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SUMMARY

Creative economies can establish sustainable development through co-creative cultural projects. Project management practice and particularly project governance can balance creativity and control fostering the co-creative environment that inspires and ignites innovation. The success of those cultural projects is the platform that leads to long-term development and growth.

This thesis work aims to answer the following research question, “How will project governance structure provide the environment for the co-creation approach to flourish and enhance project performance?” The objective of this research is to examine how the project governance structure creates a conducive environment for the co-creation approach to burgeon and boost project performance.

The authors investigate the subject by building a theoretical frame of reference, formulating a proposition and designing the research strategy in order to answer the research question. This research applies the qualitative method through semi-structured interviews based on a case study on Umeå 2014 as the ECoC. Thirteen respondents participated in this research, all of whom are members of the Umeå 2014 Project Team. As secondary data, six interviews with Umeå 2014 project owners were investigated and analysed in order to support and increase the reliability of the research findings from the primary data analysis. All primary and secondary data were analysed based on the theoretical framework.

The research revealed that project governance nurtures the environment necessary for co-creation to flourish. The co-creation approach will flourish when developed within the mixture of hierarchical and relational project governance structures that foster co-creative elements. The synergy between co-creation and project governance will boost the potential to achieve sustainable development and long-term growth.
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1 Introduction

The introductory chapter aims to present the phenomenon of creative culture and industries within the context of the European Capital of Culture (thereafter ECoC). The discussion revolves around the sustainable economic growth through the project management practices, particularly project governance, that utilise creative and cultural capitals by means of co-creation approaches in creative cities. The success of such projects will contribute to the creative economy that leads to sustainable growth in political, economic, social, and cultural aspects of a particular region. After discussing the framework of creative economy and project governance, the main research questions and objectives are formulated and explained.

Figure 1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Creative industries are defined as “activities that have their origin in individual creativity, skill, and talent, and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (DCMS, 2001, p. 3). Emerging from “the political, cultural, and technological landscape,” they are built upon a combination imposed on the indistinctive borderlines between “creative arts and cultural industries, freedom and comfort, public and private, state-owned and commercial, citizen and consumer, the political and the personal” (Hartley, 2005, p. 18).

The global economic and financial downturn has slowed down the growth of global demand and international trade. As of 2008, the economic slowdown reached up to 12 per cent, while the global export of creative goods and services still showed strong annual growth of 14 per cent since 2002 and peaked to US$592 billion in 2008 (UNCTAD, 2010, p. xxiii). Despite a slowdown in 2009 (UNCTAD, 2013, para. 2), creative products and services managed to regain significant growth of 12 per cent—from US$559.5 billion in 2010 to US$624 billion in 2011 (UNCTAD, 2013, para. 1). The aforementioned facts corroborated the contribution of creative industries and creative business as “a powerful economic force for many modern and emerging countries” (Henry & Johnston, 2007, p. 217) to fend off the global recession. Creative industries are also the driving force towards “a knowledge-based, high-value economy” (Henry & Johnston, 2007, p. 212) by being “enablers for other industries or services” (Hartley, 2005, p. 2). Creative industries are built upon creativity that fosters culture and human capital resulting in employment, innovation, and commerce—all of which lead to “social inclusion, cultural diversity and environmental sustainability” (UNCTAD, 2010, p. xix).

A new economic class called “Creative Class” has emerged and contributed a significant impact to the economic growth (Florida, 2002, p. 8-9). People in this class “share a common creative ethos that values creativity, individuality, difference and
merit” (Florida, 2002, p. 8) and may centralise in particular places to form a “clustering force” that functions as “the true engines” of economic development (Florida, 2008, p. 9). The “clustering force” and “creative class” are the main components that stimulate productivity and boost output and prosperity resulting in rapid growth in the “creative economy” (Florida, 2008, p. 9). The “creative economy” flourishes as it is being supported by “technology, growing consumer markets and better linkages to the tourism sector” (International Trade Forum, 2009, p. 8). This “creative economy” consists of “creative sectors” such as design, fine arts, film, performing arts, television and publishing (Chaston, 2008, p. 820).

In today’s creative economy, “cultural capital” is a new type of capital apart from physical, human, and natural capitals (Throsby, 1999, p. 3) that involves “social/political institutions, environmental ethics (world view), and traditional ecological knowledge in a society” to manage the natural environment (Berkes & Folke, 1994, p. 128). This factor incorporates or generates cultural value in a product or service apart from its economic value in both tangible (e.g., architecture, artworks, artefacts, venues, etc.) and intangible entities (e.g., notions, practices, principles, customs, etc.) (Throsby, 2005, p. 3-4). Hence, governments all over the world have realised the burgeoning roles and benefits of creative industries (Henry & Johnston, 2007, p. 212). One exemplar of governmental initiation to foster cultural capitals and creative industries for achieving economic growth is the European Commission’s European Capitals of Culture (ECoC).

This initiative aims to focus on promoting rich and diverse European cultures and their cultural connections through establishing contacts, mutual understanding and the sense of European citizenship (European Commission, 2013a, para. 4). Many European cities perceive this project as a window of opportunity to revitalise their cities, to enhance their international and regional reputation and image, and to grow their tourism sector (European Commission, 2013a, para. 5). Other objectives include boosting citizens’ pride and confidence, fostering creativity and innovation, promoting local artists, and improving cultural infrastructure (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004a, p. 14). If a city achieves success in delivering the ECoC project, the results will contribute tremendously to the growth and development in cultural, social, and economic aspects prior, during and beyond the year itself (European Commission, 2010, p. 3).

To become an ECoC, the candidate city should meet the following criteria (European Commission, 2006, Article 4):

1. Fulfilment of the European Dimension:
   a. That creates synergies among cultural operators, artists and cities to collaborate in cultural projects
   b. That emphasises “the richness of cultural diversity of Europe” and integrate “the common aspects of European cultures”

2. Fostering the city and citizens:
   a. Through creating interests of the citizens within and around the city as well as from other countries and involving them in the programme
b. To achieve long-term and sustainable development of the city in cultural and social aspects

According to the study on the European Cities and Capitals of Culture conducted by Palmer-Rae Associates, common issues and impacts of ECoC projects have been identified. The main challenge lies in the governance structures due to the conflicting interests among political board members and the operational management team (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004a, p. 15). Furthermore, building the cultural programme for an ECoC year is highly complex due to the conflicting factors (e.g., artistic vision vs. political interests, big events vs. local initiatives, etc.) and ambiguous aims and objectives. It should also be noted that the contents of the cultural programme depend on the city’s historical, economic, social, and political background, hence it is impossible to develop a method that fits all cities (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004a, p. 15). According to many ECoC cities, three to four years is the ideal planning time in order to be well prepared and achieve the desired outcomes of the cultural programme. Another highlighted challenge is how to build relationships, to win confidence and support, and to establish partnerships (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004a, p. 16).

The abovementioned challenges have inspired the authors to investigate the project governance structure in cultural projects like ECoC. Umeå, the ECoC 2014, is taken as a case study due to its unique approach of co-creation in delivering the cultural programme and the fact that it has been considered by the European Commission Selection Panel to be an epitome of good practice in managing an ECoC project (European Commission, 2013b, p. 10). The co-creation approach is built upon trust, two-way communication, commitment and reciprocal involvement that cultivate creativity and innovation (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 17). Based on the preliminary review of literature, the authors found that the implementation of the co-creation approach within the frames that project governance provides has not been extensively investigated. The authors identified an under researched area within the extant literature and constructed the research question based on a neglect spotting approach (Sandberg & Alvesson, 2011, p. 30).

Project governance recently has attracted many scholars’ and practitioners’ attention in an effort to underline the influences and effects on the performance and success of projects. Increasingly, as projects have come to be more multi-organisational in nature, the issue of governance and the governance structures gain more and more importance. Therefore, co-creative and partnership projects can deliver enhanced outcomes due to the resources and capabilities that co-creators can combine during the process. Governance becomes necessary to lay the framework for the objectives, the means for achieving objectives and the monitoring of the projects’ progress. Organisations need mechanisms that make certain that project managers have enough assistance to undertake the projects while the strategy is established with the involvement of the stakeholders (Renz, 2007, p. 356). In co-creative projects, different structures of project governance are required to balance creativity and control because of the dynamic nature of co-creation that demands an adaptive governance structure that encourages creativity and ensures controlled outcomes (Roser et al., 2013, p. 24-25).
1.2 Research Question

Based on the background, this research formulates and strives to answer the following research question:

“How will project governance structure provide the environment for the co-creation approach to flourish and enhance project performance?”

1.3 Research Objective

The main research objective is to examine the project governance structure that creates a conducive environment for the co-creation approach to burgeon and boost project performance. Through this research, project owners who are using the co-creation approach are able to govern the project in an appropriate manner so that project success can be achieved.

1.4 Delimitations and Limitations

The delimitation of this thesis rests on the fact that it will provide a case study on the project governance of Umeå as the European Capital of Culture (ECoC) in 2014. The findings may be considered as a relevant reference to other cities all around Europe that are going to apply or have been selected as an ECoC. However, it should be noted that the findings in this research would not be an absolute representative in comparison with other Capitals of Culture in Europe. Furthermore, due to the time constraints, the authors were unable to conduct a longitudinal study that would provide further data regarding the project governance from the pre-planning until the closeout of Umeå 2014. The investigation was focused on the project governance during the planning process that Umeå 2014 is currently undertaking between October and December 2013.

Another limitation is the availabilities of the interviewees since the Umeå 2014 Office was in the end of their planning process in which they were extremely occupied to plan the kick-off of the cultural year in the end of January 2014. However, the authors had put their best efforts to conduct interviews with the key people within the organisation in order to acquire a holistic perspective of the project governance. Secondary interviews with several projects owners of Umeå 2014 were also used in order to enhance the objectivity of the research results. However, the limitation of using secondary data is that the authors cannot control the data quality (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 335). Furthermore, the secondary data generated from one another researcher is embedded with his/her assumptions and subjectivity, while the primary data derived from the semi-structured interview is more independent (Irwin, 2013, p. 297).

1.5 Research Disposition

Chapter 1: Introduction – This chapter aims to present the phenomenon of creative culture and industry within the context of the European Capitals of Culture (ECoC), as well as discuss the sustainable economic growth through project management practices,
particularly project governance, that utilise creative and cultural capitals by means of a co-creation approach in creative cities. After discussing the framework of creative economy and project governance, the main research questions and objectives are formulated and explained.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Method – This chapter introduces how the authors approach the research topic. Preconceptions, research philosophy, approach and perspectives are elaborated in order to provide the readers with a background so that they will be able to critically analyse this research. At the end, the authors also elaborate on how the theoretical frame of reference is constructed.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Frame of Reference – This chapter begins with the introduction of Umeå 2014 as the European Capital of Culture and is followed by theories in co-creation and project governance. At the end of this chapter, the a priori proposition will be introduced.

Chapter 4: Practical Method – This chapter elaborates the research strategy implemented in this thesis. Explanations include the data collection, interview sample criteria, non-responsive analysis, and interview guides and themes. Ultimately, limitations encountered in the interview process and how the data are processed will be discussed in this section.

Chapter 5: Empirical Findings and Analysis – This chapter explains the empirical findings and analysis of the investigation on the project governance structure of co-creative projects within the Umeå 2014 Programme based on the primary and secondary data.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Suggestions – This chapter elaborates the conclusions and suggestions derived from this thesis. The answer to the research proposition will be provided based on the empirical findings and analysis. The conclusions include the discussions on the academic and practical contributions of this research towards the body of knowledge within the project governance field, particularly that of co-creation in project management practice.

Chapter 7: Truth Criteria – This chapter presents a post hoc evaluation of the research findings in terms of validity, reliability, and confirmability.
2 Theoretical Method

The point of departure introduces how the authors approach the research topic. Preconceptions, research philosophy, approach and perspectives are elaborated in order to provide the readers with a background so that they will be able to critically analyse this research. At the end of this chapter, the authors elaborate on the construction of the theoretical frame of reference.

![Figure 2. Theoretical Method](image.png)

2.1 Preconceptions

Giving preconceptions that build our research is crucial so that readers can provide critical reflections upon the results and contributions of our research. The background and position of the researcher will influence how research topic, perspectives, and methods are chosen, as well as how research findings and conclusions are framed and communicated (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 712; Easterby-Smith et al., 2012, p. 158; Malterud, 2001, p. 483-484). By being aware of this effect, it is imperative that the authors should always be reflexive when conducting their research to obtain more in-depth and extensive knowledge (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 292). The researchers should also be critical towards the research approach chosen and the results (Remenyi et al., 1998) by following the deconstructive reflexivity, which emerges from constructionist ontology and its connection to an interpretive epistemology (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 713).

The authors are currently undertaking the Strategic Project Management Programme on master’s level at Umeå University. Prior to this programme, one had studied Industrial Design and Foreign Languages & Literature at bachelor’s level and also completed a master’s degree in Creative Industry Design at National Cheng Kung University, while the other had completed a bachelor’s degree in Management Science and Technology at Economic University of Athens. In spite of having different backgrounds, the authors have common interest in project governance, project control, marketing, entrepreneurship, and sustainable development. The interests of investigating the co-creation approach in project management have been inspired by the fact that Umeå has been awarded as the European Capital of Culture (ECoC) for the year of 2014, and more specifically because of the co-creation approach through open source strategy that they have implemented from the bidding process until now (i.e., the planning process). On top of that, one of the authors has experience of living in one of the ECoCs back in 2009 in Linz, Austria, for an exchange semester. During the Strategic Project Management Module at Umeå University in October 2013, Umeå 2014 was used as a live case study. Realising the uniqueness of Umeå 2014, the authors were intrigued to explore which type of project governance would be the most effective for co-creative projects. Initial literature review on project governance and co-creation was conducted and it was found that there were few literature studies that investigate project...
governance for projects applying co-creation processes. Realising that this would be an appropriate research topic, the authors are aware that the preconceptions will somehow influence how the theoretical framework is built and how the empirical data are collected. The analysis and conclusions of this research will be based on the theoretical framework, rather than the authors’ subjectivities. However, the readers are encouraged to put the authors’ preconceptions into consideration when critically analysing this thesis.

2.2 Research Philosophy

The main research objective is to investigate the project governance structure that constructs a conducive environment for the co-creation approach to flourish and enhance project performance. The authors conducted a case study on the Umeå 2014 Project Team, which applies the co-creation approach to deliver the ECoC project assigned by the European Commission. This purpose can be achieved through a scientific procedure supported by research methodology—how research should be conducted (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 3). It is imperative for researchers to have full understanding of their ontological (i.e., the nature of reality) and epistemological (i.e., theory of knowledge) standpoints when conducting research (Coe, 2012, p. 5).

Epistemology is how people claim knowledge about the world and how they prove the trustworthiness of such claims (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108; McLaughlin, 2012, p. 25). It is the consensus of knowledge within a particular area of study (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 112). Ontology is about the nature of the world in terms of its reality and existence (Easterby-Smith et al., 2012, p. 17; Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108) or “the consideration of being: what is, what exists, what it means for something—or somebody—to be” (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000, p. 227) that triggers discussion on the research assumptions regarding how the world functions and how these views are held in belief (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 110). Ontology and epistemology are highly correlated, with the ontological standpoint affecting the way of obtaining knowledge and the choice of research methods (Evans & Hardy, 2010, p. 18).

The authors are aware that their values will affect the theories, how the hypotheses are generated, the choice of methods and approaches, as well as the strategies for data analysis in their research (Royse, 2008, p. 23). In order to design the research and the collection of empirical data, it is essential to define the philosophy along with the approach of the research. The research philosophy adopted in this study comprises several assumptions that influence the authors’ point of view, the research strategy and methods chosen (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 108).

