



Funded by the
European Union



GLAMMONS

**COLLABORATIVE
MANAGEMENT
AND CO-
LEADERSHIP
OF COMMONS-
ORIENTED
GLAMS**



**CREARE
SOCIAL**

**in
polis
urbanism**



**ISBSB
BURGUNDY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**



**MAZOMOS
LANDSCAPE | HERITAGE | CONSULTANTS**

Nova Iskra

Disclaimer

This document contains information, which is the copyright of GLAMMONS Steering Committee, and may not be copied, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, in whole or in part, without written permission. The commercial use of any information contained in this document may require a license from the proprietor of that information. The document must be referenced if used in a publication.

The European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.



Funded by
the European Union

This project has received funding from the Horizon Europe Research and innovation on cultural heritage and CCIs Programme of the European Commission grant agreement No 101060774.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This deliverable, titled "Collaborative Management and Co-Leadership of Commons-Oriented GLAMs," aims to address the following questions: How do collaborative management and coalition impact the functioning of Commons-oriented GLAMs? What challenges arise from these governance structures, and how can these phenomena be effectively managed?

To answer these questions, our first step was a conceptual review of the literature. We explored various management theories to identify tools that could aid our analysis, focusing specifically on theories related to non-profits. We also examined the differences between management and leadership, relying primarily on traditional literature to understand existing concepts. Furthermore, we delved into theories of the Commons to explore the governance of these shared resources.

From our case studies, we observed that conflict plays a central role in the functioning of Commons-oriented GLAMs. We researched how management theories address conflict and conflict resolution. We drew insights from our research partners and case studies, including the Schwules Museum in Berlin, a magazine in Serbia, and the New Patrons across Europe, each of which has a dedicated section in this research.

Our findings indicate that existing theories are inadequate to fully conceptualise collaborative management and co-leadership in Commons-oriented GLAMs. There are significant gaps between our empirical research and the literature in these fields. We found that Commons-oriented GLAMs differ in several key ways from other types of organisations:

The Nature of the Commons: In Commons-oriented GLAMs, the community that sustains the common resource is not the same as stakeholders in other organisations. The Commons and the community around it are often interdependent, making it difficult to separate the resource from the commoners.

Role of Volunteers: Volunteers in Commons-oriented GLAMs differ significantly from employees in other institutions. Unlike traditional employees, volunteers offer their work and time for free, effectively becoming financiers of the GLAM. In many cases, volunteers are perceived as unpaid employees, but they should be viewed as key contributors to the institution's funding.



The Centrality of Conflict: In more mature cases, conflict is at the core of the existence of the Commons. While traditional management theory often seeks to resolve conflict, we found that there is a necessary tension between the stability of an institution and the fluidity of the community, which changes over time and needs to be conceptualised in a non-essentialist way.

To understand the co-constitution of the resource and the commoners, we turned to relational geography and the concept of generative spaces. To examine the role of volunteers, we explored theories related to cooperatives and Commons. For conflict, we turned to political theory, particularly the concept of agonism as conceptualised by Chantal Mouffe. Agonism suggests that institutions should not aim to eliminate conflict but rather provide an arena where different groups can constructively contest their ideas. This perspective emphasises passion and emotions in mobilising collective movements, critiquing the rationalist approaches of traditional theories.

Conclusions:

1. Relational Constitution of Commons and Commoners: The Commons are constitutive of the community of commoners and vice versa. This is a common topic in geography that we find under the term of generative space.
2. Agonistic Cultural Spaces: Conflict negotiation is central to the existence of the Commons, especially in more mature cases. This concept can be used as an analytical tool to better understand the role of space in Commons-oriented GLAMs.
3. Alternative Financing and Management Models: Commons-oriented GLAMs often use alternative financing methods like sweat equity and time banks, primarily based on volunteer work.

Operational Implications:

1. Safeguarding Spaces: It is essential to create spaces where conflict negotiation and a sense of belonging can flourish. The ownership of these spaces is critical—whether owned by the commoners, the government, or private entities.
2. Promoting Commoning Practices: There is a need to foster informal activities that encourage collective action and community building.



3. Volunteer Care: Strengthening the inclusion of volunteers is vital to maintain the structure and ethos of Commons-oriented organisations.

All the above stresses the importance of *Space* as the dimension that offers a possibility of practices of commoning and belonging. It is in space that volunteer care, common resources and commoners are interconnected, with ownership playing a central role in facilitating these interconnections.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 2 |
| Introduction | 8 |
| Abstract | 8 |
| Contribution to Other Deliverables | 8 |
| Problems and Challenges; Aim of the Paper | 9 |
| Structure of the Paper | 10 |
| Part 1: Screening Management and Leadership Theories..... | 12 |
| Management Theories: Relevance for Commons-Oriented Organisations | 13 |
| Management for Non-Profits: Application in Commons-Oriented Organisations .. | 16 |
| Community-Based Management..... | 20 |
| Leadership Theories | 23 |
| Management or Leadership? | 25 |
| Governing the Commons | 28 |
| Part 2: Case Studies of GLAMmons Projects | 31 |
| Introduction | 31 |
| Case Study 1: Schwules Museum, Berlin | 31 |
| Case Study 2: Magacin, Belgrad..... | 35 |
| Case Study 3: The New Patrons, Europe | 41 |
| Preliminary Findings from the Case Studies | 46 |
| Part 3: Expanding the Conceptual Framework | 48 |
| 1. The Relational Constitution of the Commons..... | 50 |
| 2. Conflict and Agonism in Commons-Oriented GLAMs | 53 |
| 3. Sweat Equity in Commons-Oriented GLAMs | 59 |



| | |
|--|-----------|
| Lessons Learned 1: Volunteer-Centric Management in Cultural Commons | 61 |
| Lessons Learned 2: Cultural Governance | 63 |
| Part 4. Collaborative Management and Co-leadership in GLAMMONS..... | 66 |
| Collaborative Management and Co-leadership: Working Definitions | 66 |
| Key Findings | 68 |
| Further Considerations: Towards a Commons-Based Governance Model..... | 69 |
| References | 73 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Key management theories & relevance to non-profits | 19 |
| Table 2: Management or leadership | 28 |
| Table 3: Schwules Museum: Key Features | 35 |
| Table 4: Magacin: Key Features | 40 |
| Table 5: The New Patrons: Key Features..... | 46 |
| Table 6: Volunteer-Centred Management: Key Aspects..... | 63 |
| Table 7: Cultural Governance: Key Aspects | 65 |
| Table 8: Working definitions of collaborative management and co-leadership..... | 67 |
| Table 9: Key Findings | 69 |



Introduction

Abstract

This working paper, titled "Collaborative Management and Co-Leadership of Commons-Oriented GLAMs," explores how collaborative management and co-governance impact the functioning of Commons-oriented Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums (GLAMs). The study seeks to identify the challenges arising from these governance structures and to propose strategies for effective management. Through a comprehensive literature review and case studies of the Schwules Museum in Berlin, Magacin in Serbia, and the New Patrons initiative across Europe, we examined key concepts such as conflict, volunteer roles, and the nature of the Commons in these cultural institutions.

Our findings reveal that traditional management theories fall short in addressing the complexities of Commons-oriented GLAMs. These institutions are distinct in three fundamental aspects: the interdependence between the Commons and the community, the central role of volunteers as contributors and financiers, and the constructive nature of conflict within the organisation.

We introduce the concept of "agonistic cultural spaces," drawing from Chantal Mouffe's theory of agonism, to highlight the need for spaces that allow constructive contestation and dialogue. Unlike traditional organisations, where conflict is typically seen as a disruption, conflict in Commons-oriented GLAMs is integral to their evolution and dynamism. Additionally, we propose that Commons-oriented GLAMs utilise alternative financing and management models, such as sweat equity and time banks, to recognise the non-monetary contributions of volunteers.

The study concludes by emphasising the relational constitution of Commons and commoners, advocating for safeguarding spaces where conflict negotiation, volunteer care, and commoning practices can flourish. This research underscores the importance of space ownership and its role in fostering community engagement and sustainability in Commons-oriented GLAMs, providing valuable insights for developing more inclusive and adaptable governance models.

Contribution to Other Deliverables

For WP3, this working paper provides crucial insights into how communities and commoners engage with GLAMs through practices of commoning, particularly in relation to trauma and



collective memory, emphasising the importance of space as a site where healing, conflict, and community-building converge. By expanding the conceptual framework around collaborative management and co-leadership, the paper offers a deeper understanding of how these spaces operate as dynamic, agonistic environments where different voices, identities, and experiences interact. This enhanced framework sheds light on how GLAMs can navigate and embrace conflict, volunteer contributions, and collective action, thus fostering more inclusive and resilient cultural Commons. Moreover, these findings directly contribute to the policy recommendations for the third year of the project by providing practical strategies for safeguarding spaces, promoting commoning practices, and enhancing volunteer inclusion, ensuring that GLAMs can effectively support community engagement, address trauma, and sustain their operations in diverse and challenging contexts.

Problems and Challenges; Aim of the Paper

This working paper aims to deepen our comprehension of the dynamics within communities of commoners associated with GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums). These institutions not only serve as custodians of cultural and historical knowledge but also act as vital spaces for community engagement and identity formation. By examining how these communities of commoners are constituted, this paper seeks to explore the various modalities through which these groups co-manage and facilitate access and inclusiveness within GLAM environments. Additionally, the paper will investigate the interactions between these cultural communities and the broader local urban or rural communities in which they are embedded. This exploration is particularly pertinent in an era where the role of GLAMs is increasingly seen not just in the preservation of tangible artefacts but in their potential to foster communal ties and support diverse community needs. Through a multidisciplinary approach that includes case studies and theoretical analysis, this study intends to contribute valuable insights into the cooperative management of cultural resources, enhancing our understanding of the socio-cultural impacts of GLAMs within their respective communities.

Most theories concerning the governance of cultural institutions often underemphasise the role of conflict, viewing it primarily as a detrimental force rather than a potential catalyst for enhanced participation and innovation. This oversight can be attributed to a prevailing orientation towards harmony and stability, which aligns with traditional management practices that prioritise order and smooth operation. Such perspectives tend to regard conflict as a threat to efficiency and coherence, thus advocating for strategies that mitigate



discord rather than engage with it constructively. However, this approach neglects the transformative possibilities that conflict can introduce to an institution. Our working hypothesis is that engaging constructively with conflict can lead to a deeper democratisation of the governance process, inviting diverse stakeholder voices and fostering richer, more inclusive dialogues. It can challenge entrenched assumptions, stimulate critical reflections on institutional practices, and trigger creative solutions to complex problems. By redefining conflict as an opportunity for participation, cultural institutions can leverage these dynamics to strengthen their adaptability and responsiveness to the communities they serve, ultimately enhancing their relevance and vibrancy in a changing cultural landscape.

This understanding of conflict as a potential source of creativity and communal engagement in cultural institutions serves as our point of departure for the subsequent analysis. We delve into the practices of collaborative management and co-leadership of Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums), examining how these approaches harness the productive capacities of conflict to foster inclusivity and accessibility. This paper explores the theoretical underpinnings and practical implementations of collaborative strategies that not only manage but actively engage with the tensions and diversities inherent to cultural governance. By investigating how GLAMs can operate as Commons, where resources and responsibilities are shared among community members, we aim to illuminate the dynamic processes through which these institutions can transform conflict into a driving force for participatory innovation and community enrichment. This exploration seeks to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of governance that embraces the complexities of conflict, turning potential disruptions into opportunities for collective growth and sustained engagement in cultural institutions.

Structure of the Paper

This paper is organised into several key sections, each designed to systematically explore and analyse the dynamics of managing and governing Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums). The structure is as follows:

1. *Screening of Existing Management and Leadership Theories:*

The paper begins by conducting a comprehensive review of existing management and leadership theories. The objective of this review is to identify frameworks that closely align with the unique characteristics of Commons-oriented GLAMs, referred to as "GLAMmons." This screening process will highlight the extent to which traditional and contemporary



theories of management can be applied or adapted to the context of GLAMmons, focusing on their strengths and limitations in addressing the communal and participatory nature of these institutions (Part 1).

2. Case Studies from GLAMmons Project:

To ground the theoretical exploration in real-world practices, the paper then examines three case studies from the GLAMmons project: the Schwules Museum in Berlin, Magacin in Belgrade and The New Patrons, Europe-wide. These case studies serve as practical examples to test the applicability of the identified management and leadership theories in actual GLAMmons settings. By analysing these institutions, the paper seeks to assess how well existing theories hold up in practice and whether they adequately support the collaborative and inclusive goals of GLAMmons (Part 2).

3. Identification of Gaps and Transferable Concepts:

Following the case studies, the paper identifies gaps in the existing theories and explores concepts that, although not explicitly covered in the reviewed literature, may be vital for the effective management and governance of GLAMmons. These concepts may include alternative approaches to conflict resolution, participatory decision-making, and community engagement that are particularly suited to the Commons-based nature of these institutions. This section emphasises the importance of adaptability and responsiveness in management practices to cater to the evolving needs of GLAMmons communities. (Part 2)

4. Proposing a New Conceptual Framework for GLAMmons Governance:

Building on the insights gained from the theoretical review and case study analyses, the paper concludes by proposing a novel approach to conceptualising the management and governance of GLAMmons. This new framework seeks to integrate the productive potential of conflict and emphasise collaborative governance strategies that resonate with the Commons-oriented mission of these institutions. The proposed framework aims to offer a more nuanced understanding of GLAMmons governance, one that embraces complexity and fosters innovation through active community participation and shared responsibility. (Parts 3 and 4)

Each section of the paper is designed to contribute to a holistic understanding of how GLAMs, when viewed and managed as Commons, can not only preserve cultural and historical knowledge but also actively engage and empower the communities they serve. By



rethinking management and governance practices through the lens of Commons, this paper aims to provide practical and theoretical insights that can enhance the relevance and impact of GLAMs in contemporary society.

Part 1: Screening Management and Leadership Theories

In this section, we propose a comprehensive exploration of the existing management and leadership theories, both classical and contemporary, to evaluate their relevance and applicability to the governance of GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums) as Commons, or "GLAMmons." The objective is to critically assess how these theories can inform the collaborative and participatory nature of GLAMmons and whether they provide adequate frameworks for managing the unique challenges and opportunities that arise in such communal settings.

We begin by revisiting the foundational management theories that have shaped the governance of institutions for decades. These include classical models such as Taylor's Scientific Management, Fayol's Administrative Theory, and Weber's Bureaucratic Management. While these approaches emphasise efficiency, hierarchy, and order, their applicability to GLAMmons is limited by their focus on top-down control and rigid structures. Such theories often prioritize stability and uniformity, which may not fully capture the dynamic, participatory essence of GLAMmons, where community engagement and shared governance are paramount.

Moving forward, the analysis delves into more adaptive and human-centered frameworks, such as Human Relations Theory and Systems Theory. These theories recognize the importance of social dynamics and the interdependence of institutional components, offering a more holistic view of management. However, their traditional focus remains largely within the boundaries of institutional efficiency and harmony, which might overlook the productive potential of conflict and the need for more fluid and inclusive governance mechanisms in GLAMmons.

The section then transitions to contemporary management and governance theories, which offer more nuanced approaches to institutional leadership. These include Complexity Theory, Network Governance, and Participatory Management Models. These theories acknowledge the complexity and interconnectedness of modern institutions, proposing flexible, decentralized, and collaborative approaches to management. Such perspectives



align more closely with the ethos of GLAMmons, where governance is not merely about control but about fostering relationships, inclusivity, and shared responsibility.

In particular, Complexity Theory and Network Governance provide valuable insights into managing institutions as dynamic ecosystems, where multiple stakeholders interact in non-linear and often unpredictable ways. These theories suggest that adaptability, resilience, and emergent order are key to successful governance in environments characterised by diversity and change—attributes that are highly relevant to the management of GLAMmons.

Relevance to GLAMmons

As we screen these existing theories, a critical lens is applied to evaluate their strengths and limitations in the context of GLAMmons. The paper seeks to determine which aspects of these theories can be effectively adapted to support the cooperative management and governance of Commons-oriented GLAMs. Additionally, the analysis will identify any gaps or areas where these theories fall short, particularly in addressing the participatory and communal imperatives of GLAMmons. This examination sets the stage for proposing new conceptual frameworks that better capture the unique dynamics of these institutions.

