproducing. Museum control of coproduction is achieved through the way coproduction manifests, selective responses to the drivers and inhibitors of coproduction, and the level of
influence museums allow communities on the outcomes of coproduced initiatives. These mechanisms of constraint enable museums to approach coproduction in a manner that involves minimal deviation to traditional museum practice. They maintain the status quo of museum work, rather than embracing the radical change involved in new museology.

The ways museums avoid coproduction, or elect to practise forms of coproduction that require minimal change to traditional ways of working, provide insights for all organisations and fields looking to embrace coproduction. However, museums’ response to coproduction is also a case study of resistance to change. This study of coproduction in museums therefore offers broader insights into organisational behaviour and organisational change.
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