The nature and development of this research are based on interpretivism, as the authors utilised primary data derived from subjectively interpreting and perceiving meanings and understandings from the main research subjects (Mason, 2002, p. 56). The authors acknowledge their subjective worldview in this research. Since the authors tried to understand the subjective context within the research undertaken, the research conducted follows interpretivism’s footsteps (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 115). Interpretive research pursues to gain insights of how members of a social group interact and use their subjective realities in order to demonstrate and define their social action (Orlikowski & Baroudi, 1991, p. 13). Interpretivists perceive the “social reality as an
emergent process—as an extension of human consciousness and subjective experience” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 253) and this is where the values contributing to the research can be found (Wacquant, 1992b, p. 9).

While conducting the research, several challenges arose, and the researchers had to surpass the obstacle of understanding the worldview of the research subjects. Interpretive epistemology is essential and adopted in order to understand the subjective reasoning (Goldkuhl, 2012, p. 137). It is also perceived as “an emergent social process—as an extension of human consciousness and subjective experience” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 253). Interpretivism strives for discerning the intersubjective essence within the social life and elucidates the reasons behind the social action (Gibbons, 1987, p. 3).

In order to achieve the purpose of this research, the authors conducted a case study through semi-structured interviews with the Umeå 2014 Project Team. The main objective of the interviews is to retrieve information and recognise patterns that will build the holistic structure of the project governance implemented within the organisation. Such a project governance structure is built upon myriad aspects, such as roles and responsibilities, accountabilities, interpersonal relationships, and interactions. Therefore, these relationships, meanings, and power issues can be recognised through interpretivism. On the other hand, a positivist approach does not investigate beyond the “observed reality” (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009, p. 18) because it is “about constructing “objective” realities or prototypes based on observable phenomena” (Wainwright & Forbes, 2000, p. 261). Elements of positivism are adopted by realism. This scientific ideal combines aspects not only from positivism but also from interpretivism (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 115). It recognises that human beings influence the realities and also acknowledges the existence of objective realities that generate theories (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 115).

The authors decided to follow the constructionist ontology due to the lack of objectivity in this research (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002, p. 701). This ontological standpoint aims to explain the meanings of social phenomena generated by social actors and to emphasise that these social phenomena and types are the results of social interaction and always “in a constant state of revision” (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 23). Furthermore, the authors attempt to seize the “shared meanings” and interactions of social actors that construct the social world (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 78) so that the research will be able to capture human relationships, unforeseen meanings and issues resulting in more holistic results. This ontology follows the phenomenological paradigm and the interpretivism epistemology that focuses on subjectivity, meanings, and interactions (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 76; Remenyi et al., 1998, p. 104).

2.3 Research Approach

In this research, the authors investigate the subject by building a theory, formulating a proposition and design the research strategy in order to verify, extend or reject this theory. Although the interpretivist philosophy usually implements induction, this research explores the project governance structure of Umeå 2014 and the existing literature in a deductive way. Such a choice is not incompatible and every research can combine different philosophies and approaches (Saunders et al., 2009, p.124).
Deduction comprises observations that are used to verify or reject the proposition built from existing theories (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p. 16). In that context, the authors investigate the project governance structure of Umeå 2014 Organisation in order to approve or reject the proposition built based on the theoretical framework in Chapter 3.

In this circumstance, the thesis purpose might appear as a confirmatory research in terms of accepting or rejecting a proposition and following a rigid research procedure (i.e., generating theories and propositions, research design, proposition verification, and so on). On the other hand, it is believed that exploratory research with transparency, integrity and reflexivity based on a systematic research procedure can also obtain validity and conduct investigation of the reality with creativity and innovation (Reiter, 2013, p. 1-2). The confirmatory purpose lies in “a priori theorizing and hypothesizing” (Reiter, 2013, p. 7) that will be verified in a deductive way, while the exploratory purpose involves the efforts to explain the research outcomes “in a new light” (Robson, 2002, p. 59) supported by the theoretical frame of reference and extant literature. Researchers are expected to formulate “their own individual mix of methods” and have “preferences and style of collecting and analysing qualitative data” (Elliott & Timulak, 2005, p. 148). Therefore, the authors mainly focus on achieving the confirmatory research purpose supported by some elements of exploratory research.

### 2.4 Theoretical Framework

#### 2.4.1 Acquisition of the Theoretical Framework

A theoretical frame of reference is essential in order to answer the research questions addressed in this research. The main topics discussed in the theoretical frame of reference will revolve around theories on project governance, co-creation, creative culture and economy supported with supplementary literature related to the European Capital of Culture. The theoretical frame of reference should be robust so that the authors can provide a solid foundation for conducting empirical investigations that will initiate meaningful discussions and generate valuable research findings contributing to the body of knowledge (Remenyi et al., 1998, p. 69).

The main source of scientific and academic articles and books of this thesis is the online databases from Heriot-Watt University and Umeå University. Academic articles that have been assigned and discussed in previous courses and seminars will also be used as reference whenever relevant to project governance, project management, and the co-creation process within the scope of this thesis. Furthermore, official reports containing empirical analyses published by highly renowned organisations will also be considered to support this thesis with more solid literature ground. The theoretical data in this study was mainly collected from academic and scientific articles and publications that possess high correlations to the research topic.

#### 2.4.2 Eligibility Criteria

The theoretical frame of reference in this study was built upon the theoretical data that were collected through access to the online databases at Heriot-Watt University and Umeå University. Through these channels, it is possible to utilise academic databases,
such as EBSCO HOST, Web of Knowledge, Emerald, ScienceDirect, JSTOR and so on. The main keywords are “project governance”, “project management”, “project success”, “co-creation approach,” “value co-creation,” “European Capitals of Culture,” “creative economy,” “creative culture,” “cultural capital” and “creative industry”. These keywords were keyed in based on both general and specific combinations. For example, the authors would search for “co-creation process” in general and then also specifically find articles that discuss the co-creation approach within the field of project management. Through this kind of approach, it is possible to cover both general and specific contexts at the same time. In order to increase the holistic perspective of this research, the authors do not limit the academic resources within the field of business administration. Whenever relevant, references from other academic fields will also be considered bearing in mind that co-creation processes are applicable in many fields of research. As for the academic starting point and research strategy, the references are mainly derived from the online database of Umeå University’s Library.

When searching for the academic articles, the authors always consider the reputation of academic journals. In general, the articles chosen are from top peer-reviewed academic journals within that particular field depending on the keywords in order to enhance the credibility and assure the academic significance of this research. At the beginning of the selection process, the authors would read the abstracts and keywords in the articles to decide which articles are relevant to the research questions and can fit to the theoretical frame of reference.

After the preliminary selection, each article is carefully examined and relevant information is highlighted and summarised into a separate document. Important quotes were also documented in the original sentences along with the page numbers for future citations. On top of that, the quotes would also be analysed whether they contradict or reinforce the initial assumptions regarding the research topic so that the main research arguments can be established. Each summary is classified into different headings. For example, for co-creation, it consists of the following headings: definition, benefits, mechanisms, and elements of co-creation. The headings generated from these groups of notes were drawn into a mind map so that the relationships amongst them are clearly depicted.

Regarding the timeline of the chosen literature, articles regarding project governance, co-creation, creative industry, and creative economy mainly span from 2000 and ahead. While for the theories related to research methodology and strategies are dated back as far as from 1979 until present. Secondary references are not considered because the authors try to avoid misinterpretations of the original authors. To avoid this, the original key articles were retrieved and the authors can decide whether or not to include them in the theoretical framework based on the academic significance and relevance. In addition, government and academic reports published by public institutions, such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), European Union (EU) European Commission (EC), and Umeå Municipality, will also be taken into consideration to strengthen the theoretical framework of this thesis (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 74). For example, UNCTAD has published reports related to creative economy (e.g., UNCTAD, 2010). Since this thesis will conduct a case study on Umeå 2014 as the European Capital of Culture, additional information from press releases, news, official websites, presentations and reports related to this context will also be considered as references.
3 Theoretical Frame of Reference

The theoretical frame of reference of this thesis begins with the introduction of the Umeå 2014 as the European Capital of Culture and is followed by theories in co-creation and project governance. At the end of this chapter, the a priori proposition will be introduced.

Figure 3. Theoretical Frame of Reference

3.1 Umeå 2014 as the European Capital of Culture

The preparation for the bidding process for the ECoC began in Autumn 2007, in which many open meetings and seminars were held to discuss and collect ideas from the citizens, all of which would be included in Umeå’s proposal. The first bid was submitted in October 2008 and Umeå competed with other Swedish cities—Gävle, Lund and Uppsala. In December 2008, Lund and Umeå proceeded to the second stage (Umeå2014, 2013d). Finally, the European Capital of Culture 2014 was awarded to Umeå in September 2009 (European Council, 2009b, p. 2). The strength and uniqueness of Umeå’s proposal lies in the co-creation concept. The main objectives of Umeå 2014 are “to promote human growth, strengthen the role of culture as a driving force for sustainable development and reinforce the international relations and dimensions of cultural life” (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 11). Sustainable development is the “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability for future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, ch. 2, para. 1).

The concept of co-creation is achieved through an open source strategy to cultivate creativity and cultural capital among the people that will generate new ideas and solutions to existing problems (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 12). To encourage co-creation, the Umeå 2014 Project Team takes the responsibility of being an enabler and a facilitator that encourages creativity and innovation of “cultural operators” rather than being a traditional project manager (Umeå2014, 2013a, para. 3-4). In line with the open source strategy, they are always open to new project ideas from anyone or any parties who are interested and provide support through coordinating activities, helping find funds, and granting funds. To be granted financial support, projects should fulfil the main objectives of the ECoC year and demonstrate the main characteristics of an ECoC project (Umeå2014, 2013e, para. 6). The main objective is to empower the People, Culture, the City, the Northern Region, and the European interaction (Umeå2014, 2013e, para. 7). The project should demonstrate creative thinking, development, co-creation, gender equality, accessibility, diversity, and sustainability (Umeå2014, 2013e, para. 8).

Apart from financing ordinary projects, Umeå 2014 also has a special call called “Cultural Boost” or “Kulturskjutsen” designated for institutions and independent actors to conduct pilot projects and events during the ECoC year (Umeå2014, 2013c, para. 1).
The Umeå 2014 Programme is based on the eight Sámi seasons (i.e., Early Spring, True Spring, Early Summer, Summer, Early Autumn, True Autumn, Early Winter, and Deep Winter) and the projects are classified according to the characteristics of these seasons (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 12).

Umeå 2014 is a stepping-stone to reach the long-term developmental strategy through 2050. The short-term objectives spanning from 2009 to 2013 are about creating networks for ECoC 2014 and a long-term legacy beyond 2014 (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 8). The activities of Umeå 2014 are expected to continue beyond 2014 in order to bring sustainable growth in social and economic aspects that will achieve long-term development. Through culture, Umeå 2014 would like to grow citizens’ curiosity and provide an environment that fosters creativity and innovation contributing to the long-term and sustainable urban development (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 8). For example, the population will be expected to reach 200,000 inhabitants in 2050. In summary, Umeå 2014 is a cultural programme that boosts creative industries, nurtures talents and creativity, and strives for sustainable growth.

3.2 The Co-Creation Approach

The business environment has evolved so rapidly and become much more dynamic, such that it requires organisations to be more responsive, creative, and innovative. The idea of projectification within organisations is the strategic solution that is chosen in order to provide smart and effective responses to the highly dynamic business environment (cf. Lundin & Söderholm, 1995; Midler, 1995). In this case, organisations have used projects and implemented project management practice to realise this organisational strategy. Due to the rapid development of communication technology, consumers have gained involvement through social platforms to help organisations in the value creation process of a product or service (Piskorski, 2011, p. 122). The notion of imposing on customer competence (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000, p. 81) is the origin of the co-creation approach for unique value creation (cf. Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004a; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004b).

3.2.1 Definition

“Co-creation” is an approach that can be embedded within the project management practice to help enhance organisational effectiveness that helps achieve successful innovation and business performance (Huston & Sakkab, 2006, p. 60). Co-creation is the idea of involving “customers as co-creators of value” that first emerged in the marketing and development of products and/or services (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000, p. 80). In the co-creation process, the organisation encourages customers and/or consumers to be involved and contribute to its value creation by providing ideas and suggestions in the process of developing and improving products and/or services.

Co-creation is “an active, creative and social process” (Witell et al., 2011, p. 143) that stimulates producers and users to collaborate through providing ideas, sharing knowledge, or even participating in the development process of a product or services in generating value for the customers (Ind et al., 2013, p. 9-10). The interactions between the organisation and consumers involve intellectual participation and two-way communication, making co-creation distinctive from mass collaboration,
crowdsourcing, and mass customisation (Roser et al., 2009, p. 9). In summary, co-creation is about involving customers, managers, employees, and other stakeholders in the process of developing systems, products, or services that will deliver value and benefits (Ramaswamy, 2011, p. 195).

Based on the combination of how and why consumers co-create, co-creative practices can be divided into four categories: participation-for-self; creation-for-self; participation-for-others; and creation-for-others (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 317-319). Participation-for-self is about direct and close involvement of the consumer with awareness of the benefits to create the desired product through the platform or system the organisation provides (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 317-318). Creation-for-self is consumers’ self-expression motivated by the sense of self-fulfilment to create value “by and for themselves, using their own knowledge and skills, complemented by the company” (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 318). Participation-for-others is consumers’ engagement in the resources provided by the organisation that will be beneficial for others (e.g., testing and sharing product or service experiences) (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 318). Creation-for-others is about how consumers collaborate to “initiate, do, and share things with others” based on their common ideals and interests through the help of communication technology (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 318-319).

Therefore, organisations should generate strategies based on the degree of customer involvement. The deeper the customer involvement, the more complex the strategies should be implemented so that the organisation can engage and interact with its consumers for co-creating values (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 319). The degree of involvement creates the sense of participation and ownership within the consumers’ mind that will motivate them to co-create (Harwood & Gary, 2010, p. 297).

3.2.2 Mechanism of Co-creation

Embedding a co-creation approach in project management practice is a challenge, but it will be rewarding for the organisation when successfully implemented by “engaging people to create valuable experiences together while enhancing network economics” (Ramaswamy & Gouillart, 2010, p. 35). Such an engagement can be achieved through “multi-sided interactions” that are collaborative, dynamic, and contextual, as well as encouraging continuous dialogue and transparency, access, and visualisation of experiences that help enable better risk-reward assessments (Ramaswamy, 2011, p. 195-196). An organisation has seen the co-creation approach as a new source of competitive advantage for developing sustainable business (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004b, p. 12).

The key enablers to motivate value creation from customers are “technology,” “authenticity and personalisation,” and “community and social experience” (Fisher & Smith, 2011, p. 328-331). Amongst these, technology is the point of departure that acknowledges consumers’ competence in creating dialogue to co-create values (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000, p. 80). The advancement of communication technologies facilitates two-way communication, access, and interactions to exchange ideas and information between the organisation and its customers. Authenticity can be achieved through personalisation that helps create novel experience and helps define consumers’ unique identity. Community and social experience aiming for mutual investments and knowledge sharing between the organisations and the consumers will create linkages and community spirit, of which will contribute to value of the co-
creation process. To be successful, co-creation should produce value for all stakeholders, focus on the experiences of all stakeholders, and provide a platform where all stakeholders can interact directly with one another and share their experiences (Ramaswamy & Gouillart, 2010, p. 104-105), because stakeholders are those who have influence on or can be influenced by the project (El-Gohary et al., 2006). Therefore, an organisation should act as an enabler that gives opportunities and a platform for the stakeholders to create a dialogue in their own manner (Ind et al., 2013, p. 9).