This section aims to provide a thorough understanding of how classical and contemporary management and governance theories can inform the practices of GLAMmons. By highlighting the potential and limitations of these theories, we establish a foundation for the subsequent analysis of case studies and the development of a more tailored approach to managing GLAMs as Commons.

[Management Theories: Relevance for Commons-Oriented Organisations](#)

Effective management of any organisation requires a thorough understanding of various management theories. This overview provides a screening of standard management theories to examine their potential relevance and applicability to Commons-oriented organisations. By evaluating these theories, we can better understand which approaches may be most beneficial for managing and governing institutions focused on shared resources and collective management.

1. **Scientific Management** Developed by Frederick Taylor, Scientific Management focuses on improving efficiency and productivity through the application of scientific methods to analyse and optimise work processes (Taylor, 2004). This theory emphasises the importance of task specialisation, time management, and standardisation of tasks to enhance organisational efficiency. While its primary focus



on efficiency may be less directly applicable to Commons-oriented institutions, the emphasis on systematic analysis can still provide useful insights for managing shared resources.

2. **Administrative Management Theory** Henri Fayol's Administrative Management Theory emphasises the principles of management, such as division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, and coordination (Smith & Boyns, 2005). This theory provides a framework for organising and managing organisations effectively by establishing clear structures and responsibilities. For Commons-oriented institutions, Fayol's principles can help create a well-structured environment that supports effective governance and resource management.
3. **Bureaucratic Management** Max Weber's Bureaucratic Management theory highlights the importance of a hierarchical structure, formal rules and procedures, and impersonal relationships within organisations (Constas, 1958). This theory is particularly useful for ensuring consistency, accountability, and fairness in decision-making processes. For Commons-oriented institutions, adopting certain bureaucratic elements can help maintain order and transparency in the management of communal resources.
4. **Human Relations Theory** Developed by Elton Mayo and others during the Hawthorne Studies, Human Relations Theory underscores the importance of social factors in the workplace, suggesting that workers are motivated by more than just monetary rewards (Bruce & Nyland, 2011). This theory emphasises the role of interpersonal relationships, communication, and worker satisfaction in achieving organisational goals. In Commons-oriented institutions, fostering strong social bonds and a sense of community among stakeholders can be critical for sustainable management.
5. **Behavioural Management Theory** Behavioural Management Theory focuses on understanding individual and group behaviour within organisations, emphasising the importance of leadership, motivation, and interpersonal relationships. Mary Parker Follett, a key figure in this field, advocated for a democratic and participative approach to management, which aligns closely with the collaborative and inclusive nature of Commons-oriented institutions (Sethi, 1962). This theory provides valuable insights into fostering cooperation and active participation among stakeholders.



6. **Contingency Theory** Contingency Theory suggests that there is no single best way to manage organisations; instead, the most effective management approach depends on various situational factors such as the organisation's size, environment, and technology (Fiedler, 2015; Pfeiffer, 1977). Fred Fiedler's work on leadership effectiveness within this framework emphasises the need to adapt management strategies to specific contexts. For Commons-oriented institutions, contingency theory highlights the importance of flexibility and adaptability in governance and management practices.
7. **Systems Theory** Systems Theory views organisations as complex systems with interconnected parts, emphasising the interactions between these parts and their impact on organisational effectiveness (Hammond, 2019). Ludwig von Bertalanffy's work on general systems theory laid the foundation for this approach in management, which is particularly relevant for understanding the dynamics within Commons-oriented institutions. This theory supports a holistic view of organisational management, where the interdependence of various elements is recognized and managed.
8. **Total Quality Management (TQM)** Total Quality Management (TQM) is a management philosophy that focuses on continuous improvement, customer satisfaction, and employee involvement in all aspects of an organisation's operations (Deming, 1986; Crosby, 1979; Feigenbaum, 1983; Ishikawa, 1985; Juran, 1988). For Commons-oriented institutions, TQM principles can be adapted to ensure that the management of shared resources continuously improves and meets the needs of all stakeholders.

In the context of Commons-oriented organisations, selecting the right management theories is crucial for effective governance and resource management. The theories explored in this overview offer diverse perspectives and tools that can be adapted to the unique needs of such institutions. Scientific Management and Administrative Management Theory provide foundational insights into efficiency and organisational structure, which, while more traditionally focused, can still inform the systematic management of shared resources. Bureaucratic Management offers a framework for maintaining order and accountability, which is essential for transparent governance in Commons.

Human Relations and Behavioural Management Theories emphasise the importance of interpersonal relationships, motivation, and participation—key factors in fostering a strong,



engaged community within Commons-oriented institutions. Systems Theory encourages a holistic approach, viewing these organisations as complex, interconnected systems, which is particularly relevant for managing the dynamic interactions within Commons. Contingency Theory highlights the necessity of flexibility and adaptability, ensuring that management strategies are tailored to specific contexts and challenges. Finally, Total Quality Management (TQM) provides a pathway for continuous improvement and stakeholder satisfaction, ensuring that Commons-oriented organisations remain responsive to the needs of their communities.

By integrating these theories thoughtfully, Commons-oriented organisations can develop robust, adaptable management practices that align with their collective goals and sustain the shared resources they are entrusted to manage.

Management for Non-Profits: Application in Commons-Oriented Organisations

Management theories traditionally developed for the for-profit sector offer valuable insights and frameworks that can be adapted for non-profit organisations. However, non-profits, driven by mission-focused objectives that prioritise social, cultural, or educational outcomes over financial gain, require tailored management approaches. These approaches must address not only operational efficiency but also ethical governance, stakeholder engagement, and long-term sustainability.

Non-profits, particularly those similar to Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums), share a commitment to serving the public good and managing communal resources. Therefore, understanding and applying appropriate management theories is crucial to navigating the unique challenges and opportunities these organisations face.

Through a comprehensive review of the literature, we have systematically evaluated various management theories to identify those most relevant to non-profit management. This screening process helps in discerning which frameworks best align with the specific needs of managing Commons-oriented GLAMs, focusing on enhancing ethical governance, engaging stakeholders, and ensuring sustainability.

The following expanded overview highlights key management theories that have been found particularly applicable to non-profit organisations. Each theory is accompanied by an explanation of its core concepts and practical applications in the context of non-profits, particularly those managing communal resources and engaging with the public:



| APPROACH | CONTENT | KEY TEXTS |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Stakeholder Theory | Diverse stakeholders: donors, volunteers, beneficiaries, and the community. Importance of managing relationships with these stakeholders to achieve organisational objectives and create value for the community. | Freeman, R. E. (1984). Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Driscoll, C., & Starik, M. (2004). Brown, W. A. (2005) |
| Resource Dependency Theory | Various resources: funding, volunteers, and partnerships. How organisations manage their external relationships and resources to minimise dependency and ensure sustainability. | Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). Froelich, K. A. (1999). Ulrich, D., & Barney, J. B. (1984). Hillman, A. J., Withers, M. C., & Collins, B. J. (2009). Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. (2005). |
| Social Exchange Theory | Relationships with stakeholders based on social exchanges rather than purely economic transactions: How organisations balance the needs and expectations of stakeholders to maintain mutually beneficial relationships. | Blau, P. (1964). Emerson, R. M. (1976). Cook, K. S., & Rice, E. (2003). Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Homans, G. C. (1958). |



| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Capacity Building Theory | Building internal capacity to effectively deliver programs and services: developing organisational capabilities, such as leadership, governance, human resources, and infrastructure, to enhance long-term effectiveness and impact. | Connolly, P., & York, P. (2003). De Vita, C. J., & Fleming, C. (2001). Light, P. C. (2004). Eisinger, P. (2002). Letts, C., Ryan, W., & Grossman, A. (1999). |
| Results-Based Management | Demonstrate measurable outcomes and impact to stakeholders and funders: setting clear objectives, monitoring performance, and evaluating outcomes to improve organisational effectiveness and accountability. | Binnendijk, A. (2000). Mayne, J. (2007). Swiss, J. (1999). United Nations Development Programme. (2002). Poister, T. H. (2003). |
| Theories of Change | Causal pathways through which their activities lead to desired outcomes: non-profits articulate their strategies, align activities with objectives, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. | Weiss, C. H. (1995). Anderson, A. A. (2005). Connell, J. P., & Kubisch, A. C. (1998). Funnell, S. C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). Vogel, I. (2012). |
| Participatory Management | Stakeholders, including beneficiaries and community members, in decision-making processes: collaboration, empowerment, and inclusivity in organisational governance and operations. | Kaner, S. (2014). Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). Blackstock, K. L., Kelly, G. J., & Horsey, B. L. (2007). Pretty, J. (1995). Chambers, R. (1994). |



| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Collaborative Management:</p> | <p>Collaborations with other organisations, government agencies, and community groups to address complex social issues: building partnerships, fostering trust, and leveraging collective resources to achieve common goals.</p> | <p>Gray, B. (1989). Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Thomson, A. M., Perry, J. L., & Miller, T. K. (2009). Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005)</p> |
| <p>Nonprofit Board management Models:</p> | <p>Unique role of boards of directors in providing strategic direction, oversight, and accountability for organisational performance: principles of stewardship, transparency, and fiduciary responsibility.</p> | <p>Axelrod, N. R. (2005) Carver, J. (2006). Holland, T. P., & Jackson, D. K. (1998). Ostrower, F., & Stone, M. M. (2006).</p> |
| <p>Community-Based Management:</p> | <p>Operate in specific communities and must understand and respond to local needs and dynamics: grassroots participation, cultural competence, and community engagement in decision-making and program design.</p> | <p>Chaskin, R. J. (2001). Craig, G., & Mayo, M. (1995). Ife, J. (2013). Minkler, M. (Ed.). (2005). Putnam, R. D. (2000).</p> |

Table 1: Key management theories & relevance to non-profits



The application of these management theories to non-profit organisations, especially those in the Commons-oriented GLAM sector, offers valuable frameworks to navigate the unique challenges these institutions encounter. By incorporating these theories into understanding management practices in non-profits, the focus shifts from effectiveness, to the upholding of an organisation's missions, and to better serving of their communities. This customised approach not only enhances operational efficiency but also strengthens the ethical and social foundations of non-profit management, ensuring these organisations stay true to their core values while adapting to an evolving landscape.

Given the relevance of these theories, particularly in the context of Commons-oriented organisations, community-based management emerges as especially pertinent. Therefore, we explore this approach in greater depth in the following section.

Community-Based Management

Community-based management (CBM) is a management approach that emphasises the active participation of community members at every stage of decision-making, planning, implementation, and evaluation. This approach is rooted in the belief that communities have valuable local knowledge, resources, and social networks that can be harnessed to address their needs and challenges in a sustainable way.

At its core, CBM promotes a participatory and bottom-up approach, where community members are viewed as key stakeholders and co-creators of solutions rather than passive recipients. This method recognizes the diverse perspectives, values, and priorities within a community and seeks to empower individuals and groups to take ownership of the development process.

CBM is informed by principles from various academic disciplines, including community development, sociology, anthropology, and organisational theory. Influential scholars like Chaskin (2001), who highlights the importance of building community capacity for effective management, and Craig and Mayo (1995), who explore community empowerment and participatory development, have contributed significantly to its theoretical foundations. Ife (2013) further underscores the need for vision, analysis, and adaptive practices in an ever-changing global context.

Key elements of CBM include:



- **Community Participation:** Prioritising the active involvement of community members in decision-making processes. Minkler (2005) emphasises this in his exploration of community organising and building for health.
- **Recognition of Local Knowledge:** Valuing local knowledge and resources as critical inputs for problem-solving and decision-making, which aligns with Putnam's (2000) focus on grassroots participation and social capital in community engagement.
- **Capacity Building:** Empowering community members with the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively participate in management processes, ensuring meaningful contributions.
- **Partnerships and Networking:** Enhancing community initiatives by leveraging additional resources and expertise from external stakeholders.
- **Sustainability:** Fostering local ownership and building social cohesion to ensure long-term impact and the ongoing well-being of the community.
- **Empowerment and Social Justice:** Addressing power imbalances and promoting inclusive decision-making processes, ensuring that all community members have a voice in activities that directly affect them.

Community-based management (CBM) is particularly relevant to Commons-oriented organisations, such as GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums), because these institutions often manage resources that are collectively owned or shared by the public. The principles of CBM align closely with the goals of Commons-oriented organisations, which seek to ensure that these shared resources are managed in a way that reflects the interests and needs of the community.

In Commons-oriented organisations, the active involvement of community members in decision-making processes is crucial to maintaining the legitimacy and sustainability of the resources being managed. CBM's emphasis on participatory and bottom-up approaches ensures that the voices of those who are most affected by the management of these resources are heard and considered. This is vital in Commons-oriented settings, where the success of the organisation depends on the collective buy-in and stewardship of the community.

Additionally, CBM's focus on recognizing and leveraging local knowledge is particularly valuable for Commons-oriented organisations. These organisations often rely on the



expertise and insights of community members who have a deep understanding of the cultural, historical, and social significance of the resources being managed. By integrating local knowledge into management practices, Commons-oriented organisations can make more informed decisions that resonate with the community and enhance the preservation and use of these resources.

Capacity building within the community is another critical element of CBM that benefits Commons-oriented organisations. By empowering community members with the skills and knowledge needed to participate effectively in management processes, these organisations can foster a sense of ownership and responsibility among stakeholders. This not only enhances the effectiveness of specific projects but also contributes to the long-term sustainability of the Commons.

Moreover, CBM's emphasis on sustainability, partnerships, and social justice is directly aligned with the core mission of Commons-oriented organisations, which often aim to manage resources in a way that is equitable and sustainable for future generations. By promoting inclusive decision-making and addressing power imbalances, CBM helps ensure that the management of Commons is fair and that all community members have an opportunity to contribute to and benefit from the shared resources.

An important limitation of CBM theories lies in the fact that it takes the "Community" as something stable and pre-existing the organization. As we will show further below, community and Commons-oriented organizations are co-constituted and interdependent, with consequences for CBM¹.

While Community-based Management (CBM) provides a robust framework for engaging communities in the management of Commons-oriented organisations, it is equally important to consider the role of *leadership* within these settings. Effective leadership is essential for guiding the participatory processes, fostering collaboration, and ensuring that the values and goals of the community are upheld throughout the organisation's operations. To fully understand how leadership can complement and enhance CBM in Commons-oriented organisations, it is crucial to examine relevant leadership theories. These theories offer insights into the qualities, behaviours, and strategies that leaders can employ to successfully navigate the unique challenges of managing shared resources, promoting inclusivity, and driving sustainable outcomes. The following section will explore the relevance of various

¹ For a detailed discussion on the concept of "Community" particularly in a non-essentialistic way, please see Deliverable 3.2 on "Memory, trauma and belonging" together with the developed concept of "Communities of remembering".



leadership theories in the context of Commons-oriented organisations, assessing how they can be applied to support and strengthen CBM practices.

Leadership Theories

As we move forward, the focus will shift to leadership theories, which offer various perspectives on what constitutes effective leadership. These theories have evolved over time, each bringing unique insights into the qualities, behaviours, and contexts that shape successful leadership. The following discussion will screen the most relevant leadership theories, particularly in the context of Commons-oriented organisations, to identify which approaches might be most applicable and beneficial.

Leadership theories have undergone significant development over time, each presenting different views on the qualities and behaviours that make an effective leader. Below are some of the most common leadership theories:

1. **Trait Theory:**

Trait Theory posits that certain innate traits or characteristics make individuals better suited to leadership roles. Traits commonly associated with effective leadership include intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Stogdill, 1948; Zaccaro, 2007). However, research has shown that traits alone do not guarantee effective leadership, as the context in which leadership occurs also plays a crucial role.

2. **Behavioural Theory:**

Behavioural theories focus on the actions and behaviours of leaders rather than their inherent traits. These theories suggest that effective leadership can be learned through observation, imitation, and practice (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Two key behavioural approaches include:

- **Task-Oriented Leadership:** This approach emphasises achieving specific goals and objectives through task delegation, coordination, and performance monitoring.
- **Relationship-Oriented Leadership:** This approach prioritises building positive relationships with followers through support, encouragement, and empathy.

3. **Contingency Theory:**

Contingency theories propose that the effectiveness of a leader depends on various



situational factors, such as the characteristics of the followers, the nature of the task, and the organisational context (Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). A well-known example is Fiedler's Contingency Model, which suggests that the match between a leader's style (task-oriented or relationship-oriented) and the favourableness of the situation determines leadership effectiveness.

4. **Transactional Leadership:**

This theory focuses on the exchange between leaders and followers, where leaders motivate followers through rewards and punishments based on performance.