However, some challenges exist when organisations attempt to conduct a fruitful co-creation process that can add value and contribute to their competitive advantage, particularly the lack of environmental information and the ambiguity of customer objectives that make it difficult to predict the value outcome of the co-creative process (Ueda et al., 2009, p. 693). These challenges can be overcome through collaboration between the organisation and its consumers/customers/stakeholders. These people (i.e., consumers, customers, and stakeholders) are the creative agents to develop co-creative strategies based on different degrees of involvement through participation and creation to create values for self and for others (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 316-317). Participation is about consumers’ cooperation in terms of being active and engaged in the value co-creation process based on the framework and guidelines decided by the organisation; while creation is a more pro-active approach from the consumers to initiate co-creation by utilising resources, information, tools, and systems available in their hands (Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 317).

It is essential to understand the elements contributing to consumers’ motivation to co-create. Obviously, each individual has different expectations (Ind et al., 2013, p. 9). They have “intrinsic motivation” that drives curiosity and interests to gain knowledge and to be engaged in the co-creative process regardless the monetary reward (Füller, 2010, p. 109 & 112; Ind & Coates, 2013, p. 7 & 22). People are motivated to perform and be creative because they perceive the task as “interesting, involving, exciting, satisfying, or personally challenging” (Amabile, 1997, p. 39). Therefore, the co-creation process requires “intimate communication” for knowledge sharing purposes (Roser et al., 2009, p. 13).

Through good communication, the organisation can create “a productive community” that can successfully deliver a co-creative process (Ind et al., 2013, p. 22), because “the more the customer understands about the opportunities available, the greater the value processes can be created” (Payne et al., 2008, p. 92). However, a certain degree of freedom is necessary to foster this intrinsic motivation (Schau et al., 2009, p. 41). Too much control can result in diminishing “the sense of creative opportunity” (Ind et al., 2013, p. 9). Many organisations have realised that they gain more when they hand the power to the collaborative networks to be creative (Gloor & Cooper, 2007, p. 41) because creativity flourishes in “an open environment” that consists of freedom and trust (Ind et al., 2013, p. 17). When there is trust, people become more willing and committed to participate and contribute to the co-creation process (Gloor & Cooper, 2007, p. 82-83; Ind et al., 2013, p. 9 & 21). The project team should put efforts into creating “a trusting and open environment” through collecting new concepts as well as being informative and supportive (Ind et al., 2013, p. 22).
3.2.3 Outcomes of Co-Creation

According to Normann & Ramirez (1993, p. 69), “the key to creating value is to co-produce offerings that mobilize customers.” A successful co-creation process encourages customers and/or consumers to contribute knowledge and creativity to improve existing ideas or to create new ideas that can be valuable to themselves and the organisation (Ind et al., 2013, p. 5). For the consumers, the results of co-creation can be better products or services with better value and higher satisfaction (Dong et al., 2008, p.133). For the organisations, the co-creation process provides learning opportunities and new customer knowledge that build new and/or existing competences for enhancing competitive advantages (Zhang & Chen, 2008, p. 243). Through these competitive advantages, the organisation can have an innovation process with lower risk and higher efficiency and effectiveness (Ind et al., 2013, p. 8). When successfully implemented with the right system, the co-creation process can help achieve sustainable value and development (Ueda et al., 2009, p. 698).

3.3 Project Governance

In the project management field, governance has gained increased attention in recent years. As Bekker & Steyn (2009, p. 216) explain, this has mainly occurred due to two reasons: first, projects can typically be viewed as short-term oriented, temporary organisations (with a finite period) and therefore management principles that reside in organisational environments can be rented by project environments. Secondly, many corporate failures have been attributed to lack of effective governance while simultaneously corporate misconducts has been reduced in the light of focusing on governance. This implies that as projects resemble organisations in their nature, they can in fact be viewed from a perspective that credits governance for their performance (Bekker & Steyn, 2009, p. 216). However, as projects become more diverse in nature, involving multiple organisations and people, the model of corporate governance cannot be sufficient; thus there is a need to look into project governance.

3.3.1 Definitions

Governance is generally described as “involving a set of relationships between all stakeholders, a company’s management, its board, its shareholders and other stakeholders, and provides the structure through which the objectives are set and the means of attaining those objectives and monitoring performance” (Dunović, 2010, p. 147). Project governance, in particular, involves the value system, the policies, the processes, the systems and the responsibilities and tasks, which facilitate projects to accomplish specific objectives, that enhance the projects’ implementation and that promote projects’ stakeholder and organisational interests (Müller, 2009, p. 4). Williams et al. (2010, p. 41) emphasise that project governance essentially deals with selecting the right projects, ensuring that they are sustainable and is concerned with attaining the appropriate objectives.

Project governance is involved with generating methods and the ways for (Müller, 2009):

a. Determining and defining the projects’ objectives (Müller, 2009, p. 9)
b. Providing and configuring the means to achieve these objectives, first through defining the model of governance, which involves determining and prioritizing resources (governance of the project) and second through developing project management capabilities (governance of project management) so as to ensure that the projects will be implemented in a successful manner. (Müller, 2009, p. 9)

c. Controlling and monitoring projects’ success and progress (Müller, 2009, p. 9)

The objectives of project governance are: to create a positive and enhancing environment so that the projects can be implemented successfully, to prioritize projects and resources so that best use is achieved and to identify any problematic projects or projects that are challenged by obstacles and to undertake action towards either ‘rescuing’ them or terminating them (Müller, 2009, p. 17).

Governance serves as a regulation tool to establish the organisational objectives through decisions that follow acceptable cultural and ethical standards. In addition it provides support for the organisations to obtain their goals by following an adequate framework and regulated standards (Pemsel & Müller, 2012, p. 871; Williams et al., 2010, p. 41).

Project governance is derived from the areas of Public and Corporate governance, which are relevant to project activities and a good project governance model makes certain that sustainable solutions are selected and provided efficiently (Klakegg et al., 2008, p. S29). Project governance is the process of identifying and determining goals and the ways for achieving those goals along with the ways of performing project control, as well as involving a cluster of relationships between stakeholders (Turner, 2006, p. 93-95). Project governance comprises decisions on resource distribution, control of the execution, overall monitoring, clear accountability and defined responsibilities—all of which ensures alignment of the strategic objectives with the project objectives, shared decision-making and the involvement of the all parties relevant to the project (Van der Waldt, 2010, p. 251). The strategic alignment extends to the alignment of the project vision among the project team members and will affect the project management success (Christenson & Walker, 2008, p. 621).

3.3.2 Contribution of Project Governance to Project Performance

Project governance structure is the framework that defines the responsibilities, tasks and commitments of stakeholder, identifies the relationships between the participants and determines resource and risk distribution (Qiang et al., 2010, p. 1226). The project governance structure is the number of processes and rules that make certain that the outcome of the projects will be successful and the requirements will be met (Klakegg et al., 2008, p. S30).

The need for project governance arises from the fact that projects fundamentally involve several participants, various stakeholders and a considerable workload. Consequently, project governance is essential for providing a framework and set the structures which if not clearly determined might lead to negative effects on project performance. Namely such negative effects include the lack of a clear role definition, which can produce conflicts between participants, responsibility gaps or overlaps as well as inefficient use of resources (Tillman et al., 2012, p. 6).
Similarly, in networks that have a goal-oriented character, governance is in fact important in ensuring that the participants act on a collective basis and support one another. Also, that if conflicts arise, they are addressed and finally the organisation manages that the resources within the network are used in an efficient and effective manner (Provan & Kenis, 2008, p. 231). The governance structures affect project performance because of their inherent nature of determining communication, allocation of information, project reporting and stakeholder management (Garland, 2009, p. 8).

Good governance of projects in public-private partnerships promotes effective project performance and enhance project success particularly through allocating risks properly and in a manner that identifies what risks are expected to be encountered, who will take on these risks, when they will be allocated and how they will be mitigated (Abednego & Ogunlana, 2006, p. 634). Lack of project governance is in fact responsible for project underperformance, because of potential opportunistic behaviour and performance problems, because of misaligned or conflicting responsibilities and tasks of key actors of projects (Pinto, 2013, p. 9).

The governance structure is critical mostly due to the fact that it lays the framework for allowing “the most competent and most likely to make a correct decision to play the role as decision makers, and to exploit the most appropriate resources, so that resources, competence and attitude can be properly aligned with each other” (Sha, 2011, p. 1145). Essentially, the author argues that the project governance structure actually allocates control to those who have the greater capacity and capability to positively influence project outcomes. The lack of project governance leads to project underperformance, due to potential opportunistic behaviour and lack of alignment or confusing responsibilities of the key actors of the project.

Focusing particularly on networks (described as groups of organisations that participate with a goal to achieve collective output)—which are co-creating environments—Provan & Kenis (2008, p. 235) identify three different governance forms: the Shared Participant governance, the Lead Organisation Governance and the Network Administrative Organisation governance.

The first form refers to networks where all organisations (or most of the organisations) participate equally in the governance and they are in fact responsible for managing the internal and the external network. The power in decision-making is rather symmetrical, and all participants work collectively to maximize the effectiveness of the network’s output. In such governance the objectives are collectively set and the resources are mutually contributed. In such a manner, control is also distributed also equally, and it can be argued that motivation to participate and to ‘create’ is indeed balanced.

The second form refers to networks where one network participant that has greater power or controls the bulk of resources undertakes the governance. In this form centralization is very high, as one network member makes the significant decisions. Consequently, in such a governance form, the lead organisation may set goals that are more close to its interests and make decisions on resources. Thus, it can be argued that as control resides on one party, motivation and creativity can be significantly hampered.
The third form refers to a different approach in governance, one that requires an external, distinctive entity to govern the network, which is formed for the particular reason and purpose of network governance. Here centralisation is again high but it resides with a non-member of the network party (Provan & Kenis, 2008, p. 235).

The project governance structures are significant in influencing project performance and project success mostly due to the fact that they lay the framework that identifies issues of importance. Governance in co-created environments is fundamental because it addresses the following: the type of co-creator, the purpose of co-creation, the locus, the intimacy (the degree of involvement in co-creation), the time and finally the incentives (Roser et al., 2013, p. 28). Essentially, this then provides a rather clear basis on how projects are to be run, what objectives they are to achieve, how they are to be achieved and what is required from each of the project members. Three different structures in co-creation are hierarchical, market-based and relational structures (Roser et al., 2013, p. 28). Each of these structures has a significant impact on how the co-creation will function and on the outputs of the co-creation.

Relational structures and market-based structures are more likely to promote intrinsic motivation of the participants in the co-creation of value due to the mutual trust and perception of shared values and shared goals in the first case and due to the market-based forces or prizes that are relevant in the second case (Roser et al., 2013, p. 28). In projects involving inter-firm partnerships in creative industries (when defining creative industries the author explains that it is the industries that require innovation), governance structures generally tend to be more effective in promoting innovation and creativity (Maskell, 2007, p. 21). These governance structures are looser in the sense of that participants do not have a central governance figure, but rather shared governance or one that is determined by the relationships (Maskell, 2007, p. 21). Furthermore, the governance structures generally set the grounds for control and incentives, which means minimising opportunistic behaviour and emerging incentives for providing motivation for participation that improves outputs and outcomes (Demit & Lecocq, 2006, p. 1458).

Market structures and hierarchical structures are in favour of one against the other. Market structures favour most incentives while hierarchical favour most control, whereas relational-based structures are in fact in favour of achieving an optimal balance between control intensity and incentives. Governance structures are specifically ‘responsible’ for developing environments in which monitoring (control) is balanced with empowerment (signalling creativity). Such structures require both hierarchical and relational based frameworks (Sundaramurthy & Lewis, 2003, p. 413). Finally, governance based on trust and contractual governance—underpinned by relationships and simultaneous placement of boundaries and frameworks—does in fact promote creativity in contrast with the governance drawn from power, which inhibits creativity (Wang et al., 2008, p. 111).

Project governance has been credited as a critical factor contributing to the overall performance and the success of projects. Project governance is concerned with setting the framework and the structures that determine what objectives are to be achieved, how they are to be achieved and how progress and development are to be controlled and monitored. Essentially, the project governance structure defines relationships between participants, allocates tasks and responsibilities, determines contribution and in its most
effective manifestation promotes a balance between control and motivation or empowerment, which are crucial in co-created dynamic environments.

3.4 Research Proposition

In the project management practice, the environment for co-creation is highly dynamic and leads to a higher degree of uncertainties as the projects within the programme are initiated and created by the participants themselves. Therefore, the organisation should possess high responsiveness towards emerging activities within the highly dynamic project environments by establishing project governance structures. These structures help the organisation to create an environment that balances creativity and control aiming for delivering successful projects. This environment created by the project governance structure is a framework within which the project owners have the freedom to develop project ideas.

Project governance includes decisions on defined clear roles, accountabilities, ensures alignment of the project objectives with the organizational objectives and involvements of all stakeholders (Van der Waldt, 2010, p. 251). It forms an optimised environment within which the projects can be implemented successfully. Additionally, it aims to optimise resource allocation and project prioritisation. Possible problems and obstacles should be defined so actions that encounter them can be implemented (Müller, 2009, p. 17).

Roser et al. (2013) is one of the pioneering studies that investigate project governance structure in the co-creation process. They posit that the project governance structure for co-creative projects consists of a certain mixture among hierarchical, relational, and market-based structures (Roser et al., 2013, p. 28). The hierarchical structure is a top-down governance approach in which the authorities set the rules, frameworks, rewards, and resource allocation for co-creation process. The relational structure exudes trust and builds long-term cooperation. Decisions are made based on two-way communication between co-creators. The market-based structure is the “incentives rooted in the supply and demand for interaction and transactions for which prices or explicit market based value may be determined” (Roser et al., 2013, p. 28).
Figure 4. Propositional Framework

This research aims to complement the study of Roser et al. (2013) by conducting a case study on the co-creative programme of Umeå 2014 as an ECoC. Umeå 2014 is a programme that can also be referred to as an extremely large project (Pellegrinelli, 2011, p. 233). Such a large project requires a governance structure with dynamicity and responsiveness to uncertainties and emerging situations (Miller & Hobbs, 2005, p. 48). Furthermore, there is still no clear definition of co-creative projects. The authors of this thesis define a co-creative project based on the definition of a project from PMBoK (PMI, 2013, p. 1) and the definition of co-creation proposed by Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2000, p. 80) as: “a temporary endeavour undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result involving and encouraging customers as the co-creators of value.”

Based on the theoretical contribution of Roser et al. (2013) and supported by the theoretical frame of reference, the authors of this thesis formulate the following proposition as depicted in Figure 4:

“A co-creative project comprises a mixture of governance structures that is adaptive, dynamic, supportive, built upon trust, as well as balances creativity and control. The co-creation approach developed within the framework provided by the mix of project governance structures will result in enhanced project performance and potential success.”
4 Practical Method

This chapter elaborates the research strategy implemented in this research. Explanations include the research strategy, data collection, interview sample criteria, interview guides and themes. Ultimately, limitations encountered in the interview process and how the data is processed will be discussed in this section. Last but not least, ethical and confidentiality issues will be addressed when they emerge.

![Figure 5. Practical Method](image)

4.1 Research Strategy

The main objective of this thesis is to investigate the most effective project governance structure for co-creative projects, by taking Umeå 2014 as a case study. The unit of research analysis is the Umeå 2014 Organisation as a whole. The case study approach is considered appropriate because this method focuses on “the rich, real-world context in which the phenomena occur” (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 25). Even though case studies have been criticised to be biased, expensive, time-consuming and inclined to utilisation of incomplete data and therefore making researchers unable to deduce and generalise the results when only one single case study is applied (Remenyi et al., 1998, p. 168), the authors chose the case study method due to the nature of the research questions. When the question is about “how” and “why” within “a contemporary set of events” in which the researchers have no or little power to control the environment, case studies can be considered as an appropriate research method in this study (Yin, 2013, p. 14).