Transactional leadership was initially developed by James MacGregor Burns in his 1978 work *Leadership* (Burns, 1978). Burns introduced the concept of transactional leadership as a style where leaders clarify roles and expectations, establish goals, and use contingent rewards (such as incentives, recognition, or promotions) to motivate followers to achieve desired outcomes. Bernard M. Bass later expanded upon this concept in his 1985 book *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (Bass, 1985), refining the theory and exploring its implications for organisational effectiveness.

5. **Transformational Leadership:**

Transformational Leadership emphasises the role of leaders in inspiring and motivating followers to achieve common goals and transcend their own self-interest for the greater good of the organisation (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). This theory was also developed by James MacGregor Burns, who introduced transformational leadership as a style that inspires followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes. Transformational leaders are characterised by their ability to articulate a compelling vision, communicate high expectations, and empower followers to reach their full potential. Bernard M. Bass further developed this theory, particularly in his 1985 work, which highlighted the impact of transformational leadership on organisational performance.

6. **Servant Leadership:**

Servant leadership theory proposes that effective leaders prioritise the needs of their followers above their own interests. Servant leaders focus on serving others, empowering them, and facilitating their personal and professional growth. They emphasise humility, empathy, and a commitment to the well-being of their followers (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears, 1996). This approach is particularly relevant in non-profit



and Commons-oriented organisations, where the focus is often on community service and collective well-being.

7. Authentic Leadership:

Authentic leadership theory emphasises the importance of leaders being genuine, self-aware, and transparent in their interactions with followers. Authentic leaders are guided by their core values and beliefs, and they strive to build trust and credibility through consistent actions and ethical behaviour (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). This theory is especially pertinent in contexts where trust and integrity are critical to sustaining the organisation's mission and fostering strong relationships with stakeholders.

8. Situational Leadership:

Situational leadership theory suggests that effective leaders adapt their leadership style based on the readiness or maturity level of their followers. Leaders may need to vary their approach, providing more direction and support to less experienced followers while allowing more autonomy for those who are more competent and confident (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1996). This flexibility is crucial in environments where the team's needs and capabilities vary widely, such as in volunteer-driven or community-based organisations.

These leadership theories provide diverse insights into what makes a leader effective, each focusing on different aspects of leadership, from inherent traits to situational adaptability and motivational strategies. While these theories offer valuable frameworks for understanding leadership, they also highlight the complexity of leadership as it intersects with management practices. This exploration of leadership theories sets the stage for the next section, where we will delve into the distinction between leadership and management, examining how these concepts overlap and diverge within the context of Commons-oriented organisations.

Management or Leadership?

Management and leadership are distinct yet interconnected concepts within organisational theory and practice. Management involves activities such as planning, organising, coordinating, and controlling resources to achieve specific goals efficiently and effectively. It is focused on operational tasks, day-to-day activities, and the implementation of established processes and procedures to meet predetermined objectives.

In contrast, leadership is about inspiring, influencing, and guiding individuals or groups towards a common vision or shared goals. Leadership emphasises strategic thinking, vision-



setting, and motivating others to embrace change, adapt to challenges, and pursue long-term objectives. Unlike management, leadership is not solely tied to formal positions of authority; rather, it often stems from personal qualities, expertise, communication skills, and the ability to inspire and motivate others.

Managers typically derive their authority from their position within the organisational hierarchy, enabling them to allocate resources, assign tasks, and ensure compliance with organisational policies. Their decision-making process prioritises rational analysis, data-driven insights, and risk management. Managers focus on maintaining productive relationships within the organisational structure, ensuring smooth operations and adherence to protocols.

Leaders, on the other hand, cultivate relationships based on trust, inspiration, and shared values. They build networks, foster collaboration, and empower others to contribute to the collective vision and mission of the organisation. While managers are outcome-oriented, concentrating on achieving predefined goals within specified timeframes and resource constraints, leaders are change-oriented, driving organisational transformation, fostering innovation, and inspiring a shared commitment to continuous improvement and growth.

In other words, management and leadership differ in their roles, functions, focus, authority, decision-making approaches, relationships, and outcome orientation. Effective organisations require a balance of both management and leadership capabilities to navigate complexity, drive innovation, and sustain long-term performance. The following table juxtaposes the two concepts²:

| | Management | Leadership |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Role and Function | planning, organising, coordinating, and controlling resources to achieve specific goals and objectives; ensuring that tasks are completed efficiently and effectively, often | inspiring, influencing, and guiding individuals or groups toward a common vision or shared goals; setting direction, inspire motivation, foster innovation, and empower others to achieve collective success. |

² In Part 3 we propose working definitions for both “collaborative management” and “co-leadership”.



| | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| | focusing on processes, systems, and outcomes. | |
| Focus | operational tasks, day-to-day activities; the implementation of established processes and procedures to achieve predetermined objectives. | strategic thinking, vision setting; inspiring others to embrace change, adapt to challenges, and pursue long-term goals. |
| Authority and Influence | driven from Managers' formal positions within the organisational hierarchy; exercise of authority to allocate resources, assign tasks, and ensure compliance with established policies and procedures. | may or may not hold formal positions of authority; influence stems from Leaders' personal qualities, expertise, communication skills, and ability to inspire and motivate others, rather than from hierarchical position alone. |
| Decision-Making | based on rational analysis, data-driven insights, and organisational policies; prioritising efficiency, consistency, and risk management in decision-making processes. | participation in decision-making processes, but approach is often characterised by vision, intuition, creativity, and a willingness to take calculated risks to pursue strategic objectives. |
| Relationship | focus on maintaining productive relationships within the | cultivate relationships based on trust, inspiration, and shared values; build |



| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | organisational structure, including relationships with subordinates, peers, and superiors; strive to ensure smooth operations and adherence to established protocols. | networks, foster collaboration, and empower others to contribute to the collective vision and mission of the organisation. |
| Outcome Orientation | achieving predefined goals, meeting targets, and delivering results within specified timeframes and resource constraints. | driving organisational change, fostering innovation, and inspiring a shared commitment to continuous improvement and growth. |

Table 2: Management or leadership

Governing the Commons

Building on the distinction between leadership and management, an important application of governance theories emerges in the context of the Commons. The concept of Governing the Commons revolves around the management of shared resources, often referred to as Common Pool Resources (CPRs), through collective governance. The term Commons Governance refers to decision-making processes that establish and implement rules to sustainably manage CPRs. These resources may be governed under "any one or several types of property regimes" (Hess & Meinzen-Dick, 2006, p. 2), which are described as "the structure of the enforceable rights defining actions that individuals can take in relation to other individuals regarding some 'thing'" (Ostrom, 1990, p. 339).

Elinor Ostrom's work on Commons governance is foundational, and she analysed numerous case studies involving natural resource CPRs, such as fisheries, groundwater basins, forests, and meadows. These resources are characterised by their "traditional, customary, and informal nature" (Lohmann, 2016, p. 11), typically associated with primary industries like agriculture, forestry, and fishing. Often referred to as "old" or "traditional" Commons, these resources adhere to design principles that Ostrom identified (1990, pp. 91-102), which have



been validated by further research (Cox et al., 2010; Baggio et al., 2016). However, specific rules derived from these principles vary widely depending on the context (Ostrom, 1990, p. 89).

The Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework, developed by Ostrom and others, uses rational choice theory to predict and explain outcomes in Commons governance systems. It focuses on resource characteristics, rules within the property regime, and the endogenous attributes of the community, such as norms of trust and reciprocity (McGinnis & Ostrom, 2014, p. 3). Ostrom advocated that communal ownership, or Commons property regimes, are often more effective than private or state ownership for managing CPRs. Although this approach is highly regarded, it has faced criticism for shifting the burden of management and financial costs onto individuals and communities (Sauvêtre, 2018, p. 85) and for focusing too much on "endogenous variables" without adequately addressing "external forces" or broader socioeconomic contexts (De Angelis, 2017; Caffentzis, 2004).

Another critique of the IAD framework is its tendency to view the dynamics of the resource system as mostly exogenous (McGinnis & Ostrom, 2014, p. 3). To address this limitation, the Social-Ecological Systems (SES) framework was developed, giving equal attention to the biophysical and ecological aspects of resource systems. The SES framework incorporates variables such as resource systems, resource units, governance systems, and actors (McGinnis & Ostrom, 2014, p. 4), providing a more holistic understanding of Commons governance.

A further expansion of governance theory is the Institutional Resource Regime (IRR) framework, which includes different regulatory procedures for various uses of a resource within a single governance framework (Gerber et al., 2020, p. 155). An Institutional Regime (IR) refers to all the formal rules governing resource use within a specific context, allowing for analysis and comparison over time and across different settings.

In recent years, there has been growing interest in resources that were not traditionally viewed as CPRs, often referred to as new Commons. These include cultural, neighbourhood, infrastructure, medical, health, market, global, and knowledge Commons (Hess, 2009). Unlike traditional Commons, new Commons are characterized by their intentionality, formal structure, and legal protections (Lohmann, 2016, p. 11). They often embody general principles rather than a universal set of guidelines (Bollier, 2007), reflecting the complex and diverse nature of modern resource-sharing systems.



Commons governance has evolved from a focus on traditional, natural resource systems to encompass a broad range of "new Commons," which require different approaches to governance and management. By incorporating frameworks like IAD, SES, and IRR, scholars have developed more sophisticated models for understanding and managing these shared resources. However, ongoing debates highlight the need for further exploration of external forces and broader contextual influences in Commons governance.

Having explored various theories of management and leadership, it is now crucial to assess whether these theories offer useful analytical tools for understanding real-world examples. By examining three case studies of Commons-oriented GLAMs, we can evaluate the practical applicability of these concepts, exploring how well they help us analyse and interpret the dynamics within these organisations. These case studies will not only illustrate key topics but also reveal potential gaps in the theories, highlighting areas that may require further refinement or expansion. Through this process, we can determine the extent to which these theoretical frameworks effectively capture the complexities of managing and leading Commons-oriented institutions.



Part 2: Case Studies of GLAMmons Projects

Introduction

This section presents an in-depth examination of three exemplary cases from the GLAMmons project: the Schwules Museum in Berlin, Magacin in Belgrad and the New Patros in Europe. These institutions have been selected due to their significant alignment with the principles of Commons-based governance, as identified during the initial screening phase of the project. All three institutions operate as more than just traditional cultural spaces; they embody the essence of community-driven Commons, where resources, responsibilities, and decision-making processes are shared among stakeholders, often in unconventional ways.

The analysis of these case studies serves a dual purpose. First, it seeks to evaluate the applicability of existing management and governance theories, as discussed in the previous section, within the real-world contexts of these GLAMmons. Second, it aims to identify the unique challenges and dynamics present in these institutions that are not adequately addressed by traditional theories.

Through these case studies, this section will demonstrate that while existing management theories offer some insights, they fall short of fully explaining the dynamics at play within these GLAMmons. The analysis will highlight the necessity of developing new theoretical approaches that can better capture the unique characteristics of conflict, volunteer engagement, and sweat equity in the governance of Commons-based cultural institutions.

Case Study 1: Schwules Museum, Berlin

The **Schwules Museum**, located in Berlin, is a significant cultural institution dedicated to the history, art, and culture of the LGBTQ+ community. While a detailed exploration of the museum can be found in the deliverables from Year 1 (Deliverables 1.1 & 1.4), this section will highlight the most relevant aspects that pertain to the current analysis.

Ownership

The Schwules Museum (SMU) is an **association** (eingetragener Verein or e.V.) and, as such, is a legal entity that owns its assets independently of its members. Members participate in the governance of the association but do not own it or its assets. An e.V. is considered a separate legal person under German law, meaning the association itself can own property, enter into contracts, and is liable for its obligations independently of its members.



Members have specific rights and responsibilities as outlined in the association's statutes. They can participate in decision-making processes, such as voting in the **general assembly** and electing the board, but they do not possess ownership rights over the association's assets. Unlike shareholders in a corporation, members of an e.V. do not own shares or receive dividends; their involvement is based on mutual interests and the pursuit of common goals rather than financial ownership.

If the association is dissolved, its assets are typically used for purposes specified in its statutes, often benefiting the public or supporting charitable causes, and are not distributed among the members. The association is governed by its elected board and the general assembly of members, following the regulations set forth in its statutes and adhering to German association law. The e.V. structure ensures that the association operates as an independent legal entity dedicated to its stated objectives.

Management and Governance Structure

The Schwules Museum is governed by an elected **Board of Directors**, consisting of volunteers who are elected for two-year terms by the association's members. The Board provides strategic oversight, sets policies, and ensures the financial stability of the museum. It guides the thematic principles of the institution and oversees compliance with legal and statutory requirements.

The main executive power lies with the **Executive Director**, a paid position created to facilitate the museum's operational work. The Executive Director is responsible for implementing the Board's decisions, managing the staff, and overseeing daily operations, including exhibitions, programs, and administrative functions. This governance structure balances volunteer-led strategic direction with professional management, allowing the museum to function efficiently while staying true to its mission.

Staff & Volunteers

Volunteers are the backbone of the Schwules Museum*, playing an indispensable role in its daily operations and overall success. Approximately 60 **volunteers** contribute their time and skills to handle crucial tasks such as staffing the reception desk, supervising exhibitions, providing information to visitors, and assisting with administrative duties. They are deeply involved in the museum's programs, contributing to research, archival work, and educational outreach.



These volunteers work alongside more than 15 full-time paid **employees** responsible for managing the library, archive, exhibition programs, and workshops. The staff includes curators, archivists, librarians, educators, and administrative personnel. Together, they ensure the museum's programs are professionally executed and aligned with its mission.

The museum places a strong emphasis on transparent and dialogue-based participation principles. Volunteers are not only involved in operational duties but also have opportunities to contribute to program development and decision-making processes. Regular meetings, training sessions, and open communication channels are established to foster collaboration between staff and volunteers. This inclusive approach ensures that the diverse perspectives within the LGBTQ+ community are represented, and that the museum remains responsive to the needs of its audience.

Funding

Funding for the Schwules Museum comes from multiple sources, ensuring financial stability and the ability to fulfil its mission. A significant portion of its annual budget is provided through institutional funding from the State of Berlin, which recognizes the museum's cultural and social importance. This funding supports core activities, including facility maintenance, staffing, and ongoing programs.

Additional income is generated through various avenues:

Entry Fees: Revenue from ticket sales contributes to operational costs and allows the museum to offer a range of exhibitions and events to the public.

Membership Fees: Members of the association pay annual fees, providing financial support and fostering community engagement with the museum's mission.

Donations: Individual and corporate donations play a crucial role in supplementing the museum's income. These can be unrestricted or designated for specific projects.

Grants and Sponsorships: The museum actively seeks grants from foundations and cultural organisations, as well as sponsorships from businesses aligned with its values and objectives.

Fundraising Events: Special events and campaigns are organised to raise additional funds, often tied to specific projects or expansions.



The contribution of volunteers, including the Board of Directors, is invaluable. While not a direct financial input, the time, expertise, and labour provided by volunteers represent significant cost savings and enhance the museum's capacity to operate effectively. Their efforts allow the museum to allocate resources more efficiently and expand its offerings.

Exhibitions and other temporary events often require additional funding beyond the regular budget. The museum may seek project-specific grants, partnerships, or crowdfunding initiatives to finance these special programs. This approach enables the institution to explore diverse topics, collaborate with international artists and scholars, and present innovative exhibitions that might otherwise be beyond its financial reach.

Schwules Museum: Key Features

The Schwules Museum in Berlin is a prominent cultural institution dedicated to preserving and celebrating the history, art, and culture of the LGBTQ+ community. Established as an association (eingetragener Verein or e.V.), it operates as a legal entity owning its assets independently of its members. This structure allows the museum to own property, enter contracts, and be liable for obligations separately from its members.

Members play a crucial role in governance but do not possess ownership rights over the museum's assets. They have specific rights and responsibilities defined by the association's statutes, including participating in decision-making processes like voting in the general assembly and electing the board. Their involvement is driven by mutual interests and common goals rather than financial ownership. If the association is dissolved, its assets are allocated according to its statutes, often benefiting public or charitable causes.

The governance structure blends volunteer leadership with professional management. A Board of Directors, composed of volunteers elected for two-year terms, provides strategic oversight, sets policies, and ensures financial stability. The Board guides the thematic direction and oversees compliance with legal requirements. Daily operations are managed by an Executive Director—a paid position responsible for implementing the Board's decisions, managing staff, and overseeing functions like exhibitions and programs.

Volunteers are the backbone of the Schwules Museum, with approximately 60 individuals contributing to essential tasks such as reception, exhibition supervision, visitor information, and administrative duties. They work alongside over 15 full-time paid employees, including curators, archivists, librarians, educators, and administrative staff,



who ensure the museum's programs are professionally executed. The museum fosters an inclusive and collaborative environment, emphasizing transparent participation principles and involving volunteers in program development and decision-making.

Financial stability is achieved through a multifaceted funding strategy. A significant portion of the budget comes from institutional funding provided by the State of Berlin. Additional income is generated through entry fees, membership fees, donations, grants, sponsorships, and fundraising events. The museum actively seeks project-specific grants and partnerships to finance special exhibitions and programs beyond the regular budget. Volunteers' contributions represent significant cost savings, allowing the institution to allocate resources efficiently and expand offerings without incurring additional financial burdens.

Table 3: Schwules Museum: Key Features

Case Study 2: Magacin, Belgrad

Magacin³ is a unique and innovative cultural and social centre located in Belgrade, Serbia, operating under the model of a cultural Commons. This concept of a cultural Commons refers to a shared resource managed collectively by a community of users, rather than being owned and controlled by a single entity or individual. Magacin is housed in a former warehouse owned by the City of Belgrade, but its operations are entirely independent, driven by the diverse community that utilises and sustains the space.

At its core, Magacin is a vibrant hub for contemporary art, cultural production, and socially responsible initiatives. It provides a platform for a wide range of activities, including art exhibitions, performances, workshops, public debates, and community-driven projects. What sets Magacin apart from traditional cultural institutions is its open and flexible approach: there is no rigid program or curatorial concept dictating what can or cannot happen within its walls. Instead, it embraces a broad spectrum of creative and socially relevant activities that align with its core values of inclusivity, openness, and public service. This makes Magacin not just a cultural venue, but a dynamic space where community engagement and cultural innovation thrive.

Ownership

³ All information available in: Čukić, I., Pekić, M., Dimitrijević, A., Gunjić, L., Knezević Strika, L., Mijić, J., Popović, A., Radulović, S., Strika, V. (2019). *Magacin: A model for a self-organized cultural centre (English Edition)*. Association Independent Cultural Scene of Serbia.



Magacin operates under the principle of a cultural Commons, where the idea of ownership is radically redefined. Unlike traditional institutions where ownership is clear-cut and hierarchical, Magacin's space is not owned by any single individual, organisation, or entity. While the building itself is owned by the City of Belgrade, the control and management of the space are entirely in the hands of its users. This collective ownership model means that the space is treated as a shared resource, with the community taking responsibility for its upkeep, management, and future development.

In practice, this means that all users of Magacin, whether they are individuals, informal groups, or established organisations, have a stake in the space. They contribute to its maintenance, make decisions about its use, and participate in the various activities and initiatives that take place within it. This collective approach to ownership fosters a sense of shared responsibility and investment among the users, who view Magacin not as something to be consumed or utilised for personal gain, but as a communal asset that benefits the entire community.

Management

The management of Magacin is distinguished by its decentralised and community-driven nature. The central managing body is the **Magacin Users' Assembly**, which includes all regular users of the space. The Users' Assembly is responsible for the day-to-day management of Magacin, including decisions related to the space's maintenance, operational needs, and programming. This assembly-based management structure ensures that decisions are made collectively and that all users have an equal say in how the space is run.

A key feature of Magacin's management is the open calendar system, which governs access to the space. This system ensures that all users, regardless of whether they are regular or occasional, have equal opportunities to use Magacin's facilities. There is no hierarchy among users in terms of access or priority; instead, the open calendar is designed to maximise the use of the space while maintaining fairness and inclusivity. This model reflects Magacin's commitment to transparency and equal access, core values that are integral to its identity as a cultural Commons.

In addition to the Users' Assembly, there is a **Coordinating Body** that plays a crucial role in facilitating communication and coordination between the Users' Assembly and the broader governance structure, including the Association of Independent Cultural Scene of Serbia (ICSS). The ICSS legally represents Magacin and supports its public advocacy and project



financing efforts. The Coordinating Body is essential in ensuring that the various aspects of Magacin's operations are aligned and that the community's voice is effectively represented in external negotiations and partnerships.

Governance

Governance at Magacin is built on democratic principles, emphasising participation, transparency, and horizontal decision-making. The **Magacin Users' Assembly** serves as the primary governance body, where all regular users come together to make decisions about the space. This assembly meets regularly to discuss and decide on a wide range of issues, from routine operational matters to more significant strategic decisions.

One of the most important aspects of governance at Magacin is the commitment to horizontal decision-making. This means that there is no single leader or hierarchical structure dictating the direction of the space. Instead, decisions are made collectively, with each user having an equal voice. The assembly operates on the principle of majority rule, where decisions are made based on the votes of those present. However, for strategic decisions that require broader consultation and consensus, special sessions of the assembly are convened. These sessions ensure that all voices are heard and that significant changes or innovations are carefully considered and supported by the community.

This horizontal governance model is not just about making decisions; it is also about fostering a culture of participation and inclusivity. By involving all users in the decision-making process, Magacin ensures that the space remains responsive to the needs and aspirations of its community. This approach also strengthens the sense of ownership and responsibility among users, who are not just passive participants but active stewards of the cultural Commons.

Leadership

Leadership within Magacin is distributed and non-hierarchical, reflecting the community-oriented ethos of the cultural Commons. Rather than having a single leader or a small group of leaders, leadership roles within Magacin are shared among the users and are often rotated. This rotation of leadership roles helps prevent the concentration of power and ensures that a diverse range of perspectives and skills are brought to the management and governance of the space.

One of the key leadership roles is that of the **Coordinator**. The Coordinator is responsible for facilitating communication among users, supporting new users, and managing the day-to-



day finances of the space. Importantly, the role of Coordinator is a rotating position, with each term lasting just one month. This short rotation period ensures that no single individual holds too much power or influence and that leadership responsibilities are shared widely within the community.

In addition to the Coordinator, other leadership roles are also distributed among the users. These include positions within the technical maintenance team, the public relations team, and the photo documentation team. Like the Coordinator, these roles are also rotating, ensuring that different members of the community have the opportunity to contribute to the leadership and management of Magacin. This distributed leadership model fosters a culture of shared responsibility and collective action, reinforcing the principles of the cultural Commons.

Decision-Making Processes

The decision-making processes at Magacin are designed to be inclusive, transparent, and reflective of the community's collective will. The **Magacin Users' Assembly** is the central decision-making body, where all regular users have the opportunity to participate in discussions and votes on issues affecting the space. The assembly meets regularly to address a wide range of topics, from routine operational decisions to strategic planning and emergency issues.

One of the key features of Magacin's decision-making process is its openness. All decisions are made through open discussions in the assembly, and all users are encouraged to contribute their ideas and perspectives. This open process ensures that decisions are made collectively and that all users have a say in how the space is run. The assembly operates on a simple majority vote for most decisions, but for more significant strategic decisions, broader consultation and consensus are sought.

Special sessions of the assembly are convened for strategic decisions that require more in-depth discussion and broader participation. These sessions are planned in advance, ensuring that all interested users have the opportunity to participate. This approach to decision-making not only ensures that important decisions are well-considered and supported by the community but also reinforces the democratic and participatory nature of Magacin's governance.

Funding



Magacin's funding model is based largely on donations and community support. The financial resources necessary for the maintenance and development of the space are not derived from traditional institutional funding but are instead supported by contributions from users, friends of Magacin, and the wider public. This model emphasises financial transparency, with reports on collected and spent funds being made publicly available. Importantly, the amount of financial contribution from users does not grant any additional privileges or influence over the management or use of the space, ensuring that the Commons-based nature of Magacin is preserved.

Sweat equity, where volunteers contribute labour and skills as a form of investment in the space, also plays a significant role in Magacin's funding model. This non-monetary form of contribution is crucial for the upkeep and improvement of the facilities, with users regularly participating in work drives and other collective efforts to maintain and enhance the space.

Volunteers

Volunteers are a fundamental part of Magacin's operations. The centre heavily relies on the voluntary contributions of its community members, who take on various roles and responsibilities to keep the space functioning. The volunteer workforce is essential for the daily management, technical maintenance, and the organisation of events and activities within Magacin.

Volunteers at Magacin are not just seen as auxiliary support but are integral to its self-organised structure. Many of the leadership roles, such as the Coordinator and members of the technical maintenance, PR, and documentation teams, are filled by volunteers. These roles are rotated among regular users, ensuring that the burden of responsibility is shared and that many people have the opportunity to contribute to the leadership and operational tasks of the centre. This approach to volunteer management emphasises the importance of participation, shared responsibility, and community engagement.

Magacin: Key Features

Magacin is a pioneering example of a cultural Commons, where ownership, management, governance, leadership, and decision-making are all rooted in principles of collective responsibility, democratic participation, and shared stewardship. Unlike traditional cultural institutions, Magacin operates as a shared resource, managed and sustained by the very community that uses it. This model challenges conventional notions of ownership and



governance, offering an alternative framework that emphasises inclusivity, openness, and the public good.

A significant aspect of Magacin’s success lies in its innovative approach to funding and volunteer engagement. Magacin’s financial model is largely based on donations and community support, emphasising transparency and ensuring that financial contributions do not translate into disproportionate influence or control over the space. Moreover, the concept of sweat equity plays a crucial role, where volunteers contribute their labour and skills as a form of investment, reinforcing the centre’s communal and self-sustaining nature.

Volunteers are the backbone of Magacin, fulfilling essential roles in management, technical maintenance, event organisation, and leadership. The reliance on a volunteer workforce, with roles rotating among community members, ensures that responsibility is shared and that the space remains truly democratic and community-driven. This collective effort not only keeps the space operational but also strengthens the sense of ownership and commitment among users.

Through its decentralised management structure, horizontal governance model, distributed leadership roles, and strong reliance on volunteer contributions, Magacin embodies the principles of the cultural Commons. It provides a space where creativity, community engagement, and cultural innovation can thrive, sustained by the collective efforts and contributions of its users.

As a living experiment in self-organised cultural production, Magacin offers valuable insights into how cultural spaces can be organised to meet the needs of their communities while challenging traditional institutional frameworks. It serves as a model for how cultural Commons can function in practice, providing a blueprint for other cultural spaces seeking to operate in a more democratic, inclusive, and community-driven manner.

Table 4: Magacin: Key Features



Case Study 3: The New Patrons, Europe

The **New Patrons** (or Nouveaux Commanditaires) initiative is a European program that enables citizens to commission contemporary artworks that address social, political, or cultural issues relevant to their communities. Created in the early 1990s by French artist François Hers and supported by institutions like the Fondation de France, the initiative bridges the gap between art and society, making contemporary art more accessible and meaningful. It allows individuals and groups within civil society to take on the role of patrons and commission works from artists, empowering communities to shape the cultural landscape.

The initiative operates under a **Protocol**, which defines the roles and responsibilities of all participants. This Protocol allows anyone, without exception and regardless of their background, to become a patron and commission an artwork. As patrons, individuals or groups must articulate their vision and the reasons behind the project, taking responsibility for engaging with the artist and involving the broader community. They also define the technical and administrative constraints, such as the financial framework within which the artist will work.

The Protocol emphasises that artists are responsible for creating forms that respond to the patrons' goals and societal demands. Artists are chosen based on the nature of the commission, the context, and their availability. Mediators play a central role in connecting the artist and the patron, ensuring that both artistic and community objectives are met. Additionally, mediators handle public and private funding requests and guide the collaboration between all parties.

The **artist** is called upon to take an active role early in the process, engaging in a dialogue about the patrons' objectives. Artists contribute their expertise to guide patrons who may not have artistic knowledge, and they have the freedom to accept or decline a project. Once an artist is selected and a draft proposal is submitted, it is debated with the patrons. If both parties agree, the artwork enters the production phase, and a budget is established.

The **mediators** are independent experts in contemporary art. They ensure the artistic requirements of a project are respected and serve as facilitators between the patrons and the artists. Mediators must have a track record of working with artists and possess the technical knowledge necessary to bring the project to life. They also manage the necessary public and private funding for the project. Their role is to keep the process connected to the diversity of contemporary creation and to ensure that all parties remain engaged throughout



the project. Mediators are chosen by their peers for their experience and expertise and are part of the International Society of Nouveaux Commanditaires.

The **patrons** are individuals or groups who initiate the process by identifying a social or cultural issue they want to address through art. They do not need prior artistic knowledge to commission an artwork, as mediators and artists provide guidance. Patrons are responsible for expressing their goals, ensuring the artwork is integrated into the community, and managing the financial investment required. They must also approve the mediator's selection of an artist and have the right to question that choice. However, corporations cannot act as patrons, as the initiative focuses on fostering dialogue and responsibility among individuals. If patrons come from within an organisation, they need the approval of those legally responsible, who can also participate in the mediation process.

The artworks produced under the New Patrons initiative are created in various fields, including visual arts, architecture, design, music, theatre, literature, and dance. While the patrons initially express the reasons behind the project, the form of the artwork is ultimately the responsibility of the artist. The artist's proposal is developed through a collaborative dialogue with the patrons and mediators. Artist fees are distinct from production costs, and regardless of their reputation, artists must work within the financial constraints set by the patrons. This approach ensures that the artwork is valued not as a commodity but as a contribution to the community's cultural and social fabric.

Once the artwork is completed, it becomes the property of the community, and its value is measured by its use and symbolic importance rather than its market value. Public and private funding, along with community involvement, ensures that the artwork reflects collective concerns and is integrated into the local context.

Collaboration in the New Patrons Initiative

Collaboration is at the heart of the New Patrons model. It functions through a structured process that involves patrons, mediators, and artists working together:

Patrons initiate the process by identifying an issue or goal they wish to address through art. They collaborate with the mediator to articulate their vision and objectives.

Mediators serve as facilitators, connecting patrons with suitable artists and guiding the overall process. They provide technical expertise, secure funding, and ensure that the artwork aligns with the community's needs and the artist's creative vision.



Artists are selected by the mediator in consultation with the patrons. They engage in a deep dialogue with the patrons to understand the project's purpose and respond to it creatively. The collaboration between the artist and patrons continues throughout the development and production of the artwork.

The New Patrons initiative is structured around a clearly defined governance model that ensures effective management of the commissioning process, involving patrons, mediators, and artists in a collaborative framework. The roles and responsibilities of each participant are outlined in the *Protocol*, which governs how projects are initiated, developed, and brought to completion. This governance structure is critical to maintaining transparency, accountability, and the alignment of artistic and community objectives.

Governance and Management Framework:

Patrons' Role in Governance: Patrons are at the heart of the New Patrons initiative, initiating projects by identifying social, cultural, or political issues they wish to address through art. They are responsible for expressing the project's purpose and for integrating the final artwork within their community. Patrons hold the responsibility for defining technical and financial constraints, working closely with the mediator and managing local financial contributions. Governance is designed to ensure that patrons have a central role in decision-making, especially in selecting the artist, though their decision is guided by the mediator. Patrons are accountable for ensuring that the project meets community needs and aligns with the broader social objectives set out in the Protocol. Importantly, corporations cannot serve as patrons, reinforcing the initiative's focus on personal responsibility and community engagement.

The Mediator's Role in Governance and Project Management: Mediators serve as key facilitators and managers within the New Patrons model. They are independent experts in contemporary art who ensure the artistic and logistical requirements of the project are met. Their governance role includes the selection of the artist, the coordination between patrons, artists, and other stakeholders, and the oversight of public and private funding. Mediators are responsible for ensuring that the project stays true to both artistic integrity and the patrons' goals. Their autonomy in decision-making allows them to arbitrate disputes, guide the artistic process, and manage collaboration between all parties.

Mediators play a crucial management role by overseeing the project from conception to completion. This includes advising on artist selection, managing communication between the artist and patrons, and navigating technical and administrative hurdles. Mediators are also responsible for pooling together the necessary funding from public and private sources,



making sure that financial planning and project timelines align. Their role is crucial in balancing the creative freedom of the artist with the collective expectations of the patrons and the community.

Mediators are selected based on peer recognition of their experience and expertise in contemporary art. They are members of the International Society of Nouveaux Commanditaires, a collective that ensures that the governance structure is consistent across projects and that the initiative maintains high standards of artistic and social impact. This peer-based governance helps sustain the integrity and quality of projects across different contexts.