Complying with this circumstance, this research will be contextualised within Umeå as the European Capital of Culture 2014 as the choice of a specific organisation. A case is believed to allow the researchers to draw meaningful insights and “can be a very powerful example” when it is a special phenomenon that intrigues curiosity and discussion (Siggelkow, 2007, p. 20). Umeå 2014 is a representative choice of case study because the Project Team applies a co-creation approach in its project management practice. The European Commission Selection Panel also suggested Leeuwarden, which has just been awarded the ECoC 2018, to consult with Umeå 2014 regarding how to infuse and implement the co-creation approach to develop the programme (European Commission, 2013b, p. 10).

4.2 Data Collection Technique

After building the theoretical frame of reference, it is significant to decide whether to use qualitative or quantitative methods for data collection and analysis (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2010, p. 103). The authors aim to conduct a qualitative research method to collect data with the implementation of a deductive approach. Although several
researchers indicate that qualitative research is based on an inductive approach, it is not unreasonable to investigate the subjects using deduction (Hyde, 2000, p. 85).

The decision to conduct a qualitative, non-standardised research was based on the purpose of the investigation. The purpose of this research is confirmatory with exploratory elements that comprise semi-structured interviews in its design. The need for qualitative interviews is derived from the fact that this research focuses on the reasons, roles and attitudes of the interviewees (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 323-324). By following the qualitative research steps, the authors were able to examine the subject through the project team members’ eyes (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 630) and to investigate in-depth and in a detailed way the project governance structure within the decision-making that occurs (Barker et al., 2002, p. 74). Due to the exploratory elements embedded in the nature of this research, it was essential to follow this method because of the potential aspect that could arise during the investigation that were not expected and initially studied in the literature review (Barker et al., 2002, p. 74). It was also chosen due to the need for recognising patterns in participants’ responses (Silverman, 2011, p. 16).

As qualitative researchers, it is imperative to conduct research with open-mindedness (Janesick, 2000, p. 384). To maintain the open-mindedness, the authors attempt to be flexible in data collection and take this flexibility as “controlled opportunism in which researcher take advantage of uniqueness of a species and the emergence of new themes” that contribute to the research results (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 539). The authors have stimulated their “theoretical sensitivity” through studies of existing literature, past experiences and backgrounds that build the theoretical frame of reference and the a priori proposition (Strauss, 1987, p. 11).

This qualitative research comprises the ‘collection, organisation and interpretation’ (Malterud, 2001, p. 483) of semi-structured interviews for extracting the empirical data. The authors chose to implement semi-structured and open-ended interviews to collect the data that answer the research questions and try different angles on capturing meaning (Wacquant, 1992a). The authors gave the freedom to the interviewees to express themselves in their own way (Barker et al., 2002, p. 74). However, when transcribing and interpreting the interviews, pauses, body language, and overlaps were not systematically documented. This somehow weakens the reliability of the qualitative research (Silverman, 2011, p. 20).

### 4.3 Respondent Criteria

The semi-structured interview aims to retrieve information to verify the a priori theory and the proposition on the project governance structures in co-creative projects, as well as to explain why and how these structures are implemented. As previously elaborated, Umeå 2014 is the case study chosen to shed light on the research questions. The Umeå 2014 Project Team is a small organisation that consists of 25 people (as of December 2013) with different roles and responsibilities (Umeå2014, 2013b). The authors apply purposive sampling and choose the respondents of their interests in a critical and careful manner to ensure that the required parameters are included (Silverman, 2011, p. 388) and will answer the research questions (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 237). Respondent criteria are established in order to “go into organisations with a well-defined focus—to
collect specific kinds of data systematically” regardless “how small our sample or what our interest” (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 585).

The respondent criteria are decided based on the roles and responsibilities of each project team member as elaborated on Umeå 2014’s official website (as of November 2013). Based on the research questions, it is clear that the respondents will be those who are co-creatively involved in any of those processes—bidding process of Umeå 2014 as ECoC, communication with the political board for higher level of decision-making processes, project selection process, project control, project governance, both internal and external funding, and programme planning and production. In the preliminary selection, 15 qualified respondents were selected. Considering the amount of potential respondents, the authors believe that the samples “within the boundaries of the defined population” will be diverse enough to contribute to different elements within the research questions (Ritchie et al., 2003, p. 83).

4.4 Interview Procedures

After setting the respondent criteria, the authors first consulted with the thesis supervisor—Associate Professor Nils Wåhlin, who is leading the research project on Umeå 2014 (Wåhlin, 2012)—regarding the organisational culture and how to approach potential respondents of Umeå 2014. Firstly, he suggested conducting a pilot interview with the External Funding Coordinator, Stina Lindholm, who has been in close contact with Umeå University. The pilot interview was set on November 25, 2013, through the help of Associate Professor Wåhlin. The authors managed to test the interview guide, to obtain basic insights on the organisational structure and initial insights on the project governance within the Umeå 2014 Project Team, as well as the names of key persons that should be interviewed.

After the pilot interview, interview requests were sent via e-mail to the rest of the potential respondents. In total, 13 interviews were completed (Appendix 2). Interviews were conducted individually on time and in places that the respondents decided in order to make them feel most comfortable (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 329). On the other hand, the authors also realised that it was the busiest period of the year for preparation, evaluations, and production of the Opening Ceremony, since the ECoC year will officially begin on January 31, 2014. Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face to obtain immediate answers, to follow-up questions and to capture emotions, tones, facial expressions, body language and gestures of the respondents (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 216). However, there were two exceptions. One interview was conducted through Skype due to the geographic location and the other one was conducted with another research group due to the respondent’s limited availability. In general, most respondents allocated their time between 30 and 80 minutes for each interview. Regardless the interview length, each respondent is considered to have provided comprehensive answers contributing to the research questions in a satisfactory way.

The authors follow the interpretivism approach to conduct a case study in which ethics are considered to be intrinsic due to the collaboration between the authors and the respondents to build knowledge (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 115). Each interview was conducted in English starting with the interviewers’ self-introduction and a brief of the research purpose as an overview and an icebreaker. The interviewers asked for
interviewee’s consent to record and use the interview data for the research purposes. All respondents were very open and gave their consent to use the information provided for the thesis. As a matter of fact, they were very curious and requested that the authors should share the research results. After obtaining the consent, the respondent was asked to give a brief introduction about previous experiences, background, and role and responsibilities within the organisation. Most of the time both interviewers asked questions based on the interview guideline. However, there was no prior specific arrangement between both interviewers regarding assigning specific questions to ask during the interview. The interviewers asked questions in the interview guideline and follow-up questions spontaneously depending to the actual circumstances and emerging topics that occurred. The respondents were well informed that interviews were recorded, transcribed, and would only be used for this thesis work.

4.5 Interview Guide Design

As this thesis infuses an exploratory element in the nature of the research questions, it is appropriate to conduct non-standardised qualitative interviews (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 320). The interview guide consists of themes developed from the theoretical frame of reference in Chapter 3. However, the authors are aware that this guide should not restrict them; instead, they should aim for “an unbroken discussion” with the respondents and manage to ask all relevant questions even though the sequences are not in order based on the guide (Easterby-Smith et al., 2012, p. 127).

The interview guide consists of the nine following themes: Organisational Structure of Umeå 2014; the Concept of Co-creation; Project Governance; Project Selection Classification and Prioritisation; Project Performance; Challenges and Obstacles; Possible Improvements in the Governance Structure; Conclusions; and Closure. Questions are elaborated and listed in each theme as shown in Appendix 1.

The key objectives of the interview themes are as follows:

1. Organisational Structure: This theme provides background information about the roles and responsibilities of project team members, the organisational structure of Umeå 2014 and its relationship with the Umeå Municipality.
   a. Introduction: The researchers’ backgrounds and research purpose are introduced, followed by asking respondent’s consent, background, past experience, current roles and responsibilities, as well as his/her influence in the decision-making process in the organisation.
   b. Umeå Municipality: This theme aims to understand the roles of the Umeå Municipality as an enabler in the co-creation process through open source strategy of the ECoC Project during the bidding process until now, to have a general overview of the organisational structure.
   c. Umeå 2014 Project Team: Understanding the organisational structure of Umeå 2014 Project Team is crucial to identify how they deal with the decision-making processes.
2. The Concept of Co-creation: This theme is announced to understand how Umeå 2014 implements the co-creation process, what kind of co-creation mechanism they adopt, and the key elements for a conducive environment to foster co-creation.

3. Project Governance: This investigates the common project governance structure applied by Umeå 2014 to manage projects—whether it is hierarchical, relational, or market-based one—in accordance to the a priori proposition.

4. Project Selection, Classification, and Prioritisation: Probing into the selection, classification and prioritisation of projects within the Umeå 2014 Programme is essential because this determines the project governance structure they are applying.

5. Project Performance: As project governance is related to project control and guidance that will affect project performance, it is crucial to investigate the current results and progress of the co-creation approach and the open source strategy and to identify the long-term objectives of Umeå 2014 Project in relation to the City Development Plan 2050.

6. Challenges and Obstacles: This theme aims to identify challenges and obstacles during the whole project life cycle of Umeå 2014.

7. Possible Improvements in the Governance Structure: This question is intended to acquire ideas from respondents regarding how to improve the governance structure to enhance project performance of Umeå 2014.

8. Conclusions: This theme is to confirm the a priori proposition that the project governance structure for the co-creative projects is dynamic depending on the nature and current stage of the project.

9. Closure: The last part of the interview is the concluding remarks as a summary from the discussions and some final clarifications on parts that were unclear. At the end, the interviewers expressed appreciation for respondent’s time and willingness to participate in the research.

4.6 Interview Limitations

The backgrounds of the interviewers and a brief of the research purpose were always presented at the beginning of every interview. The semi-structured interview guideline was designed based on the theoretical frame of reference in Chapter 3. The authors have prescribed the respondent criteria and they are aware of the risk of being biased in the data. However, half of the total population of Umeå 2014 fulfilled the respondent criteria and managed to give interviews with honest and consistent answers. Two respondents informed that there were time constraints and limited availability. Despite these restrictions, these respondents still managed to answer key questions raised in the interview. There was no significant effect towards the data collection because some questions were merely verifications of answers obtained from other respondents.
All interviews were recorded with the interviewees’ consents. Most of interviewees did not find the presence of a recording device as intimidating and managed to answer questions openly, enthusiastically, and honestly. Even though language might be a potential barrier, all respondents have good command of English. However, the interviewers were aware that the respondents would feel more comfortable and expressive answering in their native language. In any cases of ambiguity or confusions in the questions or answers, the interviewees and respondents would clarify with each other.

4.7 Primary Data Processing

During the data analysis, the authors always keep each other informed about the progress of interpretation and analysis to give the opportunity to avoid misunderstanding and maintain effective teamwork between them (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 329).

Qualitative data analysis is the process of “extracting meanings from their content” (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 324) that is demanding and complex (Dierckx de Casterlé et al., 2012, p. 361). There is no fixed process of this analysis (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 490) and it is the researcher’s responsibility to choose the technique. The authors utilise a coding technique to analyse the interview data with the purpose of identifying patterns in the empirical data that coincide with the existing theories investigated in Chapter 3 and then approve or reject the a priori proposition. The initial themes chosen will be the guide of the data collected coding and analysis according to the deductive approach followed (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 500-501).

The researchers will implement the following steps for the qualitative data analysis—the integration between “The Qualitative Analysis Guide of Leuven (QUAGOL)” with the three types of processes of qualitative data analysis described by Saunders et al. (2009, p. 492)—within the deductive context (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 401). This technique is as follows:

1. Summary of meanings: After the interviews are completed, the researchers create summaries of the content of the interviews and keep notes related to the research questions and purpose (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 492).

   a. Reading transcriptions: After transcribing the interviews, the transcriptions will be examined to understand the general idea of the interviewee’s perspective on the subject investigated. The transcriptions were sent to the respondents for verification.

   b. Reports: After examining the transcriptions, reports are generated based on the research questions. Prioritisation will be given to the transcriptions with most information connected to the research question.

   c. Filtering: The next step of the process is to filter the reports created in the previous step and derive the most important elements and notions related to the research questions and purpose. This structuring of ideas is essential since the general reports become specific material. This filtering process is conducted by
Microsoft Excel, in which the authors compile these main ideas from the reports.

d. After filtering process: After filtering, a comparison between the filtered reports with the initial transcribed interview data will occur in order to recognise potential missing concepts. (Dierckx de Casterlé et al., 2012, p. 365-366)

2. Deriving categories: The authors derive categories based on the literature investigated in order to form the research proposition. These categories are used as a guide to list the concepts retrieved from the filtering process (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 492).

a. Pattern recognition: The authors identify patterns between transcribed interviews and create a report with all concepts that emerged and connected to the research questions and proposition built. This is an important stage, because it allows the authors to recognise common topics and validate findings based on common expressed answers to specific questions.

b. Listing: The common topics recognised, the patterns and also the themes emerging from the filtering are listed.

c. Comparison of the listed concept with the transcriptions: The purpose of this stage is to validate that the key concepts are connected to the initial interview passages.

d. Citations check and deep understanding of the key concepts: The citation of the concepts is checked in order to identify possible mismatch. This might lead to potential correction of the citation. The next step of this stage is the deeper understanding of the key concepts and the depiction of their meaning and characteristics (refer to Chapter 5).

e. Framework creation: The meanings and concepts generated in the previous stage are put in the categories derived from the literature investigated (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 502) and then again tested with the initial transcriptions in order to verify the connection (Dierckx de Casterlé et al., 2012, p. 367-368).

3. Structuring and deeper analysis of the empirical data

a. Structuring proposition verification: The final step in the process is the proposition verification and the structuring of the most important findings along with the deeper analysis and conclusions of the research (Dierckx de Casterlé et al., 2012, p. 368).

4.8 Secondary Data Processing

In order to increase the reliability of the research findings from the interviews, the authors decided to conduct a secondary analysis on Umeå 2014 project owners’ perspectives regarding the co-creation mechanism. The secondary data was retrieved from a research assistant who was conducting research to gather data that could be beneficial for the Live Case Assignment on Umeå 2014 for MSPME students under the
supervision of Professor Tomas Blomquist from the Umeå School of Business and Economics (USBE). The research assistant had conducted interviews with six project owners of Umeå 2014 during September 20-27, 2013. The authors have requested permission from Professor Blomquist to use these primary data as the secondary data to support this thesis work. These interview data had been summarised into six documents and they would be used as an additional reference. The authors were not involved in the collection of the primary data (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 326).

The secondary data analysis is implemented in order to verify the findings derived from the primary data and due to the time constraints rendering it impossible to conduct interviews personally with the project owners within the Umeå 2014 Programme. Furthermore, the secondary data are used to support the research purpose and “to partially answer the research question(s)” (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 256) by building relationships with the primary data collected (Irwin, 2013, p. 296). The secondary data are processed with the same procedure as the primary data. Main themes will be derived from the interview questions in Appendix 4. The empirical findings derived from the secondary data will be verified with the relevant information gathered from the primary data analysis and the theoretical frame of reference.
5 Empirical Findings and Analysis

This chapter presents the empirical findings and analysis of the investigation on the project governance structure of Umeå 2014 based on the interview findings and secondary data.

The authors present the organisational structure of Umeå 2014 Office to give a holistic picture of how it functions and the project environment in which the Project Team is working in. Supported by the academic literature, the empirical findings are presented based on the respondents’ perspectives and the authors’ interpretations of the interview data. The analysis follows the propositional framework of this research called ‘the Eye of Co-Creation’ as illustrated below. Through “the Eye of Co-Creation,” the project performance and success can be achieved by implementing a co-creation approach within the project governance framework. In other words, the co-creation approach acts as a seed that will grow into project performance and success only when the project governance helps to create the right environment.

5.1 Organisational Structure

Before probing into the governance structure of Umeå 2014, it is crucial to understand the organisational structure of Umeå 2014 and its relationship with the Umeå Municipality and European Commission. The whole organisational structure of Umeå is depicted in Figure 8 (Lindholm, 2013, p. 16).
Umeå 2014 established a “company” in order to manage funding from external sources. The Umeå 2014 organisation holds accountability to the political boards consisting of City Council, Executive Board, ECoC Committee, and Monitoring Committee in Brussels. The Director or CEO is in charge of the overall management of the Project Team and is supported by the Leadership Team, which is in charge of communication, funding, administration, and artistic contents. At the operational level, there are three teams responsible for the programme, communication, and funding, respectively. (Lindholm)

Consisting of around 20 full-time employees at the time of the investigation (Tenevall; Weinichall), Umeå 2014 is the smallest ECoC office in the history (Edman; Lindegren), as well as “among the smallest cities ever to host an ECoC” (Åkerlund & Müller, 2012, p. 171). The organisational structure within the Umeå 2014 Project Team is quite flat and flexible (Abrahamsson; Vähä), even though it can be “quite chaotic in some ways” (Eriksson Fredriksson). Despite the lean structure, “every department in the Municipality somehow is involved” in providing assistance and resources to the Umeå 2014 Office (Abrahamsson; Lindholm). After Umeå 2014, the project close-out will take around half a year until June 2015 (Lindegren; Vähä) and then the office will be dismantled and some of the project team members will continue to work within the Umeå Municipality (Björinge; Vähä) “so that the knowledge would still be in the organisation” (Lindegren).

### 5.1.1 Umeå 2014 Project Team

As of December 25, 2013, the Umeå 2014 Project Team consists of 25 people (Umeå2014, 2013b). The number of employees in the Umeå 2014 Office has changed...
several times during this thesis work. The full list of 13 respondents is presented in Appendix 2. In the presentation of empirical findings and analysis, the authors will refer the respondents by their last name(s). First, the background, roles and responsibilities, and influence in the decision-making process of each respondent are introduced below.

**Respondent 1: Stina Lindholm, External Funding Coordinator**

Stina Lindholm is educated as a cultural analyst with law and project management knowledge. She has been involved in different organisations to work within organisational and city development. Currently, she is the Coordinator for External Funding in Umeå 2014. Her main responsibilities are providing consultancy, coaching, and networking to project owners who are seeking funding from external sources (e.g., companies, sponsorships, etc.). In December 2013, she will start working on the long-term legacy issues of Umeå 2014. (Lindholm)

**Respondent 2: Marcus Weinehall, Glass House**

Marcus Weinehall completed his education in International Cultural Tourism in 2009 and started working for Umeå 2014 as an intern back in April 2010. Currently, he is fully responsible for the Glass House and seven opening ceremonies. Weinehall has the full authority to decide activities that will take place in the Glass House. The idea of the Glass House was born in 2010 after Fredrik Lindegren, the Artistic Director of Umeå 2014, visited another city that was applying for the ECoC. The Glass House is aimed to be a marketing medium for anyone who would like to participate in Umeå 2014. It was supposed to be removed in 2011, however it is still being kept due to its success in attracting public attention and interests. This venue will continue to be an important venue with a myriad of interesting public activities and events until and beyond 2014. (Weinehall)

**Respondent 3: Robert Tenevall, Cultural Boost**

Prior to Umeå 2014, Robert Tenevall was a festival and theatre producer who has collaborated with a lot of artists and in music festivals. Hence, he has experience in the co-creation approach. In Umeå 2014, Tenevall is in charge of the Cultural Boost, a micro funding resource for small projects and initiatives. He is involved in the programme group to decide which projects can be brought up to the political board to get funding. Aside from these responsibilities, he also handles the database that keeps track on all projects. (Tenevall)

**Respondent 4: Jan Björinge, CEO**

Jan Björinge is the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Umeå 2014 and mainly deals with the general management of the organisation. Educated in economics, Björinge has been city manager of Umeå for 13 years and in Härnösand for two years. He was responsible for the bidding process and he has an overall influence in the decision-making process since he is managing the whole project team. Working with co-creation is not a new idea for Björinge since he has been practicing this approach from the time when he became a city manager. (Björinge)
Respondent 5: Shauna Adams, Programme Producer

As the programme producer of Umeå 2014, Shauna Adams has 25 years of experience in cultural and art production, and is in charge of the overall operative planning for implementation of the whole programme since September 2012. As a native Canadian, she was a professional classical clarinettist who started to enter the opera world focusing on theatre, art and stage production. She moved to Sweden around 15 years ago and re-educated herself in visual arts in Luleå. As the Programme Producer, she is responsible for making contracts, databases, ways of working, routines, and strategic planning. (Adams)

Respondent 6: Margareta Ling, Coordinator

Margareta Ling is the Coordinator of the programme group and in charge of all project proposals. Prior to her post in Umeå 2014, she was a language teacher for 30 years and has worked within the administration of City of Umeå. Aside from keeping track on all projects, she is also involved in the decision-making process of which projects that should be addressed to the political board of the ECoC year for co-financing. She also handles all enquiries related to the project proposals. (Ling)

Respondent 7: Ellacarin Blind, Sámi Producer

Ellacarin Blind works full-time for the National Union of the Swedish Sámi People in Sweden and only part-time for Umeå 2014. Her main responsibilities are creating links and networks among Sámi projects and other partners for acquiring external financial support. (Blind)

Respondent 8: Anne Wuolab, Producer

As a producer of Umeå 2014, Anne Wuolab focuses on the Sámi cultural projects in the Opening Ceremony. Her main responsibilities are to present the Sámi Culture and see how it is represented in the Umeå 2014 Programme. The main production she is in charge of is the Opening Ceremony, where there will be a Sámi Square with a myriad of Sámi Cultural activities, political discussions, and so on. (Wuolab)

Respondent 9: Dan Vähä, Administration Manager

Dan Vähä is the Head of Administration of Umeå 2014 since May 2013. He is mainly responsible for the financial management, personnel logistics, and being a part of the decision-making process with the political board. He is also involved in signing contracts for projects co-financed by Umeå 2014. Prior to his current position, he was the Head of the Nordmaling Municipality and has a ten-year experience as a manager in community planning offices. (Vähä)

Respondent 10: Fredrik Lindegren, Artistic Director

With extensive experience of 15 years as stage actor and director at theatres and opera performances, Fredrik Lindegren has been involved in Umeå 2014 since 2006 during the bidding process. In 2007, he was appointed as the Head of the Cultural Department of Umeå Municipality. Lindegren presented the Umeå 2014 proposal for the final
decision in September 2009. His role as the Artistic Director of Umeå 2014 began in November 2009 and he is mainly responsible for communication with the political boards to decide about bigger projects (i.e., above 100,000 SEK), while he can make decisions for projects below 100,000 SEK within the project team. Together with the programme group, Lindegren is building the whole programme for the ECoC year of Umeå. (Lindegren)

**Respondent 11: Tina Eriksson Fredriksson, Programme Planning**

With a finance background, Tina Eriksson Fredriksson has been involved in different roles in the National Art Council and has worked in many projects with NorrlandsOperan. In relation to Umeå 2014, Tina was deeply involved in the preparation of documents for the bidding process of Umeå 2014. Her post in the programme planning of Umeå 2014 Opening Ceremony began in 2011 and ended in early December 2013. One of her main responsibilities is to create the dramaturgy of the programme. (Eriksson Fredriksson)

**Respondent 12: Albert Edman, Head of Urban Development and Sustainability**

Albert Edman is the Head of Urban Development and Sustainability of Umeå 2014. As an engineer by background and with experience from international policy institutions, he is responsible for issues related to sustainability, urban development and finance within the context of the horizontal objectives of Umeå 2014. He decides about the national funding for Umeå 2014 projects and manages the relations with the Swedish Government and related cultural institutions. (Edman)

**Respondent 13: Kirsi Abrahamsson, EU Officer**

Kirsi Abrahamsson is the EU Officer based in the International Office of the Umeå Municipality. She is in charge of international projects with the partner cities (i.e., Saskatoon, Canada; Würzburg, Germany; Petrozavodsk, Russia; Vaasa, Finland; Helsingør, Denmark; and Harstad, Norway). Her previous experiences include 25 years of working with Nordic corporations, six years in Copenhagen at the Nordic Council for Ministers, as well as working as the General Secretary for managing the cooperation between Sweden and Finland at the Kvarken Council. (Abrahamsson)

### 5.1.2 The Open Source Strategy

It should always be kept in mind that Umeå 2014 is not a cultural producer in itself (Lindegren, 2013, para. 4). The Cultural Programme of Umeå 2014 is built through an open source strategy (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 12), meaning that Umeå 2014 will welcome project proposals prior to and throughout the ECoC year (Lindholm). The Programme Producer emphasised that they “leave the door open for anyone to come in with proposals” (Adams) and there is no “certain date for an application” (Björinge). The main goal of this strategy is “to investigate the most creative ideas and to get many people to be responsible in the realisation of the [Umeå 2014] programme” (Björinge).
All project proposals are reviewed and selected by the Programme Team, then the shortlisted projects will be taken to the political board for the final funding decision. Those that do not receive funding still can be included in the programme calendar if the project owners are going to undertake these projects (Björinge). When these non-funded projects are “more in line with our [Umeå 2014] ideas,” they will be highlighted and communicated in the Umeå 2014 Website (Lindholm). That is “the co-creation part” (Adams) in which dialogues and collaboration with citizens, artists, universities, cultural operators and businesses as potential project owners take place (Weinehall).

The open source strategy is considered to be “completely unique” and different from other ECoC cities (Lindegren). The results of the open source strategy have been “excellent” (Ling) and they “have a very strong, very impressive programme” (Adams) even though it can be very challenging to create a well-balanced programme (Adams; Lindegren; Vähä). Umeå 2014 Project Team only produces the Opening Ceremonies that highlight the beginning of every Sámi Season (Eriksson Fredriksson; Lindholm; Weinehall) and runs a marketing project called “Caught by Umeå”—touring in eight European cities in collaboration with Jukkasjärvi Ice Hotel to promote the Northern Region and Umeå 2014 (Ling; Weinehall).

As of November 27, 2013, there were 67 project sponsors that have been co-financed by the Political Steering Committee of Umeå 2014 with a total amount of 70 million SEK (Lindegren, 2013, para. 7). It is difficult to know exactly how many projects are being undertaken within Umeå 2014 Programme because of the open source strategy that keeps “the door open” (Adams) to “have ideas coming the whole time from the people who want to work in the projects” (Blind). Based on the database, there are over 300 registrations, approximately 80 Cultural Boost Projects (Adams) that result in “over 40 festivals, over 90 big happenings” (Weinehall). Even prior to the start of the ECoC year, Umeå 2014 calendar always has “at least one event every day” (Weinehall).

5.2 The Co-Creation Approach

The co-creation approach is implemented in Umeå 2014 “in order to make a creative programme” and “also for [making] better decisions” (Björinge), meaning that these better decisions will help to reduce risks (Ind et al., 2013, p. 8). The aim of co-creation is “about fostering what you have, making it grow” so that it will become “something that will evolve long term” (Adams). Having “a good vision” will motivate potential co-creators to contribute to the concept and create “a common story” (Eriksson Fredriksson). It is like “making a big puzzle” and “trying to build the picture” (Adams). The co-creation approach through an open source strategy implemented by Umeå 2014 has been fruitful (Adams; Lindegren; Ling; Vähä); fewer than five projects within the programme “have not been able to follow through and have lost their finance” from Umeå 2014 (Adams). This is “a living evidence that the platform is working” (Adams).

5.2.1 Mechanism and Environment of Co-Creation

Projects in Umeå 2014 can come from anyone, such as experts, cultural associations, NGOs, artists, or anyone who is interested (Björinge; Blind; Tenevall; Weinehall). There are two types of projects—“traditional grant” and “Cultural Boost” (Björinge; Lindholm; Tenevall). Both of them are the same in terms of application procedure, with
the only difference being the financing. The application procedure is to submit project proposals explaining the main ideas, project plan, and budget (Lindegren). For the traditional grant, every project is usually co-financed from different sources of funding (Lindholm; Ling; Weinshall). Umeå 2014 will only “give partial funding to run the projects” (Adams). The office will co-finance a project up to 50% and the rest will be co-funded from other sources, such as the European Commission, companies, and so on (Ling; Weinshall; Abrahamsson). Co-creators can consult with the Umeå 2014 Project Team for coaching and networking to find external funding (Lindholm; Ling; Tenevall). For the Cultural Boost, it is decided within the Programme Team led by the Artistic Director (Lindegren; Tenevall). All projects should meet the criteria that are clearly written in the project application (Adams; Björinge; Lindegren; Lindholm; Ling; Tenevall; Weinshall).

In order to make co-creation successful, Umeå 2014 strives to create an environment that fosters co-creation by creating a platform that supports funding, communication, planning and marketing of projects (Lindholm), as well as giving tools, networks, and coaching to co-creators about how to seek other sources of funding (Weinshall). In general, the Umeå 2014 Project Team acts as a facilitator that gives support and general information of how to get involved in ECoC (Adams; Björinge; Ling; Tenevall; Weinshall). According to the interviews, the environment fostering co-creation incorporates freedom, trust, good partnerships, inner motivations, and sense of ownership.

5.2.2 Freedom and Control

Co-creators should be given freedom in order to be creative and contribute their knowledge to the organisation (Fournier & Lee, 2009, p. 110). The freedom given to the co-creators is not a complete freedom (Eriksson Fredriksson). It is a freedom to be creative and innovative within the framework provided (Weinshall). This framework is officially stated in the five empowerment objectives and seven horizontal goals that can be found in the project application form (Adams; Lindegren; Ling).

Contracts and written agreements are two main tools that Umeå 2014 uses to control the projects. Contracts apply for traditional projects (Adams; Lindegren; Ling), while written agreements for Cultural Boost (Tenevall). The contract is “a formal legal document that confirms and regulates the entire agreement…every contract is a little bit different for every project” (Adams). The Programme Team will have individual meetings with each project owner to customise the contracts (Weinshall). The contract “explains the respective rules and responsibilities of project owners” and “the rule is to keep us updated” (Ling). Funding is given based on the nature and needs of the project (Adams; Tenevall; Vähä). Project owners should deliver the results and hand in reports consisting of economic analyses of inbounds and outbounds along with the receipts to provide financial transparency (Tenevall).

Umeå 2014 does not control the procedures of the project since the project owners are experts (Lindholm) and “the artistic level is very high without us having to control it” (Adams). The project owners can run projects with their own ways and can contact Umeå 2014 when substantial changes and major issues occur (Adams; Lindholm; Ling; Tenevall; Weinshall). After a project is approved for funding, there will be an official meeting where the contract is signed and rules and responsibilities are explained and
clearly written (Adams; Ling). There will be gate review meetings and follow-ups conducted by the Programme Team (i.e., Fredrik Lindegren, Shauna Adams, Margareta Ling, and Robert Tenevall) to keep the project on track (Lindholm; Weinehall). The frequency of these meetings depends on the need of the project that is decided by the project owner (Tenevall). Umeå 2014 has established a database that can keep track of all projects (Adams; Tenevall).