Artists' Role within the Governance Framework: While the patrons set the initial objectives, the artist is responsible for determining the form and execution of the artwork. Governance around the artist's role ensures that their creative process aligns with the broader social objectives set by the patrons, while still allowing artistic freedom. Artists are chosen by mediators, based on their relevance to the project and availability, with the final decision endorsed by the patrons. This balance between the mediator's expertise and the patrons' input ensures that the project is feasible both artistically and contextually. Artists participate in the governance process through early involvement in the project's conceptualization. This dialogue between the artist, mediator, and patrons ensures that the artist's vision is shaped by and responds to the community's needs. The artist's independence is protected, but they must work within the financial constraints agreed upon by the patrons. Their fees are distinct from the project's production costs, allowing for clear management of resources.

Funding and Financial Management:

Financial governance is a critical component of the New Patrons initiative. Mediators are responsible for securing both public and private funding necessary for the project. This includes managing financial resources efficiently to ensure the completion of the artwork. Patrons are accountable for local financial contributions, and together with mediators, they define the budget within which the artist will operate. The clear separation between the artist's fees and production costs ensures transparency in financial management. The initiative emphasises that the value of the artwork is not determined by the market but by its use and significance to the community. This financial governance model ensures that public funds are used to support meaningful and socially engaged artistic endeavours, rather than speculative art investments. The governance structure thus aligns financial



management with the initiative's broader social goals, making the artwork a public good rather than a commodity.

Collaboration and Decision-Making:

The **New Patrons** initiative operates through a collaborative governance framework that emphasises shared responsibility and collective decision-making:

Patrons, with the guidance of the mediator, set the objectives for the project and participate actively in key decisions, such as the choice of the artist and the financial planning.

Mediators manage the process, ensuring alignment between the artist's work and the patrons' goals, while also handling logistical, technical, and financial matters. Their independence allows them to mediate between different stakeholders and maintain the integrity of the artistic process.

Artists contribute their expertise and vision, shaping the form of the artwork in dialogue with the patrons and the community.

This collaborative approach ensures that all parties have a voice in the governance and management of the project, fostering transparency and accountability. Each player has distinct yet interconnected responsibilities, contributing to the overall success of the project while ensuring that contemporary art serves the public and responds to societal needs. The shared governance model ensures that decision-making is democratic, with all participants negotiating tensions and conflicts to achieve a common goal.

The New Patrons: Key Features

The New Patrons initiative is a European program that empowers citizens to commission contemporary artworks addressing relevant social, political, or cultural issues. Its governance structure emphasises shared responsibility among patrons, mediators, and artists, ensuring a collaborative and transparent process. Patrons, who can be individuals or groups, initiate the project by identifying an issue and working with mediators to articulate their goals. They are also responsible for ensuring the artwork integrates with the community and for managing local financial contributions. Importantly, corporations cannot serve as patrons to maintain a focus on personal responsibility and community engagement.



Mediators play a pivotal role in managing the project from start to finish. They select artists based on the nature of the project, coordinate between all stakeholders, and secure the necessary funding. As independent experts in contemporary art, they ensure that the artist's creative vision aligns with the patrons' objectives while maintaining artistic integrity. Mediators are part of the International Society of Nouveaux Commanditaires, which helps standardise governance across projects.

Artists contribute their expertise and take responsibility for the form of the artwork, which is developed through dialogue with the patrons and mediators. Their fees are separate from production costs, ensuring clear financial management. Financial governance focuses on public and private funding, with a commitment to creating works valued for their societal impact rather than market value.

This collaborative governance model ensures that all participants—patrons, mediators, and artists—are involved in decision-making, creating a process where contemporary art serves as a public good that responds to community needs.

Table 5: The New Patrons: Key Features

Preliminary Findings from the Case Studies

Based on the common characteristics found in the three cases of the Schwules Museum, Magacin, and the New Patrons initiative, the following structured summary highlights the role of *space*, *conflict* and *volunteers*:

The physical **spaces** within these institutions facilitate new relationships and interactions among participants. The Schwules Museum, with its focus on LGBTQ+ history and culture, provides a space where marginalised voices are amplified, allowing for connections across different generations, identities, and experiences. Magacin, located in a former warehouse, operates as an open, flexible environment that encourages spontaneous collaborations, fostering a sense of belonging and shared purpose among artists, activists, and community members. The New Patrons initiative extends this concept of space beyond a physical location by creating a framework where patrons, mediators, and artists interact, transforming public spaces through art that reflects community values and concerns. In all three cases, space is reimagined as a platform for generating new relationships, facilitating dialogue, and building community engagement.

Conflict emerges as a driving force across all three cases, serving not merely as a source of disruption but as a catalyst for growth, dialogue, and innovation. At the Schwules Museum,



conflict is often linked to the diversity of voices and perspectives within the LGBTQ+ community, fostering debates and critical engagement that challenge traditional narratives. Similarly, at Magacin, conflict plays a role in shaping democratic and horizontal decision-making processes, as users negotiate how to best utilize shared resources in a space without a fixed ownership structure. The New Patrons initiative, on the other hand, illustrates how conflicts between patrons, mediators, and artists can lead to creative solutions and artworks that reflect diverse social and cultural concerns. In each case, conflict is not something to be avoided but is seen as an integral part of the collaborative process, driving collective creativity and ensuring that these institutions remain dynamic and responsive to their communities.

Volunteers are essential to the operation and sustainability of all three projects, providing not only labour but also a critical funding source through their "in-kind" contributions. At the Schwules Museum, approximately 60 volunteers play an active role in day-to-day tasks, contributing to exhibitions, research, and educational programs. Their unpaid work represents a significant cost saving and embodies the spirit of community-driven cultural work, making it one of the museum's main sources of support. Magacin's model is even more reliant on volunteers, who not only maintain the space but also participate in its governance and decision-making, embodying the principles of collective responsibility and shared stewardship. This reliance on volunteer labour is a primary form of funding for Magacin, ensuring its continued operation without traditional financial resources. The New Patrons initiative involves volunteers in different capacities, with patrons taking on roles that involve articulating their vision, managing local finances, and ensuring the successful integration of commissioned artworks into their communities. In each case, the "in-kind" contributions of volunteers are not just supplementary but central to the institutions' functioning, demonstrating that cultural Commons rely heavily on volunteer engagement, commitment, and sweat equity as a core source of funding.

These three aspects—space, conflict and volunteers—reveal how these Commons-oriented institutions transcend traditional governance models, emphasising the importance of shared responsibility, inclusive participation, and collaborative creation in fostering vibrant, community-driven cultural spaces.



Part 3: Expanding the Conceptual Framework

Building upon the insights gained from the case studies of the Schwules Museum in Berlin, Magacin in Belgrad and the New Patrons, this section aims to develop a robust theoretical framework that addresses the specific challenges identified in the governance of GLAMmons. The previous section highlighted the inadequacies of traditional management and governance theories in accounting for the roles of conflict, volunteer engagement, and sweat equity within these institutions. To bridge these gaps, this section will explore relevant theories and concepts that can better inform the management practices of Commons-based GLAMs:

The Relational Constitution of the Commons: In Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums), the community that sustains the common resource functions quite differently from stakeholders in other organisations. Here, the Commons and the community around it are deeply interdependent, blurring the line between the resource itself and those who engage with it.

When the Commons is a physical resource—such as a building, site, or collection—the community of commoners is often constituted around this tangible asset. The physical presence of the resource serves as a focal point, drawing individuals together and giving rise to a sense of shared ownership and responsibility. In this scenario, the resource exists independently, and the community forms around it to protect, manage, or interact with it.

However, when the Commons is based on an interpersonal resource—like memory, collective history, cultural belonging, or shared identity—the relationship between the commoners and the resource is more intricate. Here, the Commons are constituted by and with the commoners. The community itself generates and defines the resource through shared practices of remembering, storytelling, and cultural engagement. In this case, the Commons do not pre-exist the community; rather, they emerge out of the interactions, relationships, and shared experiences of the commoners.

This dynamic interplay means that the common resource is continuously constituted by the commoners, and in turn, this evolving resource redefines the relationships within the community. The commoners are not merely managers or stewards of an independent asset; they are co-creators, and their collective actions and interactions shape both the resource and their sense of community. In Commons-oriented GLAMs, this interdependence requires governance models that accommodate the fluid, evolving nature of the resource and the



community, recognizing that the identity and practices of the commoners are inseparable from the Commons they sustain.

Conflict and Agonism in Commons-Based Organisations: The case of the Schwules Museum demonstrated that conflict is not merely a disruption to be managed but can be a central, productive force within an institution. Traditional management theories often seek to minimise or resolve conflict, viewing it as a threat to organisational harmony and efficiency. However, in the context of GLAMmons, conflict can serve as a catalyst for critical dialogue, innovation, and community engagement.

To conceptualise this productive potential of conflict, this section will draw on the concept of “Agonism”, as developed by political theorist Chantal Mouffe. Agonism posits that conflict and disagreement are inherent and necessary elements of democratic societies, and rather than seeking to eliminate these tensions, institutions should create spaces where they can be openly expressed and constructively engaged. This section will explore how agonistic principles can be applied to the governance of GLAMmons, framing conflict not as a problem to be solved but as a dynamic process that can enhance participation, inclusivity, and innovation within these institutions.

Sweat Equity as a Resource in GLAMmons: Another key challenge identified in the case studies is the reliance on sweat equity—where volunteers contribute their labour and skills as a form of investment in the institution. Traditional management theories, which typically emphasise financial capital and formal funding mechanisms, often overlook the value of sweat equity as a critical resource.

This section will develop a concept of sweat equity tailored to the context of GLAMmons, recognizing it as a form of non-monetary capital that plays a crucial role in sustaining these institutions. By framing sweat equity as a legitimate and valuable resource, this section will propose new ways to account for and leverage volunteer contributions in the management and governance of GLAMmons. This conceptualization will also address how institutions can create systems of recognition and reciprocity that honor and sustain the contributions of volunteers.

Managing an Organisation of Volunteers: Finally, the case studies highlighted the importance of volunteers as a distinct type of workforce within GLAMmons. Unlike paid employees, volunteers are often motivated by personal commitment to the institution’s mission and values, which requires a different approach to management. Traditional



management theories, with their focus on hierarchical control and financial incentives, offer limited guidance on how to effectively engage and manage volunteer labour.

This section will explore theories and best practices for managing organisations that rely heavily on volunteers, focusing on strategies that foster motivation, commitment, and a sense of ownership among volunteer contributors. By developing a nuanced understanding of volunteer management, this section will provide practical insights into how GLAMmons can better support and sustain their volunteer workforce, ensuring that these institutions remain vibrant and responsive to the communities they serve.

Through the exploration of agonistic conflict, sweat equity, and volunteer management, this section aims to construct a theoretical framework that is better suited to the unique dynamics of GLAMmons. By addressing the specific challenges identified in the case studies, this framework will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how Commons-based cultural institutions can be effectively governed and managed. This theoretical foundation will not only enhance the conceptualization of GLAMmons but also offer practical tools for their continued development and sustainability.

The following paragraphs expand the theoretical framework and enhance the understanding of cooperative management and co-leadership in Commons-oriented GLAMs.

1. The Relational Constitution of the Commons

In Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums), the community that sustains the Commons is fundamentally different from the stakeholders found in other types of organisations. Here, the relationship between the Commons and the community is deeply interdependent, which makes it difficult to separate the resource from the commoners themselves.

When the Commons is a physical resource—such as a building, a site, or a collection—the community of commoners tends to form around this tangible asset. The existence of the physical space serves as a focal point, drawing individuals together and giving rise to a sense of shared ownership, stewardship, and responsibility. For instance, a museum or library does not merely house cultural artefacts; it also becomes a site where individuals and groups engage, contribute, and shape the ongoing identity of the institution.

However, in cases where the Commons is an interpersonal resource—based on shared memory, collective history, cultural belonging, or a sense of identity—the nature of the relationship between the Commons and the community is even more intricate. In these



instances, the Commons are not just utilised by the commoners; they are actively constituted by and with them. The shared practices of remembering, storytelling, and cultural engagement give rise to the Commons, making it a living, evolving entity that cannot exist independently of the community around it. The Commons and the community are in a constant state of co-creation, with the interactions, relationships, and experiences of the commoners shaping the very essence of the resource.

This dynamic interplay means that in Commons-oriented GLAMs, the resource is constituted by the commoners, and in turn, the evolving resource redefines the relationships within the community. The commoners are not merely passive managers or stewards of an independent asset; they are co-creators, contributing to the ongoing formation and transformation of the Commons. This interdependence demands governance models that are flexible and responsive to the fluid nature of both the resource and the community.

For example, in some GLAMs, the physical space itself may serve as a Commons, providing a venue where the community gathers and interacts. In other cases, the interpersonal relationships and shared cultural practices within the community may define the Commons. Either way, the resource and the commoners are mutually constitutive, challenging traditional governance structures that tend to view resources as static entities and stakeholders as separate actors. To better understand this complex relationship, we can turn to the theoretical frameworks of relational space and generative space developed by human geographers.

Relational and Generative Space as a Theoretical Framework

The interdependence between the Commons and commoners in GLAMs can be better understood through the concepts of *relational space* and *generative space*, primarily discussed by geographers like Doreen Massey, Edward Soja, and David Harvey (Massey, 2005; Soja, 1989; Harvey, 2006). These concepts emphasise that space is not a mere physical backdrop but is actively shaped and continuously redefined through human interactions, social relations, and power dynamics.

Relational Space

Relational space argues that space is constituted through social interactions and the relationships between various actors (Massey, 1994; Soja, 1989). Rather than being a fixed, physical entity, space is an ongoing process, produced and reproduced through connections and activities. This view aligns with how Commons-oriented GLAMs function: they are not



just physical locations but are defined and constantly reshaped by the community's engagement, participation, and shared practices.

Massey (1994) and Soja (1989) suggest that space is the result of social, economic, and political interactions. Similarly, Commons-oriented GLAMs are shaped by the actions and relationships of the commoners. A gallery or museum, for example, is not merely a collection of artefacts but a space where cultural practices, knowledge exchanges, and community building take place, continuously redefining the institution's role and identity.

Massey (2005) emphasises that space is characterised by the coexistence of diverse trajectories and relations. In the context of GLAMs, this means that the institution is a site of multiple interactions—cultural, educational, social—each contributing to the evolving nature of the Commons. The museum or archive thus becomes a multifaceted space where different meanings, identities, and purposes intersect.

Harvey (2006) explores how power dynamics and capital influence the production of space. In Commons-oriented GLAMs, the control and use of space can be a site of negotiation and contestation, reflecting the power dynamics within the community of commoners. The ways in which access to resources, decision-making processes, and governance structures are negotiated in these spaces are crucial to understanding their relational constitution.

Generative Space

Massey (2005) extends the idea of relational space to generative space, suggesting that space not only arises from social relations but also has the capacity to shape those relations in return. This concept highlights the reciprocal nature of Commons-oriented GLAMs, where the resource and the community are mutually constitutive.

In generative space, social relations constitute the space, and once established, the space itself influences the nature and dynamics of those relations (Massey, 2005). This resonates with how GLAMs function: the Commons, whether physical or interpersonal, forms through the collective activities of the community. However, once the Commons exists, it shapes future interactions, enabling new forms of community engagement, cultural production, and governance.

In generative space, there is a continual interplay between the commoners and the Commons. The physical layout of a gallery or the cultural practices within an archive does not merely provide a setting; it actively transforms the community, creating new possibilities for action, interaction, and belonging (Massey, 2005). This dynamic relationship means that



GLAMs must adopt flexible governance models to accommodate the evolving needs and identities of their communities.

Generative space is fluid and ever-changing, much like the Commons-oriented GLAMs that are reconstituted through ongoing community interactions. The significance of these institutions is continually recreated through their use, reflecting Massey's (2005) view of space as an "event" rather than a "thing." This fluidity underscores the necessity of governance structures that can adapt to the changing dynamics of the Commons and its community.

Implications for Commons-oriented GLAMs

The theories of relational and generative space offer a critical framework for understanding the interdependence between Commons-oriented GLAMs and their communities. These institutions are not simply defined by the physical or interpersonal resources they manage; they are constituted through the dynamic social relations that take place within them. Space plays a central role in this process: it is both the product of communal interactions and an active agent that shapes and transforms those relations.