Since the projects are co-financed from different sources, Umeå 2014 imposes control only on the part they fund (Lindholm). If a project is not successful in finding another co-financing source, Umeå 2014 Project Team is always open for a dialogue to find a solution to make the project happen through finding external funding or sponsorships, applying for other grants, and making adjustments of the project scope (Adams; Lindegren; Lindholm; Abrahamsson). For projects that are not funded and the project owners still would like to be a part of Umeå 2014 Programme, the Project Team is not responsible for them (Vähä). The Municipality of Umeå already has basic procedures that one should follow “if someone is trying to make an event…so this is a kind of control…there are five or six permissions they need to get” (Vähä).

For every type of project within Umeå 2014 that fails to deliver, the project owner is obliged to return the funding (Adams; Björinge; Lindegren; Lindholm; Tenevall). The amount of the penalty depends on the situations (Adams; Väha, 2013). Situations that demand the project owner to return the funding are: (1) when there is an unapproved major change that changes the whole project, (2) when the project period changes without notice, and (3) when the project does not manage to acquire adequate financing (Adams). However, Umeå 2014 does not want to “draw hard lines” (Adams) and there is always a room for dialogues and discussions to find solutions (Abrahamsson; Adams). Project termination is done through stopping the funding (Lindholm; Weinehall). If there is a slight shortage of funding, the project owner can have a dialogue with the Project Team to request a little amount of additional funding (Adams). The main aim is to help project owners to make the good project ideas happen (Lindholm).

5.2.3 Trust

Trust is the main element between the Project Team and the project owners (Björinge). The Umeå 2014 Project Team is aware of their influence on the project owners, but they are “careful” and always “keeping the relationship warm” (Adams). They put considerable amount of trust on project owners’ competence (Björinge), which implies that they will deliver the outcomes as written on the contracts and agreements (Weinehall). Communicating “what can be funded and what cannot be funded” clearly should be done at the beginning (Tenevall) because “we are all investing in the success of projects” (Adams) and “it is all about relationships” (Adams). They aim to foster relationships that support the projects (Adams; Björinge) by giving responsibilities and trust (Eriksson Fredriksson) that will “keep the good spirit” (Weinehall). As a matter of fact, there has been a long record of relationship with the majority of co-creators “since they are already in the [Umeå] Municipality system base funding” (Lindegren). The trust between the project owner and the project team is realised in the contract to make the open source strategy work (Lindegren; Vähä). Co-creation is “all about relationships” and emphasises on the “quality of the interactions between people” (Roser et al., 2009, p. 3). Without trust, the potential co-creators will not be willing to participate and contribute to the organisation (Ind et al., 2013, p. 21).
5.2.4 Inner Motivation

For project owners, one of the main inner motivations to participate in Umeå 2014 is the fulfilment of their cultural and artistic ideals that drive their business (Lindholm; Ling; Weinehall). This kind of inner motivation is self-initiated and “forcing collaborations…will not work” (Adams). Through Umeå 2014, the project owners have more resources to deliver more ambitious projects (Ling) and “they have the sense of ownership of what they want to do, so they are motivated to do that [which is] different from the traditional project management” (Wuolab). However, some project owners can be “too protective on their ideas and this affects the way they associate with our organisation” (Tenevall).

The citizens of Umeå are motivated to participate in Umeå 2014 because they would like to be “a part of Umeå” (Lindholm). “They are very proud of their city” (Ling). The motivations are different for each citizen (Björinge) and more of “personal interests and passion about something” (Tenevall). Umeå 2014 is connected to the long-term objectives of the city itself and people care about their city, which is “a fundamental part of societies” to achieve sustainable growth (Edman). For the Sámi people in particular, the main inner motivation is to utilise Umeå 2014 as a platform to provide knowledge about Sámi people, as well as “to raise questions in politics, in arts, in literatures, in theatre” (Blind) so that “their voice will be heard nationally and at the European level” (Edman).

It is also crucial to understand the social and political perspectives of the citizens, media, cultural operators, Sámi people, and politicians regarding Umeå 2014 as perceived by the Project Team. The citizens of Umeå has the spirit to oppose to everything that is going on in the city, “which is kind of [the] strength of Umeå” (Edman) that people are critical and always question (Björinge). There has always been “negative voice” saying that the taxpayers’ money “should have [been] used for something else [rather than the ECoC]” (Abrahamsson) such as welfare, schools, and so on (Edman). Actually people of Umeå were quite sceptical when Umeå won the bid (Weinehall) because “they do not know what the capital culture year really is” (Björinge). However, the citizens have been involved in project applications (Vähä). For example, there are around 25 applications submitted to the Cultural Boost every month (Tenevall). As a matter of fact, media has been influential in shaping citizens’ perspectives on Umeå 2014 (Adams). People are now changing their perspectives (Weinehall) and “waiting to see what is going to happen…they want growth, they want people to come to Umeå” (Adams). The Project Team believes that people will be proud of Umeå to be the ECoC 2014 (Björinge; Ling; Tenevall; Weinehall).

The media had been criticising Umeå 2014 since the decision was made to participate in the bidding process (Weinehall). After winning the bid, the media has been putting the spotlight on Umeå 2014 ever since. A lot of debates have been going on in the media about urban development and other issues that affect citizens’ perspectives (Adams; Weinehall) and also put tremendous pressure on the Umeå 2014 Project Team (Tenevall). However, the media’s negative perspective has slowly changed after Umeå 2014 showed their current achievements and progress (Weinehall). Culture had never been on the top of the politicians’ agenda, but the designation and progress of Umeå 2014 have succeeded to make culture “become number one” (Weinehall). The amount
of budget allocated for Umeå 2014 is only a small part of the total annual budget of the whole Municipality of Umeå (Edman; Weinehall), but the outcomes so far have been extremely fruitful and satisfying (Adams; Lindegren; Ling; Vähä) because the cultural operators have been proactively contributing with ideas about projects to Umeå 2014 (Tenevall). They “do not force people, it is a volunteering process” (Björinge).

The Sámi perspectives have been embedded in the Cultural Programme of Umeå 2014. Sámi people are positive about being involved in the ECoC because they perceive it as an opportunity to raise awareness to the national government and the society in general about the mining law and other policies that have affected the livelihood of the Sámi people in the Northern Region (Blind). Umeå 2014 will be “a good opportunity to start a dialogue, to start the information and knowledge campaign and to bring out today’s Sámi [situation]” because “the knowledge about [the] Sámi [people] is very limited” (Wuolab).

Based on the abovementioned findings, monetary rewards are not the main motivations of co-creators to participate in Umeå 2014. Clearly stated in the first bid application of ECoC 2014, Umeå 2014 strives to harness the “Passion and Curiosity” through “the Art of Co-creation” that will help create dialogues among potential co-creators leading to building meaningful projects together that contributes to the long-term development (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 16). It is the “intrinsic motivation” that drives the co-creators to be creative because they perceive Umeå 2014 as a designation that grows interests and involves people, as well as challenging and rewarding (Amabile, 1997, p. 39-40).

## 5.3 Project Governance

### 5.3.1 Strategic Alignment

Through the process of fulfilling these criteria, the alignment of the organisational objectives with the project objectives is achieved initially “because that’s how they get in [to the Umeå 2014 Programme]. They have to be aligned with the overall [objectives] and that’s what has been great. Even with such a short period of time, the work that we’ve done has been amazing and we’re able to map the programme, we’re able to make a good decision so that we have a good balanced programme…[we are] really proud” (Adams).

After the year of 2014 there will be different evaluations in order to ensure strategic alignment and measure the success of the projects. The Project owners have to provide a report in which they analyse the economic aspects and also the general aspects such as how many people visit the event, how many were contributing to the program and how they did work on the horizontal objectives (Adams; Edman; Vähä). An independent firm, PwC, which follows the projects from the beginning to the end, will provide economic reviews (Björinge; Tenevall). The European Union will also request for the evaluation report, while Umeå School of Business and Economics will finish the research on Umeå 2014 (Björinge; Edman). Furthermore, the Swedish government, specifically the Department of Culture, will evaluate if the taxpayers’ money were spent in the right direction and the interactions with the national institutions (Björinge; Lindegren).
5.3.2 Decision-Making for Funding

Following the open source strategy, all projects coming from external sources are not run by the organisation. There is a mix of hierarchical and relational governance structures that leads to decision making whether to fund or not a project. In the two levels of decision-making, the political board and the Umeå 2014 office (Vähä), there is a democratic process of selecting projects to fund. The governance structure provides the frames that provide the organisation with the means to obtain the targets set (Pemsel & Müller, 2012, p. 871; Williams et al., 2010, p. 41). The political board (Tenevall) along with the European Union (EU) set the frames (hierarchical) that support the Umeå 2014 Organisation to obtain the goals set. The EU is not involved in the artistic content that is formed by the project owners and brought for validation to the political board by the artistic director and the administrator (Adams). Within the project management office, there is the administration team including the communication manager, the administrator, the artistic director and the external funding manager (Lindholm; Vähä). The management and administrative teams can only make decisions for projects with budget lower than 100,000 SEK (Lindegren) and for Cultural Boost with budget up to 20,014 SEK (Tenevall).

For project with higher amount of budget, the political board has to decide and then the contracts are signed (Vähä). The Programme Team will select project proposals and then these will be brought to the political board for the final decision-making regarding budget and frames (Weinehall). The administration team influences the political board but do not make the final decision (Vähä). Before the application is examined by the political board, there is a bureaucratic process of preparing the document by the project owners. The application form has to be filled and sent to the Umeå 2014 Office in which it is stamped and further discussed with the project owner (Lindegren). Potential improvements of the application is discussed to consider whether the criteria are fulfilled and whether external funding issues exist, even though most of project owners are operators that do projects every year and have relevant experience (Tenevall). When the decision is made, the project owners usually “get the money when they start, in the middle, and in the end of the project” (Vähä).

On the other hand, in projects run by Umeå 2014 such as the Opening Ceremony, there is a strict hierarchical organisation that even could be considered as similar to military operations. In “a military operation production, there’s no room for democracy really, everybody has to be in a clear role, everybody has to have their hat on” (Adams). The relationship with the political boards is hierarchical when it comes to the decision-making for the programme frameworks and funding for large projects (Lindegren; Lindholm; Vähä). After the frame is set by the political board, the project owners will have the freedom within that frame (Adams; Björinge; Tenevall). The main reason for this bureaucratic procedure is to ensure that Umeå 2014 is “feeding long-term cultural growth and not one-offs” (Adams) and the budget comes from the taxpayers’ money that “has to be handled in a regulated way” (Lindegren).

5.3.3 Project Selection, Classification, and Prioritisation

Selecting and prioritising the right projects leads to achieving the strategic objectives and sustainability (Williams et al., 2010, p. 41). Umeå 2014 organisation aims to construct an interesting and diversified programme that will be based on the eight Sámi...
seasons, (Vähä; Wuolab) eight themes (Lindegren; Vähä) and seven horizontal goals (Lindholm). All projects are kept on a database within which different types of reports can be generated in order to identify what is missing to maintain the balance of the programme and make it exciting (Björinge; Weinehall).

In order to balance the programme in each category, decisions are made “case by case” and there is an organic process on project selection (Adams). Except from these criteria, the budget is being considered. The final decision is based on “what we are missing and more about a tighter decision process on what we are willing to support with the money we have left” (Adams). So “the more criteria fulfilled, the more competitive the projects are” (Ling). The selected projects have to be diversified, innovative (Björinge), apply to what is missing, to the available budget, and aim in the long term since Umeå 2014 does not finance one-offs (Adams). The projects have to “be something for the public, something that contributes to the programme…the organisation does not support people who can make profit from the project” (Ling). The decisions made for financing projects should “be wise in budget allocation to ensure that the programme consists of balanced and diversified projects” (Lindegren).

5.3.4 Challenges and Obstacles

Challenges and obstacles in ECoC have been studied by Palmer-Rae Associates (2004). Common challenges encountered in Umeå 2014 are communication, organisational structure, lack of resources and time, and different interests of stakeholders. Obstacles and challenges in the whole process of the programme life cycle derived from the fact that there was “no previous experience” and the Umeå 2014 Project Team learned “on the process” due to the lack of time (Lindholm). Another origin of these problems was the geographical position of Umeå and the fact that few people in Europe could find Umeå on the map (Adams; Björinge; Eriksson Fredriksson; Weinehall). Potential issues and challenges should be anticipated in order to implement corrective measures (Müller, 2009, p. 17).

5.3.4.1 Communication

The communication of the idea and the mechanism of co-creation and funding was a challenge. It is a new strategy implemented in a cultural capital year and "it is really a challenge to let people, the citizen to be the artistic director by themselves, for their project" (Weinehall). “The idea of open source should be clearly defined, communicated, and depicted on the mechanism” (Adams). Initially these ideas as long as with the co-finance strategy were not clearly defined and communicated to the project owners and that resulted in confusion since the people were used to more traditional ways of funding (Lindholm).

The open meetings organised by the Umeå 2014 Organisation were pointing to the direction of making these concepts clear but there was a lack of connection between them and the ideas were not further discussed. “The problem comes when the co-creation is blurry and there is uncertainty in the budget availability and confusions about what the mission is” (Eriksson Fredriksson) and “once you get on your head what the idea of co-creation is all about, there are not many obstacles” (Adams). At the beginning it was not clear that Umeå 2014 does not fund any project 100% and that the
projects selected should fulfil some criteria and frames. “The challenge from the beginning was to make this project known” (Ling). An additional problem was that “everybody thinks they have good ideas but sometimes they are not feasible” (Tenevall). The administration team selects solutions that are sustainable within the frames of a good project governance model (Klakegg et al., 2008, p. S29). It is hard to explain and give feedback to all project owners about the reason of why their project was not selected to get funding (Abrahamsson; Lindegren). Furthermore, Umeå’s geographical position created a challenge in communicating the idea of being Capital of Culture in Sweden and especially across the Swedish borders (Blind).

5.3.4.2 Lack of Resources

The most common problems identified from the interviewees were the limited budget, human resources (Lindholm; Tenevall) and the lack of experienced people who have deep knowledge on co-creation processes (Eriksson Fredriksson). Umeå 2014 aims to build a “programme with the available limited budget and make the best out of it” (Lindegren). Some projects did not get funding because of the limited budget (Björinge) and some other projects got less money than they applied for, which raised the problem of seeking funding from an external source (Adams). Umeå 2014 Office is the smallest ECoC office in history with 20 people (Lindegren). This gives huge pressure to the administration team and it is “not easy to coordinate everything” (Abrahamsson). The lack of manpower resulted in lack of control, limited evaluation of strategic alignment and limited knowledge on project’s total funding from the EU, municipality, Swedish government and external sources (Vähä).

On the other hand, if the main responsibility is left to the project owners and the organisation is not involved in the process of production, a bigger administration office might not be a necessity (Eriksson Fredriksson; Weinehall). Furthermore, not only that the number of personnel is limited but also their knowledge on co-creative process. The limited number of employees combined with the inexperience in that field initially made the roles and responsibilities within the project management office unclear and hard to navigate because everyone was trying to do everything (Eriksson Fredriksson). Lacking resources, poor resource allocation, and unclear roles and responsibilities will lead to conflicts among project team members and participants that will affect project performance (Tillman et al., 2012, p. 6).

5.3.4.3 Roles, Responsibilities and Processes

Each team member should have a clear role in order to contribute their knowledge and competence at their best (Fournier & Lee, 2009, p. 109). The lack of previous experience and the fact that is the first time the co-creative strategy is implemented in an ECoC led to confusions in roles and responsibilities (Tenevall). “It was not clear who makes the decisions...It was unclear, from the board until down to the office” (Vähä). The organisation is very small and everyone was doing the same tasks because the roles and responsibilities were blurry (Eriksson Fredriksson). There was a delay on setting up the organisation and the strategic planning of the programme (Adams). Clear accountability and defined responsibilities are two elements that contribute to the alignment of the strategic objectives with project objectives (Van der Waldt, 2010, p.
and due to the problems that occurred, the administrator and the programme producer were hired.

The administrator defined the administration process, the communication process, the programme process and the management process (Vähä). The programme producer “had to make all the contracts from scratch, the database from scratch, ways of working, routines, systems, strategic planning in a very short period of time” (Adams). All these parts of the governance structure were implemented to enhance the projects’ performance and in a way that promote projects’ stakeholder interests (Müller, 2009, p. 4). The programme planner sets up the governance structure, which if it is absent, may cause negative effects of the projects outcome (Tillman et al., 2012, p. 6, Garland, 2009, p. 8).

5.3.4.4 Lack of Time

The delay that occurred after the bidding process until the strategic planning had a huge impact on the organisation (Eriksson Fredriksson; Ling). There was a huge amount of work that had to be done within less than two years and that gave pressure to the whole project team. It needs “a year for concept work, strategic planning and then a year for pre-production planning and then a year for production…The organisation did not grow fast enough and there was no time for the project management office personnel to know each other’s role and everything was done within time constraints” (Adams). “People have to work under fire everyday” (Lindegren). This is also one of the most common problems that leads to poor project performance in ECoCs (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004, p. 16).

5.3.4.5 Different Interests among Different Stakeholders

To balance and coordinate the interests of different stakeholders is proven to be challenging although important as a part of identifying the relationships between them (Turner, 2006, p. 93-95; Qiang et al., 2010, p. 1226). Conflicting interests among different stakeholders has been a common problem in ECoCs (Palmer-Rae Associates, 2004, p. 15). The European Union set the objectives and requirements, the politicians want to rule over the projects, the citizens have their own interests (Adams; Tenevall; Weinehall) and the Sámi people would like to be involved in ECoC to raise awareness about political issues (e.g., mining policy and ILO 169) (Blind; Eriksson Fredriksson).

Even though the Municipality and the Swedish government do not get involved in the process, they have their interest because they fund the projects with tax-payers money and the citizens of Umeå think that spending money in welfare or schools is more important than funding projects such as the opera (Edman). That creates conflicts and tension between the stakeholders (Tenevall). “Everyone has their own agenda” (Björinge) and the Umeå 2014 Office has to “keep everybody happy” (Weinehall), “keep the relationships warm” and “keep the dialogue going” (Adams). The Umeå 2014 Project Team has always been living under the pressure from different stakeholders (Tenevall) and has been under the media spotlight since they won the bid (Weinehall).
5.3.5 Possible Improvements

Although in general the outcomes are very satisfying (Björinge), there were some potential improvements that could be implemented and inspired sooner in the process such as better communication, strategic planning and more visionary projects. The idea of open source and co-creation could be better communicated to project owners (Lindholm; Ling; Tenevall; Weinehall) making clear how the process works since people were used to the traditional way of funding (Lindholm) and also that the “amount of dialogues could be broader, deeper and more profound” (Eriksson Fredriksson).

There was also a gap between the winning of the bidding process until the programme planning (Adams; Ling). This resulted in a one-year delay on strategic planning which created a domino effect due to the fact that is was overlapping with the operative pre-production planning. Therefore, the Umeå 2014 Project Team was “constantly living at catching the next plate as it falls” (Adams). From the project owner’s perspective there could be “more visionary projects, more mind blowing perspective changing projects” (Eriksson Fredriksson).

5.4 Project Performance

5.4.1 The Outcomes of Co-Creation Approach

The results of co-creation in the Umeå 2014 Programme are very fruitful (Adams; Björinge; Blind; Edman; Eriksson Fredriksson; Lindegren; Weinehall). All interviewees agreed that the results so far are very satisfying and in general the programme is balanced although the programme is not so “strong in the summer’s programme”. There is also a need for projects related to kids and elder people along the year. There is also a lack of films and dance activities (Vähä).

The open source strategy has proven to be successful and the European Union suggested to other capitals of culture to follow Umeå’s practice (Edman). This co-creative model works “because there is no point of forcing relationships, forcing collaborations” (Adams). On the other hand, since the cultural year has not finished, it is likely that some problems will arise during the programme (Tenevall). The fruitful results are validated by the fact that Lonely Planet now is marketing Sweden as the 4th most interesting country to visit because of Umeå as the ECoC. Among other events, one significant conference that will take place during the year is the biggest human rights conference in Europe (Weinehall).

5.4.2 Long-Term and Short-Term Objectives

The Municipality of Umeå has been putting 70 per cent more efforts (Edman) than the average Swedish municipalities into investing in culture to stimulate long-term economic growth since 1974 (Proposition 1974:28). As a result of this and other development efforts, Umeå has become one of the cities with the fastest growth in Sweden (Edman; Weinehall). Culture is utilised as the main driving force to achieve sustainable development at local, regional and international levels to achieve the short- and long-term objectives of Umeå 2014 (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 11).
According to the interviews with the Umeå 2014 Project Team, it was found that the respondents were clear about the abovementioned objectives. Such a uniform vision is significant in maintaining alignment of projects within Umeå 2014 Programme with the strategic objectives that will affect the project management success (Christenson & Walker, 2008, p. 621).

These two types of objectives should be differentiated (European Council, 2009a, p. 5) and were elaborated further in the second bid application report (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 8). The short-term objectives spanning from 2009 to 2013 are to build networks for the ECoC year and the legacy after 2014, as well as to enhance the existing cultural events and other cultural infrastructures to achieve more sustainable developments. Through more advanced cultural infrastructures, citizens of Umeå will gain better access to culture so that they can collaborate with cultural operators and practitioners “in the shaping, making and creation of culture” in the Northern Region and Europe (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 8). For the long-term objectives, Umeå would like to become a “culture-driven” city to attract the Creative Class people (e.g., cultural operators, regional and international students, business people, and tourists) to visit and live so that the population will reach up to 200,000 by 2050 (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 8).

The long-term objectives are: Long-term growth and sustainability (Abrahamsson; Adams; Edman; Eriksson Fredriksson; Lindholm) through strengthening collaboration within Sweden and Europe through cultural projects and infrastructures (Tenevall; Weinehall); population of 200,000 inhabitants in 2050 (Björinge; Lindholm; Tenevall; Weinehall) by transforming Umeå into a “good” and “interesting” city (Ling; Vähä) with “an attractive community” (Adams) to live, work, study and visit, as well as attract investments and create new businesses (Björinge; Vähä); for example, the tourism is expected to double until 2020 (Björinge), at least 11 per cent increase in hotel room reservation (Edman; Weinehall), approximately 50,000 visitors for the Opening Ceremony in end of January 2014 (Weinehall), and Umeå will be on the European map as an interesting destination (Björinge). All of these achievements will make the citizens proud of their own city in the long term (Lindholm; Vähä; Weinehall) and will help embed creativity in all aspects of life and business (Björinge).

5.5 Secondary Data Analysis

The secondary data analysis is conducted to partially verify the empirical findings from the primary data. The secondary data consist of six interviews of project owners within the Umeå 2014 Programme. These six examples are utilised to partially confirm the project governance practice of the Umeå 2014 Organisation due to the fact that all of them are small projects. Therefore, the authors are aware that these secondary data are not adequate to fully confirm the empirical findings derived from the primary data.

5.5.1 Empirical Findings

The secondary data mainly discusses about the purposes and sources of funding of the project, interactions between Umeå 2014 Project Team and the project owner in terms of providing information, support, control and freedom. The list of six respondents in the secondary data is presented in Appendix 3.
**Project 1: Fåglarna Visar Vägen (Birds Over Europe)**

“Fåglarna Visar Vägen” (“Birds Over Europe”) is a project led by Per Hansson, a scientist from the Umeå Fågelförening (Umeå Birds Society). This is a unique project combining scientific data collection from the satellite transmitters attached on a number of birds that are migrating around the world. The main aim is to inform people in the locations where the birds stop about the Umeå 2014 as the ECoC. This project is co-funded by Umeå 2014, Umeå Fågelförening, and Umeå River Delta Field. Umeå 2014 mainly provides financial support of 110,000 SEK to purchase the satellite transmitters from USA, while Umeå Fågelförening and Umeå River Delta Field contributes with their knowledge and time. (Hansson)

In November 2012, Hansson received the funding and could begin the project by purchasing the equipment. In early June 2013, the research team managed to start keeping track on their birds that started the migration. The project owner explained that his team had a misunderstanding during the application process. Hansson suggested that this project can be “a way of advertising the happening of Umeå 2014” and the Umeå 2014 Project Team “should take advantage on the places that the birds have selected” by doing some activities (Hansson). However, the Umeå 2014 Project Team explained that this kind of arrangement would be beyond their capacity. This leads to the loss of project benefits that the project owner would like to achieve (i.e., marketing, advertising, partnership, etc.). However, the project owner was proactive and took the initiatives to contact the authorities in the location that the birds landed and inform them about Umeå 2014. (Hansson)

The misunderstanding finally was solved after Shauna Adams explained the administrative aspects and different ideas about this project. Hansson modified the project descriptions and he has always been proactive in telling news and progress of the project to the Umeå 2014 Office. Even though the project owner perceived the contact and involvement of the Umeå 2014 Project Team as “very little” and “in some case they left us alone,” Hansson and his team “felt a lot of appreciation” from them (Hansson). After clarifying the misunderstanding, they discussed that they will organise a welcome back party when the first birds arrive in Umeå again. The project owner was not sure if a final project report is obligatory, but it will not be an issue if he has to. To a certain extent, Hansson would like to have “much stronger” connection and deeper involvement from the Umeå 2014 Project Team, but he understood that the Project Team “had no possibility” to do that. (Hansson)

**Project 2: Umeåregionen Läser (One Book, One City)**

“Umeåregionen Läser” or “One Book, One City” is a library project that creates a reading group that reads one particular book during a specified period of time and holds events to talk and discuss about that book. The project has been running for a year before receiving Cultural Boost fund from Umeå 2014 and some amount of support from Nordmaling Municipality, which are very substantial for such a small project to run more extensively. This project also partner with six municipalities around Umeå region and Studieförbundet ABF.
The project owner contacted the Umeå 2014 project team twice before and after the project application. They were suggested to do crowd funding to make the project bigger, but it was considered as “a lot of effort for little money” (Edlund). They were also invited to lunch meetings with other project owners for networking but there was no substantial result. They “do not get any support beside this money support” and they “are very thankful for this” (Edlund). The project owner perceives this project as a small one within the programme of Umeå 2014, so there is no objection on the strategy of Umeå 2014 Organisation of not getting involved in the process. The project owner has to fill a final report but there is no need for an update before that. (Edlund)

**Project 3: Beethoven Inspires–Piano Recitals with Opera Classes 2014**

Bengt Hultman, the President of the Swedish Clementi Society, is undertaking the “Beethoven Inspires” Project. This project is based on the idea that Beethoven is an inspiration to many artists, composers, and people in general. Hultman utilises his wide and unique classical music network to encourage and invite world-class pianists and composers to come to Umeå during the ECoC year. Another goal of this project is to spread knowledge about Muzio Clementi. Two to three piano recitals and opera classes have been planned to take place during the ECoC year. The amount of events will be based on the availabilities of funding and venue. (Hultman)

Hultman has been applying for funding from different sources. So far, the project has received 75,000 SEK from Umeå 2014 under the condition that it will get additional funding from other sources. The project owner is confident that he will manage to secure other funding. Several organisations and associations are involved in non-monetary ways by helping with selling tickets and marketing the concerts. In the past, the project leader applied for funding as an individual several times but got rejected because he did not have any organisations to support his project. There was also an unsuccessful attempt to obtain Cultural Boost funding even though the preconditions were fulfilled. In the final application before it received funding, Umeå asked for fulfilment of the criteria in a written form (application form). (Hultman)

Except from funding, the project owner argues that there is insufficient communication with the Umeå 2014 Project Team. Hultman described it as “one-line communication” as he is always the one who calls, asks questions, emails, and so on, “but very little [amount] of responses” (Hultman). He understands and does not complain about this because Umeå 2014 Project Team has “[so] much [work] to do” (Hultman). However, he strongly believes that “if they ask for engagement in the community and they have many people who want to cooperate, they have to take care of them” (Hultman). Even though the support provided by the Umeå 2014 Project Team is considered “very very little,” the project owner still would like to have full freedom in doing his project because he is experienced and knows his contacts very well. The Project Team supported the marketing part of the project sufficiently. Furthermore, the support that Umeå 2014 Project Team provides in general, if requested, is extensive and helpful but not sufficient specifically to the area of classical music. During the project if any change occurs, it has to be reported to Umeå 2014 Project Team. Hultman is aware that he will be obliged to deliver an evaluation report at the end of the project in which he is familiar with due to his previous experiences in similar projects. (Hultman)
**Project 4: Staden (The City)**

“Staden” (“The City”) is a dance performance project that focuses on choreographic movements within the city using different expressions through video projections, music, and questions about space, timing, movements, and dynamics. The project is still growing bigger and the respondent is uncertain “how the project will finally end up”, however the goal is to continue this project after 2014 (Ehnberg). It is a co-funded project retrieving funds from different sources. Umeå 2014 and the Artistic Board fund the project so far, but there are some additional possible sources that have not responded yet. Currently, there are approximately 15 organisations participating in the project. The project not only has to comply with the criteria set by the Umeå Organisation in the application form in order to get funding, but also retains this compliance in the project life cycle. There was not much of contact and there is no need for continuous progress reports. The support provided was focused on how to seek for funding from several companies and create a network. The meetings that the Umeå 2014 Organisation organised aimed to create those networks that project owners will share ideas and knowledge. The project owner believes that the evaluation report is important and the Umeå 2014 Project Team is effective on this difficult task of gathering perspectives and networking. (Ehnberg)

**Project 5: Lady Sings the Blues**

The purpose of this project is to highlight the existing beauty of the female singing voice. There are a number of activities within this project based on singers from blues, jazz and pop with an emphasis on blues. At the moment, there is one performance arranged in February 8, 2014. The Cultural Boost funding that the project received is not sufficient. Umeå Blues Association, which is the association behind the project, plan to invest 30,000 to 40,000 SEK and regain this amount of money from selling tickets. The results so far are fruitful and there is a possibility for cooperation with other project owners. There is no frequent communication between the project owner and Umeå 2014 and that makes the project owner feel isolated and that the project is not a part of Umeå 2014 Programme. The project owner believes that the audience will not be enough to cover up the initial investment. Except from funding, Umeå 2014 organised several meetings with other project owners that did not lead to anything. The project owner runs projects for many years, so the strategy of Umeå 2014 of not getting involved in the process is welcome. However, he has talked with other project owners about this issue and many of them felt that they were neglected and not feeling to be involved in the Umeå 2014 Programme because “there must have been some kind of lack of information from the Umeå 2014” (Sundén). At the end of the project, an evaluation report has to be delivered. (Sundén)

**Project 6: PechaKucha Umeå PechaKucha Riga**

PechaKucha means chaos, chitchat and the sound of a conversation in Japanese. This event was invented in 2003 by Astrid Klein and Mark Dytham, two American architects based in Tokyo. In this event, anyone, regardless of their social statuses, can present their ideas and visions in 20 images for 20 seconds each. The project owner brought this event to Umeå in 2009 and would like to get people in the city to share “so many interesting ideas that you don’t know anything about…from all kinds of ages and professions” (Sjöberg). She managed to get sponsors from Västerbottens-Kuriren (VK),
hotels, eco-taxi, an advertising bureau, sound and lighting technicians, Umeå 2014 and Umeå Municipality. Usually PechaKucha Umeå is arranged in collaboration with other organisations to make it even more thematic and interesting. The project owner is planning to bring PechaKucha to Riga, however her colleague in Riga is currently on maternity leave. (Sjöberg)