In Commons-oriented GLAMs, space is not a static backdrop; it is a living, generative force that enables the formation of new social connections, cultural practices, and governance structures. This generative nature of space means that the Commons and the community continuously recreate each other, demanding governance models that are flexible and responsive to these ongoing changes. Recognizing the significance of space in this context is crucial for understanding how these institutions operate and for fostering environments where the Commons and the community can mutually thrive. The emphasis on space shifts the focus from simple management of fixed resources to the central role of space in the evolving relationships that define and sustain the Commons.

2. Conflict and Agonism in Commons-Oriented GLAMs

Conflict is an inherent aspect of organisational life, particularly within non-profit and Commons-oriented institutions where diverse stakeholders, varying interests, and complex social dynamics converge. Traditional management theories often focus on strategies to manage and resolve conflicts, viewing them as obstacles to organisational harmony and efficiency. However, in the unique context of Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums), conflict can play a more nuanced and even constructive role.



These institutions, which are deeply embedded in the communities they serve, often face the challenge of balancing diverse perspectives and interests. Management theories such as Stakeholder Theory, Social Exchange Theory, Collaborative Management, and Participatory Management offer valuable frameworks for navigating these challenges by emphasizing the importance of engagement, cooperation, and equitable decision-making. These theories typically aim to align conflicting interests to support the organisation's goals and sustainability.

However, in certain Commons-oriented GLAMs, such as the Schwules Museum, conflict has been recognized not just as a challenge to be overcome, but as a source of dynamism and growth. In these cases, conflict can drive institutional change, fostering a closer alignment between the institution and its community of commoners.

In the following paragraphs we review the position of conflict within several key management theories, examining how these theories traditionally address conflict and exploring the potential for conflict to act as a catalyst for positive change in Commons-oriented organisations.

Stakeholder Theory offers a robust framework for understanding and managing conflicts within non-profit organisations by emphasizing the importance of balancing diverse stakeholder interests. According to Freeman (1984), this theory involves identifying and engaging various stakeholders in the organisation's operations, inherently requiring the negotiation and alignment of conflicting interests with the organisation's goals. Freeman highlights that effectively managing these relationships is essential for the sustainability and success of non-profits.

Similarly, *Social Exchange Theory*, as proposed by Blau (1964), can be applied to understand conflicts within non-profits. This theory posits that social interactions are based on the exchange of resources, with each party expecting something in return. Conflicts in non-profits often arise when these expectations are not met or when there is an imbalance in the perceived value of the exchange. Managing these expectations and ensuring equitable exchanges can help mitigate conflicts.

Collaborative Management and Participatory Management approaches also address conflict, albeit indirectly, by focusing on cooperation and collective decision-making. Gray (1989) discusses how collaborative management involves strategies to build consensus and engage multiple stakeholders in decision-making processes. This approach can reduce



conflict by ensuring that various perspectives are considered and valued in shaping the organisation's strategic direction.

Participatory Management, particularly as discussed by Cornwall and Jewkes (1995), emphasises the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process. By ensuring that all voices are heard and considered, this approach can preemptively address potential conflicts, aligning interests and reducing grievances within the organisation.

While these management theories generally view conflict as something that needs to be resolved for the organisation to function smoothly, some cases in Commons-oriented GLAMs (such as the Schwules Museum) demonstrate that conflict can bring dynamism and drive institutional growth and change. In these contexts, conflict does not merely need to be managed or resolved; it can be a catalyst for the institution to evolve and grow alongside the community it serves. This dynamic interplay between conflict and collaboration can help the institution and its community of commoners adapt to new challenges and opportunities, ultimately strengthening the organisation's resilience and relevance.

However, because traditional management theories often fall short in recognizing the constructive potential of conflict, we will explore a theory that places a certain type of conflict, *Agonism*, at the centre of the Commons. By doing so, we aim to better understand how conflict can be harnessed to foster engagement, innovation, and growth within Commons-oriented organisations.

Chantal Mouffe's Concept of Agonism and Its Application to Commons-Oriented GLAMs

Chantal Mouffe's concept of agonism provides a significant theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of democracy and is highly applicable within the context of Commons-oriented GLAMs (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums). Mouffe critiques traditional models of consensus in democratic practice, advocating instead for a model where conflict and dissent are not just inevitable but essential to democratic engagement. This perspective is particularly relevant for managing Commons-oriented cultural institutions, as it offers a robust framework for enduring and managing conflicts without descending into antagonism. This chapter begins by presenting Mouffe's foundational ideas and then explores how they can be applied to the governance of GLAMs.

Following the theoretical overview, the chapter systematically applies Mouffe's ideas to the specific context of GLAMs. It discusses how these institutions can embody agonistic principles by transforming cultural spaces into arenas where community members actively engage with and contest cultural and historical narratives. The section suggests practical



strategies for GLAMs to facilitate agonistic interactions, such as through participatory art projects and community-driven curatorial practices, aligning with Mouffe's advocacy for a vibrant clash of democratic positions within public spaces.

The chapter uses Mouffe's theory of agonism as a lens to explore the potential of GLAMs in fostering a dynamic and inclusive cultural environment that reflects the contested nature of collective memory and identity formation. This approach not only enriches the role of GLAMs in their communities but also aligns them with broader objectives of democratic renewal and social justice.

Theoretical Overview

Chantal Mouffe's theory of agonism is a substantial contribution to political theory, particularly within the realm of democratic discourse. Mouffe critiques conventional political models that prioritise consensus and harmony among stakeholders, introducing agonism as a paradigm that recognises the inevitability and legitimacy of conflict within democratic societies. This framework is equally applicable to the governance of Commons-oriented organisations, including GLAMs.

Mouffe argues that conflict and disagreement are not only inevitable in a pluralistic society but are also necessary and beneficial for democracy. She differentiates between "enemies," whose ideas we seek to destroy, and "adversaries," whose ideas we oppose but still respect as legitimate participants in democratic discourse. Agonism is about transforming enemies into adversaries.

Mouffe posits that democratic institutions should not aim to eliminate political conflict but rather provide arenas where different groups can constructively contest their ideas. This conflict is expressed through a confrontation among adversaries, not enemies. She also emphasises the role of passion and emotions in mobilising political identities and collective movements, criticising the rationalist approach in traditional liberal democracy that downplays the role of passion in the public sphere.

Mouffe advocates for a "radical democracy" that embraces diversity and the dynamic nature of political identities. This approach seeks to widen the field of democratic participation and continually challenge the existing order to make democracy more inclusive and responsive to changing conditions.

Her concept of agonism responds to the dissatisfaction with traditional democratic politics, which often seeks to suppress difference and dissent in the pursuit of consensus or majority



rule. Agonism offers a framework for understanding political phenomena such as populism and public protests, suggesting that these can be expressions of democratic engagement rather than threats to democracy.

Agonism, Art and Culture

In her essay *Art and Democracy: Art as an Agonistic Intervention in Public Space* (2008), Mouffe explores the role of art in democratic politics through the lens of agonism. She argues that public space is a battleground where various hegemonic projects vie for dominance. This ongoing conflict, she contends, cannot be ultimately reconciled, which forms the core of her theory on the nature of democratic politics.

Mouffe critiques the post-political climate, dominated by neoliberal ideology, that seeks to depoliticise public issues by reducing them to mere technicalities managed by experts. She stresses that political actions inherently involve making decisive choices among conflicting alternatives, often without the possibility of achieving a rational consensus due to the antagonistic nature of social relations.

Art plays a crucial role in challenging the consensus-driven, post-political order and illuminating the repressive mechanisms that underpin it. According to Mouffe, artistic practices should aim to disrupt the existing hegemony and open up spaces for new forms of expression and identity, thus contributing to democratic discourse.

Mouffe highlights that the critical power of art is now more important than ever, even as it faces challenges from a capitalist system that seeks to co-opt artistic endeavours. The aesthetic strategies of counterculture movements, which once sought authenticity and anti-hierarchical ideals, have been appropriated by capitalism to enhance its own regulatory schemes, transforming artistic critique into a component of capitalist productivity. However, this does not strip art of its critical power but instead necessitates a reevaluation of how artistic practices can be effectively used in the hegemonic struggle.

Relevance for Cooperative Management and Co-Leadership in Commons-Oriented GLAMs

Mouffe concludes that while the modernist idea of the avant-garde is no longer tenable, this does not imply that art cannot play a critical role in democratic politics. Instead, she proposes a new role for art in the agonistic struggle, where artistic practices not only challenge the existing order but also help imagine new forms of social organisation and identity. This redefines the relationship between art and politics, emphasising an intrinsic link where each continuously informs and reshapes the other within the social framework.



Mouffe's concept of agonism, as articulated in her exploration of the role of art in democratic politics, can be fruitfully applied to the management of Commons-oriented cultural institutions such as GLAMs. In such settings, art is not just a medium of expression but also a strategic tool in managing and negotiating communal resources. Mouffe's theory suggests that art in public spaces serves as a means of contestation and negotiation, vital for challenging dominant hegemonies and fostering democratic engagement.

Just as Mouffe argues that art challenges the consensus-driven neoliberal order by illuminating and disrupting repressive mechanisms, management practices in Commons-oriented organisations can similarly challenge entrenched systems of power. By adopting agonistic principles, these institutions can use their cultural resources—artistic and otherwise—to question and redefine the norms and practices that govern communal resource sharing.

Mouffe emphasises the role of art in activating public spaces as arenas of democratic contestation. Similarly, in managing Commons-oriented organisations, democratic engagement can be enhanced by encouraging stakeholders to actively participate in decision-making processes. This can be facilitated through forums, workshops, and interactive exhibitions that engage the community, mirroring the interactive role of art in public spaces.

Artistic interventions in Commons management can serve as a medium to navigate and mediate conflict. By fostering a culture that views conflicts as opportunities for dialogue and innovation rather than threats, these institutions can harness creative expressions to explore and address communal tensions.

Mouffe points out that artistic practices expose the contingent nature of what is often perceived as natural or given. In Commons-oriented organisations, management can adopt similar strategies to reveal the constructed nature of cultural norms and practices, encouraging a reevaluation of how resources are used, shared, and governed.

In Mouffe's view, art reshapes identities and social relations by engaging directly with diverse social spaces. In managing cultural Commons, art can be strategically employed not just for aesthetic purposes but as a transformative tool that promotes social learning, fosters community identity, and instigates socio-cultural changes.

Integrating Mouffe's agonistic approach into the management of cultural Commons involves seeing these institutions as microcosms of broader societal dynamics, where art and cultural practices play critical roles in shaping democratic practices and community relationships.



This approach not only enhances the resilience and adaptability of cultural institutions but also aligns them with broader democratic objectives, making them active participants in the ongoing struggle for democratic renewal and social justice. In this way, the management of cultural Commons, much like Mouffe's vision for art, becomes a dynamic engagement with the community that continuously evolves and responds to its socio-political context.

3. Sweat Equity in Commons-Oriented GLAMs

Sweat equity refers to the non-monetary investment that individuals contribute to a project or organisation through their labour, time, skills, and expertise (Levinson, 1992). This concept is particularly relevant in Commons-oriented GLAM (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums) projects like the Schwules Museum in Berlin, Magacin in Belgrade, and the New Patrons initiative, where financial resources are often limited, but the contributions of dedicated individuals are crucial to success.

The theoretical foundation of sweat equity lies in recognising that labour can be a form of capital (Graham & Lefebvre, 1998). In the context of these GLAMs, sweat equity enables these organisations to operate and thrive, despite financial constraints. For example, the Schwules Museum is supported by volunteers who manage daily tasks and contribute to exhibitions and research, while Magacin relies on community members to maintain operations and organise events. The New Patrons initiative allows community members to become active patrons, contributing their time and vision to realise artistic projects that address social and cultural issues. In all three cases, sweat equity fosters a sense of ownership and belonging, connecting volunteers more deeply to the organisation's goals.

Valuation and Compensation for Sweat Equity

Valuing sweat equity in these GLAMs can be challenging, as it involves quantifying non-monetary contributions. One method used is the replacement cost, which estimates how much it would cost to pay for the services volunteers provide. For instance, the work done by an archivist at the Schwules Museum or a project coordinator at the New Patrons initiative would be valued based on market rates for those roles. Another approach is the opportunity cost method, which considers the potential earnings that contributors forgo by volunteering. For example, a volunteer dedicating time to Magacin instead of working a paid job represents a tangible, personal financial sacrifice.

Compensation for sweat equity in these settings is often non-monetary but vital for maintaining volunteer engagement. At the Schwules Museum, this might include involving volunteers in decision-making processes, while at Magacin, it could involve leadership roles



and recognition within the community. For the New Patrons initiative, contributors gain a sense of authorship and active participation in creating culturally significant works, which serves as a form of compensation.

Sweat Equity and Social Capital

Sweat equity is closely linked to social capital, which encompasses the networks, relationships, and trust built within an organisation or community (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). In Commons-oriented GLAMs, contributors of sweat equity also invest in building these social networks, enhancing collaboration, trust, and a shared sense of purpose. This phenomenon is evident in all three cases: volunteers at the Schwules Museum form strong connections through their shared work, Magacin fosters collaboration among community members, and the New Patrons create networks between artists, patrons, and mediators, strengthening community bonds.

Legal and Ethical Considerations

Clear agreements around sweat equity are necessary to avoid disputes and ensure fair treatment of contributors. In Commons-oriented GLAMs like the Schwules Museum, Magacin, and the New Patrons, these agreements help define contributors' rights, responsibilities, and terms of compensation, ensuring that their efforts are valued and respected (Levinson, 1992). Organisations must also be vigilant against exploitation, ensuring that volunteers are not overworked or undervalued. Ethically, providing a voice in decision-making processes, recognising contributions, and fostering an inclusive environment are essential for maintaining trust and motivation among volunteers.

Challenges and Risks of Sweat Equity

While sweat equity is a powerful resource, it presents challenges such as burnout and inequity. Volunteers at the Schwules Museum, Magacin, or New Patrons may face exhaustion if demands exceed their capacity. Furthermore, differences in the perceived value of various contributions can lead to feelings of unfairness, especially if certain skills or tasks are valued more than others. To address this, organisations should adopt standardised valuation methods, such as replacement cost, to ensure fairness and transparency.

Sustainability is another challenge, as relying solely on sweat equity may not be viable in the long term. Organisations must consider transitioning towards more sustainable models, such as incorporating paid staff or financial investments, to ensure continued success.

Nevertheless, sweat equity remains a fundamental aspect of these Commons-oriented



GLAMs, providing a core source of funding through "in-kind" contributions that are as crucial as any financial investment.

Lessons Learned 1: Volunteer-Centric Management in Cultural Commons

Given the findings from the three case studies, it becomes clear that volunteer-centred management is a critical strategy for such organisations that rely heavily on volunteer labour, such as cultural Commons, non-profits, and other community-based initiatives. As volunteers form the backbone of these organisations, understanding and effectively managing their contributions is essential for both short-term success and long-term sustainability (Ellis, 2010; Renz, 2016).

a. Motivation and Retention

A foundational aspect of volunteer-centred management is understanding what drives individuals to volunteer and how to keep them engaged over time. Volunteers often contribute for various reasons, including personal growth, social interaction, altruism, and a deep commitment to the organisation's mission (Clary & Snyder, 1999). This is particularly relevant in cultural Commons where volunteers may be motivated by a strong sense of cultural preservation or social justice. For instance, at the Schwules Museum, volunteers are driven by a commitment to LGBTQ+ history and rights, while at Magacin, volunteers are engaged in supporting community-based art and cultural projects. The New Patrons initiative allows community members to act as patrons, directing their energies towards artistic projects that reflect social and cultural concerns in their communities. Addressing these motivations through meaningful engagement and recognition is key to retaining volunteers in all three cases (Rochester et al., 2016).

b. Leadership and Management

Leadership in volunteer-centric organisations must be adaptive and participatory, differing from traditional top-down management styles. Transformational leadership, which encourages volunteers to engage deeply with the organisation's goals, is highly effective (Ellis, 2010). Leaders must inspire volunteers and integrate them into the organisation's core mission. This approach is evident at the Schwules Museum, where leaders skilfully navigate conflicts and foster an inclusive environment. At Magacin, leadership is decentralised, with rotating roles among community members, ensuring flexibility and responsiveness to volunteers' needs (Liao-Troth, 2008). Similarly, in the New Patrons initiative, leadership is distributed among mediators who guide projects, artists who create, and patrons who



commission works, demonstrating a shared leadership model that values all participants' contributions.

c. Communication and Collaboration

Effective communication is vital for successful volunteer management. In organisations with diverse volunteers, maintaining open and respectful communication channels is essential (Allen, 2012). This ensures alignment with the organisation's goals and prevents misunderstandings that could lead to conflict. In the Schwules Museum, effective communication fosters collaboration in a sensitive and emotionally charged environment, while at Magacin, collaboration is enhanced through regular meetings and open dialogue. The New Patrons initiative thrives on a structured communication framework where patrons, artists, and mediators collaborate to realise artworks that respond to community needs, ensuring that every participant's voice is valued and heard.

c. Evaluation and Measurement

To ensure volunteer programmes are effective, organisations must develop evaluation and measurement systems (McCurley & Lynch, 2011). These systems track volunteer satisfaction, retention rates, and contributions to the organisation's success. This approach is critical in volunteer-driven settings like the Schwules Museum, where volunteers are integral to preserving LGBTQ+ history, and at Magacin, where regular evaluations ensure responsiveness to volunteers' needs. The New Patrons initiative relies on feedback mechanisms to assess the impact of commissioned artworks, helping improve collaboration among patrons, artists, and mediators.

d. Governance and Sustainability

Effective governance is crucial for the sustainability of volunteer-driven organisations. Governance structures should support volunteer involvement in decision-making, fostering a sense of ownership and commitment (Cornforth, 2014). At the Schwules Museum, volunteers participate in governance, ensuring that their contributions are recognised. Magacin's governance is built around the Users' Assembly, allowing volunteers to be directly involved in decision-making, which promotes resilience and adaptability (Light, 2004). In the New Patrons initiative, governance is shared among patrons, mediators, and artists, each playing a role in shaping projects, ensuring that the organisation remains flexible and sustainable while reflecting the values of transparency, inclusivity, and shared responsibility.



By integrating these strategies, the Schwules Museum, Magacin, and the New Patrons demonstrate the importance of volunteer-centred management in cultural Commons, showcasing how effective leadership, communication, evaluation, and governance contribute to creating sustainable, community-driven organisations.

Volunteer-Centred Management: Key Aspects

Volunteer-centred management is a multifaceted approach that requires careful attention to motivation, leadership, communication, evaluation, and governance. In organisations like the Schwules Museum, Magacin, and the New Patrons, where volunteers are integral to the mission and operations, implementing these strategies is essential for maintaining a committed and effective volunteer workforce (Rochester et al., 2016; Hager & Brudney, 2004). By understanding what motivates volunteers, providing strong and adaptive leadership, fostering effective communication and collaboration, regularly evaluating volunteer programmes, and building inclusive governance structures, these organisations create environments where volunteers feel valued, engaged, and invested in the long-term success of the organisation (Ellis, 2010; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The experiences of the Schwules Museum, Magacin, and the New Patrons demonstrate that volunteer-centred management is not merely about managing tasks and responsibilities; it's about cultivating a culture that supports and empowers volunteers, transforming their contributions into meaningful and impactful outcomes for the organisation and the communities they serve (Renz, 2016). Through a comprehensive and thoughtful approach to volunteer management, these cultural Commons can continue to thrive, driven by the passion and dedication of their volunteers (Cornforth, 2014).

Table 6: Volunteer-Centred Management: Key Aspects

Lessons Learned 2: Cultural Governance

Given the complexities and nuances discussed above, it becomes clear that there is a need to broaden our understanding of management and leadership within Commons-oriented GLAMs. This expanded perspective should encompass what has been termed "Cultural Governance." As we delve deeper into the concept, it is increasingly recognized in cultural policy debates as a vital approach to understanding and managing cultural phenomena within societies. Cultural governance goes beyond traditional management practices by integrating various disciplinary perspectives and addressing the complex interplay among cultural actors, policies, and institutions (Bennett, 2001; Miller & Yúdice, 2002).



Cultural governance refers to the structures, processes, and mechanisms that influence the creation, dissemination, and preservation of cultural values and practices. It emphasises the roles of both governmental and non-governmental entities in shaping cultural landscapes, acknowledging that culture is not merely a product to be managed, but a dynamic and evolving field influenced by diverse stakeholders (Holden, 2006; Schmitt & Van Eeden, 2014).

In the evolving landscape of cultural policy and management, it is essential to broaden our conceptual framework to include the notion of "cultural governance." This concept is increasingly recognized in cultural policy debates as a vital approach to understanding and managing cultural phenomena within societies. Cultural governance goes beyond traditional management practices by integrating various disciplinary perspectives and addressing the complex interplay among cultural actors, policies, and institutions (Bennett, 2001; Miller & Yúdice, 2002).

Cultural governance focuses on the dynamics of power and control within the cultural sector. It examines how different stakeholders—including artists, cultural organisations, policy-makers, and communities—negotiate and implement cultural initiatives. This approach recognizes the importance of both formal and informal networks in the cultural ecosystem, highlighting the need for a nuanced understanding of how cultural authority is distributed and exercised (Landry & Bianchini, 1995).

To effectively analyse and operationalize cultural governance, various theoretical frameworks and models can be employed. These include network theory, which explores the relationships and interdependencies among cultural actors; systems theory, which examines the interconnectedness of cultural processes; and governance models that address the decentralization of cultural authority. These frameworks help to unpack the complexities of cultural interactions and provide insights into how cultural policies and practices can be more effectively managed and implemented (Sullivan & Keating, 2008).

While the concept of cultural governance offers a comprehensive approach, its implementation is not without challenges. These include managing diverse and sometimes conflicting cultural interests, addressing the limitations of resources, and ensuring equitable access to cultural goods and services. Furthermore, there is the challenge of balancing top-down policy directives with grassroots cultural expressions, ensuring that cultural governance remains inclusive and representative of the community's needs and aspirations (Miller & Yúdice, 2002; Schmitt & Van Eeden, 2014).



The future of cultural governance lies in enhancing participatory governance, where stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making processes. This approach aims to foster a more inclusive, dynamic, and sustainable cultural ecosystem. By encouraging greater collaboration among various cultural actors and embracing the complexity and diversity of cultural expressions, cultural governance can contribute significantly to societal development and cultural enrichment (Holden, 2006).

Cultural Governance: Key Aspects

Cultural governance integrates multidisciplinary perspectives to address the complex interplay among cultural actors, policies, and institutions, going beyond traditional management practices. It focuses on the structures, processes, and mechanisms that shape cultural values, recognising that culture is dynamic and influenced by various participants, including governmental and non-governmental entities.

Central to cultural governance is understanding how power and control are negotiated within the cultural sector. It examines how artists, organisations, policymakers, and communities implement cultural initiatives, highlighting the role of formal and informal networks in distributing cultural authority.

However, implementing cultural governance presents challenges, including managing conflicting interests, addressing resource limitations, and ensuring equitable access to cultural resources.

A key aspect of cultural governance is fostering participatory governance, where participants actively engage in decision-making. This inclusive approach encourages collaboration among cultural actors, enhancing the diversity of cultural expressions and contributing to societal development and enrichment.

Table 7: Cultural Governance: Key Aspects



Part 4. Collaborative Management and Co-leadership in GLAMMons

The insights derived from the examination of existing management theories, the case studies of the Schwules Museum in Berlin, Magacin in Belgrade, the New Patrons, and the subsequent theoretical exploration of space, conflict, sweat equity, and volunteer management reveal a pressing need for a new conceptual framework. These case studies underscore the limitations of traditional management and governance models, which often fail to capture the intricate and dynamic nature of GLAMmons—institutions that operate as cultural Commons, deeply embedded within their communities, and reliant on shared resources, collective decision-making, and active participation from diverse stakeholders.

Collaborative Management and Co-leadership: Working Definitions

Given that the title of this working paper is "Collaborative Management and Co-Leadership of Commons-Oriented GLAMs," it is crucial to establish working definitions for these key terms. The distinctions between management and leadership, as previously discussed, set the stage for understanding how these concepts can be adapted and applied within Commons-oriented organisations. Collaborative Management and Co-leadership are two approaches that integrate elements of both management and leadership, specifically tailored to foster inclusivity, shared responsibility, and collective decision-making. Based on the discussion above, we now provide working definitions for both Collaborative Management and Co-leadership, outlining how these models can be effectively utilised in the context of Commons-oriented GLAMs:

Collaborative Management refers to a governance strategy where decision-making authority and responsibility are shared among multiple participants who have an interest in, or are affected by, a particular resource or project. This approach recognises the centrality of Space as more than just a physical setting; it acts as a generative force that shapes and is shaped by community practices, interactions, and cultural engagements. In this context, Space becomes the foundation for fostering relationships, collective decision-making, and the emergence of new cultural practices, making it an essential element of collaborative management. The role of conflict is viewed through the lens of Agonistic Cultural Governance, where conflict serves as a vital and constructive force, encouraging open dialogue, creativity, and critical engagement, which leads to more inclusive and innovative outcomes. Additionally, collaborative management deeply values sweat equity, seeing volunteer contributions as core capital that sustains the organisation. It integrates



mechanisms for recognising, valuing, and managing these contributions, ensuring that volunteers feel a sense of ownership and long-term commitment. Ultimately, collaborative management creates a structure that is adaptive, inclusive, and aligned with the Commons-based ethos, facilitating the active participation of all involved.

Co-leadership refers to a leadership style in which two or more individuals share the responsibility, authority, and accountability for leading an organisation, team, or project. In Commons-oriented GLAMs, co-leadership acknowledges the transformative nature of Space, understanding it as a dynamic and interactive environment that nurtures shared leadership practices and encourages the emergence of diverse voices. This leadership model embraces conflict as a constructive and necessary element, fostering an environment of Agonistic Cultural Governance, where different perspectives can be openly contested and integrated into the decision-making process. Co-leadership also emphasises the importance of sweat equity, recognising that the contributions of volunteers and community members are fundamental to the institution's success and sustainability. By adopting volunteer-centric management strategies, co-leadership ensures that volunteers are not only valued but also empowered to participate in decision-making and take on leadership roles, reinforcing a culture of inclusivity, shared responsibility, and long-term engagement. This approach results in a more resilient and responsive leadership structure, capable of adapting to the evolving needs and dynamics of cultural commons.

Table 8: Working definitions of collaborative management and co-leadership

GLAMmons function as more than just repositories of cultural heritage; they actively embody the values, struggles, and aspirations of their communities. Unlike conventional organisations, they are characterised by their fluid and evolving structures, where space, conflict, and volunteer contributions are fundamental to their operations and sustainability. Traditional models tend to emphasise hierarchical leadership, financial capital, and structured governance, but such approaches often overlook the more complex, relational, and participatory nature of GLAMmons, where shared ownership and collective agency are paramount.

Recognising this gap, the need for a tailored framework arises—one that integrates the principles of Commons-oriented governance while acknowledging the unique dynamics at play in GLAMmons. This new framework seeks to address the specificities of GLAMmons by integrating key elements that have emerged as central to their functioning, including the role



of space, the constructive potential of conflict, the significance of sweat equity, and the importance of volunteer-centric management.

Key Findings

The Role of Space in GLAMmons: One of the most significant insights from our exploration of Commons-oriented GLAMs is the centrality of space in their constitution and governance. Space in GLAMmons is not merely a physical backdrop; it is a generative force that actively shapes and is shaped by the community's practices, interactions, and cultural engagements. Whether the Commons takes the form of a physical site, such as the Schwules Museum in Berlin or Magacin in Belgrade, or an interpersonal resource like shared memory and history, space serves as the foundation upon which relationships are built and sustained. The interdependence between space and social relations is what sets GLAMmons apart, making it imperative for governance models to consider space as a dynamic entity that influences how the community and the Commons evolve. By acknowledging the fluid and transformative nature of space, GLAMmons can create environments conducive to community participation, shared decision-making, and the emergence of new cultural practices.

Agonistic Cultural Governance: Building on Chantal Mouffe's concept of agonism, Agonistic Cultural Governance reimagines conflict not as a disruption to be minimised, but as a fundamental and constructive element of governance within Commons-oriented GLAMs. This framework merges the principles of cultural governance with agonistic elements, viewing conflict as a vital source of creativity and critical engagement. By embracing conflict as an integral part of the governance process, this approach encourages institutions to create spaces for open dialogue and contestation. In doing so, it fosters greater inclusivity, innovation, and a more dynamic cultural environment where diverse voices and perspectives can actively shape the institution's direction and impact.

Sweat Equity as Core Capital: Recognizing the significant role of sweat equity in sustaining GLAMmons, the new framework will position volunteer labour and contributions as central to the institution's resource base. This perspective shifts the focus from traditional financial metrics to a more holistic understanding of capital, encompassing the non-monetary investments made by community members. The framework will propose mechanisms for valuing, managing, and sustaining sweat equity, ensuring that these contributions are recognized and rewarded within the institution's governance structure.



Volunteer-Centric Management: The proposed framework will also place a strong emphasis on the management of volunteers as a distinct and vital workforce. It will outline strategies for fostering a sense of ownership, motivation, and long-term commitment among volunteers, recognizing their unique motivations and the critical role they play in the success of GLAMmons. This approach will include practical recommendations for building a volunteer-centric culture that aligns with the Commons-based ethos of these institutions.

Table 9: Key Findings

Further Considerations: Towards a Commons-Based Governance Model

By integrating these elements, the new conceptual framework aims to provide a more effective and contextually appropriate model for the governance of GLAMmons. This model will be inherently flexible, capable of adapting to the diverse and evolving needs of different communities, while maintaining a strong commitment to the principles of shared governance, inclusivity, and communal resource management.

In this final section, the proposed framework will be detailed and articulated, offering some food for thought for both theoretical and practical guidelines. The goal is to provide some initial thoughts that equip GLAMmons with the tools they need to navigate the complexities of their unique operational environments, ensuring their sustainability, relevance, and ability to fulfil their cultural missions in a rapidly changing world. Furthermore, this framework will serve as a foundation for formulating policy recommendations (deliverables in the 3rd year of the project) that can guide institutional practices and support the broader adoption of Commons-based governance models within the cultural sector.

Proposal 1: Governing Through Community in Commons-Oriented GLAMs: Transformative Bottom-Up Practices and Playful Experimental Modes of Co-Governance

Community governance in the context of Commons-oriented GLAMs refers to the practices and frameworks that enable community members to actively participate in the decision-making and management processes traditionally handled by institutional leadership. This approach leverages the collective knowledge, cultural insights, and lived experiences of the community to foster more inclusive, democratic, and responsive governance within GLAM institutions. By focusing on a bottom-up methodology, community governance ensures that decisions are made closer to where they impact the community, increasing the relevance and effectiveness of those decisions.



Transformative bottom-up practices within Commons-oriented GLAMs empower community members to take the lead in shaping the institution's direction and activities. This includes community-led curation, collaborative programming, and participatory budgeting where community members have a direct say in how resources are allocated. Playful and experimental modes of co-governance encourage Commons-oriented GLAMs to adopt innovative and flexible approaches to community involvement. These could include gamified participation platforms, artistic interventions that engage the public in planning and decision-making, and pilot projects that allow communities to test and refine new governance models in a supportive environment. Such approaches not only make governance more engaging for the community but also allow GLAMs to explore new ways of co-creating cultural and educational experiences.

The benefits of community-driven governance in GLAMs are extensive. Increased engagement from community members often leads to more relevant and sustainable cultural programming and resource management. Additionally, this approach strengthens the bonds between the institution and its community, building trust and ensuring that the institution remains responsive to the needs and interests of the people it serves. It also fosters transparency in decision-making, with accountability and community oversight becoming integral parts of the governance structure.

Implementing community-driven governance in Commons-oriented GLAMs comes with its own set of challenges. Resistance from traditional leadership structures, difficulties in maintaining consistent community engagement, and the complexity of coordinating large-scale participatory projects can pose significant obstacles. Moreover, there is the risk of 'participation fatigue,' where community members may become less engaged over time. To overcome these challenges, it is important for GLAMs to provide continuous support and education, communicate the tangible benefits of participation clearly, and offer incentives that encourage sustained involvement.

Technology plays a crucial role in facilitating community governance within GLAMs by providing platforms for virtual engagement, data collection, and transparency. Digital tools such as online forums, interactive apps, and virtual exhibition spaces can enhance participation and make the governance process more accessible to a broader audience. For example, blockchain technology could be used to ensure transparency and security in decision-making processes, allowing community members to have a clear and verifiable role in the governance of GLAMs.



For community governance to thrive in GLAMs, supportive policy frameworks are needed to encourage participatory engagement and allocate resources for community-led initiatives. Policymakers should create flexible regulatory environments that allow for experimental governance practices and provide platforms for sharing best practices and lessons learned. Additionally, policies should aim to reduce bureaucratic barriers to participation and enhance transparency and accountability within GLAM institutions.

The future of community governance in Commons-oriented GLAMs will likely involve greater integration of technology, with an increased use of data analytics and artificial intelligence to enhance decision-making and personalise community services. The ability to scale successful community governance models across different GLAMs will be critical, with the potential to influence governance practices on a broader scale. As communities become more interconnected globally, the principles of community governance will play a vital role in addressing global challenges through locally-driven cultural actions.

Proposal 2: From Commoning Practices to Diverse Postcapitalist Cultural Economies

Postcapitalist models, such as degrowth, the solidarity economy, and participatory economics, offer alternatives to traditional capitalist frameworks that are typically characterised by relentless growth and profit maximisation. These theories propose economic structures that prioritise sustainability, community empowerment, and the equitable distribution of resources. For instance, degrowth advocates for reducing consumption and production to achieve environmental sustainability and enhance quality of life. The solidarity economy focuses on cooperative and community-based economic activities that prioritise social well-being over profit. Participatory economics involves all stakeholders in economic decision-making processes, ensuring that the economy serves the collective interests of the community. By exploring these models, both scholars and practitioners aim to create economic systems that are more attuned to human and ecological needs.

While commoning practices present a viable alternative to traditional economic models, scaling them poses significant challenges. One major barrier is the entrenched legal and economic systems that favour private ownership and individual profit over communal resource management. Additionally, commoning requires a high level of community engagement and consensus, which can be difficult to sustain as projects expand. The complexity of resource allocation also increases with scale, making it challenging to ensure fair access and distribution among a growing number of stakeholders. To overcome these challenges, innovative legal frameworks, sustained community commitment, and adaptable



management strategies are necessary to scale commoning practices without compromising their foundational principles.

Technology plays a pivotal role in facilitating commoning by providing tools that enhance communication, coordination, and resource management. Digital platforms allow communities to organise more efficiently, enabling the sharing of resources like tools and spaces, and the distribution of tasks among members. Blockchain technology, for instance, offers a transparent and secure method for managing communal resources and transactions, reducing the need for central authorities. This is especially transformative for communities that lack access to traditional banking systems. Moreover, technology helps document and disseminate knowledge across communities, preserving the collective wisdom that is central to commoning practices.

The future of postcapitalist cultural economies will likely be shaped by a growing recognition of global challenges such as climate change, inequality, and the shortcomings of traditional economic models. As communities seek more sustainable and equitable alternatives, commoning practices are expected to gain momentum. This shift may be accelerated by technological advancements that facilitate decentralised and community-driven economic activities. Additionally, there is an emerging trend towards localisation and the strengthening of regional economies, which could further support the development of commoning practices tailored to local needs and environments.

Integrating commoning practices into postcapitalist economic models has profound theoretical implications for both economics and cultural studies. From an economic perspective, it challenges the core assumptions of neoclassical economics by prioritising social and ecological well-being over profit. Culturally, it prompts a reevaluation of values related to work, ownership, and community, advocating for more cooperative and communal ways of living. This integration also provides a new lens through which to view economic interactions as deeply embedded in social and cultural contexts, potentially leading to richer and more nuanced understandings of economic behaviours and practices.



References

- Allen K. (2012). *The Big Book of Volunteer Management: Solutions for Every Stage of the Volunteer Life Cycle*. McGraw-Hill.
- Anderies J. M., Janssen M. A., & Ostrom E. (2004). A framework to analyze the robustness of social-ecological systems from an institutional perspective. *Ecology and Society*, 9(1).
<https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss1/art18/>
- Anderson A. A. (2005). *The community builder's approach to theory of change: A practical guide to theory development*. The Aspen Institute.
- Ansell C., & Gash A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
- Axelrod N. R. (2005). *Board leadership and development*. Fieldstone Alliance.
- Baggio J. A., Barnett A. J., Perez-Ibarra I., Brady U., Ratajczyk E., Rollins N., Rubiños C., Shin H. C., Yu D. J., Aggarwal R., Anderies J. M., & Janssen M. A. (2016). Explaining success and failures in the Commons: The configural nature of Ostrom's institutional design principles. *International Journal of the Commons*, 10(2), 417–419.
<https://doi:10.18352/ijc.634>
- Bass B. M., & Riggio R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bennett, T. (2001). *Differing Diversities: Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bhargava R. (2014). *Sweat equity: Building value in your company by harnessing the power of human capital*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Binnendijk A. (2000). Results-based management in the development cooperation agencies: A review of experience. *OECD*.



Blackstock K. L., Kelly G. J., & Horsey B. L. (2007). Developing and applying a framework to evaluate participatory research for sustainability. *Ecological Economics*, 60(4), 726-742.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid: The key to leadership excellence*. Gulf Publishing Company.

Blau P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Bollier D. (2007). The growth of the Commons paradigm. In C. Hess & E. Ostrom (Eds.), *Understanding knowledge as a Commons: From theory to practice* (pp. 27-40). MIT Press.

Brown W. A. (2007). Exploring the association between board and organizational performance in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 17(3), 301-317.

Bruce, K., & Nyland, C. (2011). Elton Mayo and the deification of human relations. *Organization Studies*, 32(3), 383-405.

Brudney J. L., & Meijs L. C. P. M. (2009). It ain't natural: Toward a new (natural) resource conceptualization for volunteer management. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(4), 564-581.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Caffentzis G. (2004). A tale of two conferences: Globalization, the crisis of neoliberalism, and the question of the Commons. Retrieved Feb 23, 2024, from <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/A+tale+of+two+conferences%3A+globalization%2C+the+crisis+of+neoliberalism...-a0325496377>

Carver J. (2006). *Boards that make a difference: A new design for leadership in nonprofit and public organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Casciaro T., & Piskorski M. J. (2005). Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(2), 167-199.

Chambers R. (1994). Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): Analysis of experience. *World Development*, 22(9), 1253-1268.

Chaskin R. J. (2001). Building community capacity: A definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(3), 291-323.



- Chavis D. M., & Wandersman A. (1990). Sweat equity: Building community through participation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18(1), 55-81.
- Chrislip D. D., & Larson C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference*. Jossey-Bass.
- Clarkson M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92-117.
- Clary E. G., & Snyder M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5), 156-159.
- Connell J. P., & Kubisch A. C. (1998). Applying a theory of change approach to the evaluation of comprehensive community initiatives: Progress, prospects, and problems. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, 2, 15-44.
- Constas, H. (1958). Max Weber's two conceptions of bureaucracy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(4), 400-409.
- Cook K. S., & Rice E. (2003). Social exchange theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 53-76). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Cornforth C. (2014). *Nonprofit governance: Innovative perspectives and approaches*. Routledge.
- Cornwall A., & Jewkes R. (1995). What is participatory research? *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(12), 1667-1676.
- Costanza S. (2013). The Commons trust and community governance.
<http://www.storep.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/STEP-2013-12-Costanza.pdf>
- Cox M., Arnold G., & Villamayor Tomás S. (2010). A review of design principles for community-based natural resource management. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), 38.
<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art38/>
- Cropanzano R., & Mitchell M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Crosby, P. B. (1979). *Quality is free: The art of making quality certain*. McGraw-Hill.
- De Angelis M. (2017). *Omnia Sunt Communia: Principles for the transition to postcapitalism*. Zed Books.



De Vita C. J., & Fleming C. (2001). Building capacity in nonprofit organizations. *Urban Institute*.

Deleixhe M. (2018). Conclusion: Is the governance of the Commons a model for a new global governance?. In S. Cogolati & J. Wouters (Eds.), *The Commons and a new global governance* (pp. 322-334). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Driscoll C., & Starik M. (2004). The primordial stakeholder: Advancing the conceptual consideration of stakeholder status for the natural environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(1), 55-73.

Eisinger P. (2002). Organizational capacity and organizational effectiveness among street-level food assistance programs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1), 115-130.

Ellis S. J. (2010). *From the top down: The executive role in volunteer program success* (3rd ed.). Energize Inc.

Feigenbaum, A. V. (1983). *Total quality control*. McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. R. E. D. (2015). Contingency theory of leadership. In J. W. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership* (pp. 232-1–2015). Pfeiffer.

Fitzgerald T. (2008). Sweat equity: The value of human effort in startup companies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(3), 583-604.

Freeman R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Froelich K. A. (1999). Diversification of revenue strategies: Evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(3), 246-268.

Funnell S. C., & Rogers P. J. (2011). *Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models*. Jossey-Bass.

Gerber J.-D., Lieberherr E., & Knoepfel P. (2010). Governing contemporary Commons: The institutional resource regime in dialogue with other policy frameworks. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 112, 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.06.009>



- Gibson-Graham J. K., & Dombroski Kelly. (2020). Introduction to *The handbook of diverse economies: Inventory as ethical intervention*. In J. K. Gibson-Graham & Kelly Dombroski (Eds.), *The handbook of diverse economies*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Giest S., & Howlett M. (2013). Understanding the pre-conditions of Commons governance: The role of network management. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 36, 37-47.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2013.07.010>
- Graham J. R., & Lefebvre C. (1998). Sweat equity: The role of personal effort in the creation of business value. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(9), 791-812.
- Gray B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. Jossey-Bass.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Hager M. A., & Brudney J. L. (2004). Volunteer management practices and retention of volunteers. *The Urban Institute*.
- Hager M. A., & Brudney J. L. (2011). Problems recruiting volunteers: Nature versus nurture. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 22(2), 137-157.
- Hammond, D. (2019). The legacy of Ludwig von Bertalanffy and its relevance for our time. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 36(3), 301-307.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. Verso.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training & Development Journal*, 23(5), 26-34.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1996). Great ideas revisited. *Training & Development*, 50(1), 42-47.
- Hess C. (2009). Mapping the new Commons. *SSRN*.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1356835>



- Hess C., & Meinzen-Dick R. (2006). The name change: Or what happened to the "P"? *Libraries' and Librarians' Publications*, 23.
- Hofmann Vera, Euler Johannes, Zurmühlen Linus, & Helfrich Silke. (2022). *Commoning art. Die transformativen Potenziale von Commons in der Kunst*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Holden, J. (2006). *Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy: Why Culture Needs a Democratic Mandate*. Demos.
- Hustinx L., & Handy F. (2009). Where do I belong? Volunteer attachment in a complex organization. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 20(1), 85-106.
- Ishikawa, K. (1985). *What is total quality control? The Japanese way*. Prentice Hall.
- Juran, J. M. (1988). *Juran on planning for quality*. Free Press.
- Lamla J. (2024). Nachhaltiges Konsumieren im Anthropozän. *zfwu Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Unternehmensethik*, 25(1), 7-27.
- Landau F. (2017). Diversifying the stage of policymaking: A new policy network in Berlin's cultural field. In *Art and the city*. Routledge.
- Landau-Donnelly F., & Pohl L. (2024). Practising post-foundationalism: Encountering conflict and contingency in pandemic everyday life. In F. Landau-Donnelly, H. Carlsson, & A. Legendijk (Eds.), *Reflecting on practices - New directions for spatial theories* (pp. 89-106). Newcastle upon Tyne: agenda publishing.
- Landry, C., & Bianchini, F. (1995). *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*. Earthscan.
- Lee J.-A. (2015). Non-profits in the Commons economy. In M. David & D. Halbert (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of intellectual property* (pp. 335-354). SAGE.
<https://ssrn.com/abstract=2567547>
- Levinson H. (1992). Sweat equity and its role in business valuation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 30(2), 43-54.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271-299.
- Liao-Troth M. A. (Ed.). (2008). *Challenges in volunteer management*. Information Age Publishing.



Light P. C. (2004). *Sustaining nonprofit performance: The case for capacity building and the evidence to support it*. Brookings Institution Press.

Lockwood D. (1969). Soziale Integration und Systemintegration. In W. Zapf (Ed.), *Theorien des sozialen Wandels* (pp. 124–137). Köln Berlin: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Lohmann R. A. (2015). *Voluntary action and new Commons* (1.2.1PDF ed.). Skywriters Press.

Lohmann R. A. (2016). The Ostroms' Commons revisited. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 1-16. DOI: 10.1177/0899764016643613

Madison M. J., Frischmann B. M., & Strandburg K. J. (2010). Constructing Commons in the cultural environment. *95 Cornell Law Review*, 657.

https://scholarship.law.pitt.edu/fac_articles/206

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, Place, and Gender*. University of Minnesota Press.

Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. SAGE Publications.

McCurley S., & Lynch R. (2011). *Volunteer management: Mobilizing all the resources of the community* (3rd ed.). Heritage Arts Publishing.

McGinnis M. D. (2011). An introduction to IAD and the language of the Ostrom workshop: A simple guide to a complex framework. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1).

McGinnis M. D., & Ostrom E. (2014). Social-ecological system framework: Initial changes and continuing challenges. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2): 30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06387-190230>

Miller, T., & Yúdice, G. (2002). *Cultural Policy*. Sage Publications.

Mouffe C. (2000). *The democratic paradox*. Verso Books.

Mouffe C. (2005). *On the political*. Routledge.

Mouffe C. (2008). Art and democracy: Art as an agonistic intervention in public space. *Open*, 14, 6-15.

Mouffe C. (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the world politically*. Verso Books.

Mouffe C. (2018). *For a left populism*. Verso Books.



Ostrom E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Paul F. C., & Cumbers A. (2023). The return of the local state? Failing neoliberalism, remunicipalisation and the role of the state in advanced capitalism. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 55(1), 165-183.

Pfeiffer, J. W. (1977). Interview: Interviews Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, management theorists and consultants. *Group & Organization Studies*, 2(1), 9-24.

Renz D. O. (Ed.). (2016). *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Rochester C., Paine A. E., Howlett S., & Zimmeck M. (2016). *Volunteering and society in the 21st century*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Salamon L. M., Sokolowski S. W., & Haddock M. A. (2011). *Measuring the impact of volunteering: A multi-country study*. The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

Sauvêtre P. (2018). Forget Ostrom: From the development Commons to the common as social sovereignty. In S. Cogolati & J. Wouters (Eds.), *The Commons and a new global governance* (pp. 78-100). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Schiller-Merkens S. (2022). Social transformation through prefiguration? A multi-political approach of prefiguring alternative infrastructures. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 47(4), 66-90.

Schmid B. (2018). Structured diversity: A practice theory approach to post-growth organisations. *mrev management revue*, 3, 281-310.

Schmid B., & Smith Thomas S. J. (2021). Social transformation and postcapitalist possibility: Emerging dialogues between practice theory and diverse economies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(2), 253-275.

Schmitt, T., & Van Eeden, L. (2014). *Cultural Governance: The Promotion of Cultural Diversity*. Springer.

Sethi, N. K. (1962). Mary Parker Follett: Pioneer in management theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 5(3), 214-221.



Simmel G. (1972). Der Streit. In W. L. Bühl (Ed.), *Konflikt und Konfliktstrategie: Ansätze zu einer soziologischen Konflikttheorie* (pp. 65–113). München: Nymphenburger Verlag.

Singh D. P., Thompson R. J., & Curran K. A. (Eds.) (2021). *Reimagining leadership on the Commons: Shifting the paradigm for a more ethical equitable and just world*. Emerald Publishing.

Smith, I., & Boyns, T. (2005). British management theory and practice: The impact of Fayol. *Management Decision*, 43(10), 1317-1334.

Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. Verso.

Spears, L. C. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(7), 33-35.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.

Storlazzi A., & Pastore P. (2022). Theory of Commons governance and public administration system. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Global encyclopedia of public administration public policy and governance* (pp. 12751-12758). Springer.

Suckert L. (2022). Back to the future. Sociological perspectives on expectations, aspirations and imagined futures. *European Journal of Sociology*, 63(3), 393-428.

Sullivan, H., & Keating, M. (Eds.). (2008). *The Governance of Public and Non-Profit Organizations: What Do Boards Do?* Routledge.

Taylor, F. W. (2004). *Scientific management*. Routledge.

Thompson R. J. (2021). Introduction Part I: Overview on leading on the Commons. In D. P. Singh, R. J. Thompson, & K. A. Curran (Eds.), *Reimagining leadership on the Commons: Shifting the paradigm for a more ethical equitable and just world* (pp. 1-30). Emerald Publishing.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89-126.



Wood B. E. (2022). Youth citizenship: Expanding conceptions of the young citizen. *Geography Compass*, e12669.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6-16.