The communication with Umeå 2014 Project Team does not occur often, but it is effective. Umeå 2014 Project Team always considers the possibility to add this project to other activities. In every meeting and arrangement that the PechaKucha Project has, Umeå 2014 sends forms questioning if the overall criteria are followed. Umeå 2014 Organisation is perceived as the umbrella above all projects, but each project owner has to hold his or her own umbrella. In general, Umeå 2014 Organisation asks for update of the progress but is not getting involved with the project itself. The project owner supports this strategy and will contact Umeå 2014 Office only if she needs further information. The project owner personally think that “it would be disturbing with so much contact” because she is “really experienced” in running and supporting projects (Sjöberg). A final evaluation report has to be filled after the completion of the project, but the project owner suggested that Umeå 2014 should have customised evaluation procedures based on the size of the projects. (Sjöberg)

5.5.2 Analysis

The project owners’ perspectives help verify whether the current project governance approach implemented by the Umeå 2014 Project Team is effective or not. Furthermore, the impressions given by the Umeå 2014 Project Team appear somewhat play a role in giving motivations to the project owners to deliver their projects. The summary of the secondary data is shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding category</th>
<th>Frequency of contact with project team</th>
<th>Support from project team</th>
<th>Information the project team is asking from the projects</th>
<th>Extent project team is involved</th>
<th>Desired degree of freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds over Europe</td>
<td>Co-funded</td>
<td>Only for the funding</td>
<td>In the beginning, no follow up from the project team</td>
<td>Contact not extensive, expects more support</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Less, desires more involvement and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeåregionen Läser (One Book, One City)</td>
<td>Cultural Boost</td>
<td>At the beginning only</td>
<td>None, except financial</td>
<td>No updates except final report</td>
<td>Little - very little</td>
<td>Moderate, aware that this is not a big project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven Inspires</td>
<td>Co-funded</td>
<td>Disappointed, only one-way communication</td>
<td>Very little proactive support, but good reactive support</td>
<td>Detailed project application only</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Full freedom in doing the project, but expects more support for other things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staden (the City)</td>
<td>Co-funded</td>
<td>Not much support in different ways</td>
<td>Receives support in different ways</td>
<td>Reports regarding specific criteria set out by project team</td>
<td>Little freedom</td>
<td>Full freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Sings the Blues</td>
<td>Cultural Boost</td>
<td>Seldom, feelings of neglecting</td>
<td>None, except financial</td>
<td>No progress reports requested</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Full freedom, but would like to feel being involved in the Umeå 2014 Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PechaKucha Umeå</td>
<td>Cultural Boost</td>
<td>Small but good quality</td>
<td>Small, more that the project supplies lessons learned to the project team</td>
<td>General status info only, but the project does not want more interference</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Full freedom, because of long experience in this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PechaKucha Riga</td>
<td>Cultural Boost</td>
<td>Small but good quality</td>
<td>Small, more that the project supplies lessons learned to the project team</td>
<td>General status info only, but the project does not want more interference</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Full freedom, because of long experience in this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of the Secondary Data

The six project owners of Umeå 2014 Programme mainly discussed about their impressions and relationships with the Umeå 2014 Office in terms of support (i.e., financing, networking, coaching, involvement in building the project idea, etc.), communication and requirements for project closure (i.e., final reports, surveys, documentations, etc.).

Regardless the funding sources, all project owners felt that there had been low frequency of contacts and little support from the Umeå 2014 Project Team (Edlund; Ehnberg; Hansson; Hultman; Sjöberg; Sundén). Some project owners perceived this phenomenon as a good management practice, because they are experts in their field and would like to have more freedom to do their projects in their own ways and pace (Edlund; Hansson; Hultman; Sjöberg; Sundén). While some other project owners demand more attention and deeper involvement from the Umeå 2014 Project Team in order to take advantages of the project benefits (Hansson), as well as make them feel that their projects are parts of the Umeå 2014 Programme (Sundén). However, they understand that the Umeå 2014 Project Team is extremely busy and hence unable to give full attention to each project owner (Hansson; Hultman; Sundén). In general, they were satisfied with the financial support given even though some of them had to seek funding from other sources (Edlund; Hansson; Hultman; Sundén).

There were mixed perceptions regarding the quality of communication with the Umeå 2014 Project Team. Most project owners were aware that they should be pro-active to contact Umeå 2014 if any problems or major changes arise during the project (Hultman; Sjöberg). There was also a case in which a project owner did not receive responses from the Umeå 2014 Project Team (Hultman). Some respondents expressed that Umeå 2014 would give good reactive support when requested (Ehnberg; Hultman; Sjöberg). Most respondents were aware that they are obliged to complete a written evaluation report and some questionnaires when the project ends (Edlund; Ehnberg; Hultman; Sjöberg;
Sundén). However, there was one respondent expressing that he was not aware of this requirement (Hansson). These phenomena show that the quality of communication in Umeå 2014 should be enhanced.

Implementing project governance that balances communication, relationships, trust, freedom, and control to create the co-creative environment is very challenging. Considering the myriad of obstacles that Umeå 2014 Project Team is facing during the project life cycle, the current results of the co-creation approach have been fruitful and the co-creators were deemed to be quite committed to deliver their projects. Improvements in communicating the open source strategy, funding policies, the available support provided, application procedures, and project evaluation are imperative in order to avoid project owners’ disappointments as it will affect their future inner motivations to contribute to cultural projects under the framework of Municipality of Umeå, the Swedish National Government, and European Commission.
6 Conclusions and Suggestions

The conclusions and suggestions of this thesis are presented in this chapter. The answer to the research proposition will be provided based on the empirical findings and analysis. The conclusions include the discussions on the academic and practical contributions of this research towards the body of knowledge within the project governance field, particularly that of co-creation in project management practice.

The aim of this thesis is to answer the research proposition that co-creative projects should implement a mixture between hierarchical, relational, and market-based governance structures in order to respond to the dynamic environment of co-creation and to enhance project performance and potential success. To verify this proposition, this thesis has probed into a case study of Umeå 2014 as an ECoC that applies a co-creation approach in its programme management practice. The governance structures implemented by Umeå 2014 was investigated through a qualitative study with semi-structured interviews with the Umeå 2014 Project Team. The findings of this study can be a learning material for other ECoCs, but it should be noted that this study has been limited to the context of Umeå 2014.

6.1 Findings

6.1.1 The Co-Creation Approach

The co-creation approach successfully fosters creativity and enhances performance when the “open environment”—in which trust and knowledge sharing exist—is established (Ind et al., 2013, p. 17). Umeå 2014 Project Team acts as an enabler and a facilitator. They give tools, trainings, workshops, information, and have created a platform that integrates and supports funding, communication, planning, and marketing of projects. High amount of trust also has been put on the co-creators’ expertise and experiences that the projects will be delivered based on the contracts and agreements. The contracts and agreements are the official frames drawn by Umeå 2014 Project Team as a way of governing the project to ensure project performance and success. However, there is a certain degree of freedom for the co-creators within that frame, in which they can do the projects in their own ways. This freedom helps co-creators to keep the “inner motivations” or “intrinsic motivations” (Amabile, 1997, p. 39; Ind et al., 2013, p. 7) alive, because these motivations are the main drivers for passion and curiosity to do the projects they believe to be meaningful and contribute to long-term growth. However, communication that keeps co-creators’ sense of community (Fournier & Lee, 2009, p. 111) to be a part of the programme should be well maintained. It is, indeed, a great challenge to keep the balance between control and freedom to foster creativity and innovation to projects that bring value and contribute to the long-term
objectives of Umeå 2014, as well as to build long-term collaboration and/or partnership with the co-creators that will be beneficial to help achieve the long-term development plan of 2050. The co-creation approach can be realised through project governance structure that supports the co-creative elements.

6.1.2 Project Governance Structure

The project governance of Umeå 2014 ECoC overall is quite effective and delivers the planned outcomes.

a. Strategic alignment

Umeå 2014 ensures the strategic alignment of the organisational objectives with the projects’ objectives initially through compliance with certain criteria and also evaluating the result after the project is finished.

b. Structures and processes

There is a mix of hierarchical and relational governance structure when there is a decision needed of whether to select and fund a project. Governance structures develop environments that balance control and creativity. Such structures require a combination of hierarchical and relational frameworks to make and maintain that balance (Sundaramurthy & Lewis, 2003, p. 413). It should be noted that this mixture of structures exists within all projects, except in the Opening Ceremonies that are run by the Umeå 2014 Project Team.

c. Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities

Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities should be clearly defined in order to optimise performance and effectiveness. The political board, which plays the role of the board of directors, with EU set the general rules and frames that the Umeå 2014 Organisation has to follow when making the decision to bring a project to the board for validation (i.e., hierarchical). The political board and the EU are not involved in the artistic content that is decided by the project owner and finalised after discussion with the Umeå 2014 Project Team (i.e., relational).

d. Resource allocation and project prioritisation

Prioritising projects is crucial for the project management team to allocate the available resources in order to achieve the project objectives. The Umeå 2014 Project Team initially selected the projects that contribute to the balance of the programme. The project selection is an organic process in which criteria such as “what is missing”, budget and long term objectives are considered and then bring them to the political board for validation. On the other hand, for projects run by Umeå 2014 such as the Opening Ceremony, there is a strict hierarchical governance structure and all decisions come from the political board with a top-down decision-making approach.
e. Control

Identifying potential issues and challenges in a project is essential to plan the corrective measures (Müller, 2009, p. 17). Umeå 2014 Office dealt and is dealing with some obstacles and challenges during the project life cycle. All of these problems were derived from a number of reasons as follows:

1. The Project Team was learning on the process without previous experience
   Initially the idea of co-creation and open source was not clearly defined and communicated to the public and that resulted in misunderstanding of the way that the co-creation mechanism functions. The project owners were used to traditional funding process and it was not clear that Umeå 2014 would not provide funding that covers the total needs of the projects. The Umeå 2014 Project Team acknowledges these challenges and suggests that a possible solution is to have more profound and deeper dialogues with the project owners to clarify this funding policy to avoid misunderstanding in the future.

2. The geographical position of Umeå
   The geographical position of Umeå has been a challenge to communicate the idea of Umeå being the ECoC 2014 within Sweden and Europe. Between September and October 2013, Umeå 2014 ran a project called “Caught by Umeå” to promote Umeå as the ECoC 2014 and to raise curiosity of people around Europe.

3. Resources and time limitations
   One of the most common problems was the limited budget and human resources. There was no sufficient knowledge in the co-creation approach in the Umeå 2014 Project Team. This lack of knowledge on co-creation and the human resources led to lack of control and limited monitoring of the alignment of strategic objectives. Additionally, some projects did not get funding because of the limited budget. The small number of employees combined with their inexperience in co-creation made the roles of the Umeå 2014 Project Team Members unclear and blurry. This lack of clear roles could create conflicts among the project team members. Responsibility confusion and overlaps are indicators of reduced project performance (Tillman et al., 2012, p. 6).

Due to these problems, the political board decided to hire the programme producer, Shauna Adams, in September of 2012 and the Head of Administrator, Dan Vähä, in May of 2013. Time constraints, due to a delay from winning the bidding process until the initiation of strategic planning, resulted in overlaps with the operative pre-production planning and huge workload that had to be undertaken in less than two years. The programme producer had to create contracts, systems, structures, routines and strategic planning in a short period of time. On the other hand, the Head of Administration was assigned by the political board to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the Umeå 2014 Project Team.

f. Stakeholders

Project governance comprises a number of interconnected relations between stakeholders (Turner, 2006, p. 93-95). The involvement of all stakeholders should be
put into consideration when undertaking a project (Van der Waldt, 2010, p. 251). A challenge that is still encountered by the Umeå 2014 Organisation is the conflicting interest of Stakeholders. EU sets the project objectives, the citizens of Umeå have their interests, the Sámi people would like to express their political views and the politicians want to put their nuance to the projects. Umeå 2014 Project Team has been trying to balance these interests, but this process has been proven challenging so far.

6.1.3 Project Performance

The co-creation approach through open source strategy has yielded positive results on building a rich, diverse, and creative cultural programme of Umeå 2014. This success has also been approved by the European Commission, which has suggested Leeuwarden (ECoC 2018) to follow Umeå 2014’s practice. Due to the successful road show “Caught by Umeå,” Lonely Planet has nominated Sweden as the 4th most interesting country to visit in 2014. Many important conferences will take place in Umeå during the cultural year and one of them is the biggest human rights conference in Europe. Most recently, the New York Times has nominated Umeå as one of 52 destinations to visit in 2014 (New York Times, 2014, no. 31). These examples of positive results have contributed to the short- and long-term growth of Umeå.

Aiming to become “the Culturalized City” (City of Umeå, 2008, p. 21), Umeå Municipality has invested in culture, which is considered as the vehicle to sustainable development and long-term growth. The projects undertaken by the co-creators of Umeå 2014 are expected to provide learning experiences that are valuable to build networks and to strengthen collaboration among the national and local governments, cultural operators, business operators, investors, and the citizens. Through the ECoC project and long-term development plan of 2050, Umeå aims to evolve into an interesting “culture-driven” city that attracts new ventures and increase the population up to 200,000 inhabitants (City of Umeå, 2009, p. 8). The sustainable development and long-term growth of Umeå will make the citizens proud and more motivated to contribute with their knowledge and new ideas to the community.

6.2 Conclusion

Based on the empirical findings and analysis, the authors accept the research proposition. Projects applying a co-creation approach require a conducive environment that is constructed by the project governance structure. The main co-creative elements that have been identified in the theoretical frame of reference include trust, freedom, creativity, inner motivation, and innovation, all of which should be reinforced with good two-way communication, knowledge sharing, and effective collaboration. All of these co-creative elements should create a synergy that is imperative for successful co-creation approach. The project governance structure sets the following frames and processes: clear definition of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities; effective resource allocation and prioritisation; alignment of strategic and project objectives; stakeholder management; and control. All the elements within the project governance should also create a synergy that provides a conducive environment for the co-creation approach to function. The co-creation approach will flourish when developed within the frames that provide the mixture of hierarchical and relational project governance structures. The synergy between co-creation and project governance will cultivate the
potential to achieve sustainable development and long-term growth. The final proposition and the relationships among co-creation, project governance, and project performance and success are depicted in “the Eye of Co-Creation” shown in Figure 10.

![Figure 10. The Eye of Co-Creation](image)

6.3 Significance and Contribution

6.3.1 Academic Implications

The thesis work extends the findings of Roser et al. (2013) regarding the mix of project governance structure for co-creative projects through validating the a priori research proposition. The findings based on the case study of Umeå 2014 provide insights how a co-creation approach works in an environment established by the project governance structure conducive to achieve project performance and success within the context of the City of Umeå. This study extends the research in the theoretical domains of co-creation and project governance through providing empirical findings and analysis based on a real case that is happening at the moment. Moreover, this research provides insights into the benefits and results of a co-creation approach through an open source strategy when embedded in the project governance structure of a project within the creative industries.

The co-creation approach can be enhanced through the right project governance structure that shapes the right environment for the project by providing the right framework, processes, adequate resources, clear roles, responsibilities and accountabilities, all of which are decided within the top management. The implications of project governance on fostering creativity and culture are evident and significant to enhance project performance and to achieve the potential project success. In addition, this research also extends the studies of ECoCs, particularly in the investigation of the common problems encountered during the ECoC projects (cf. Palmer-Rae Associates,
The findings shed light on how an ECoC deals with these problems through restructuring the organisational structure, establishing processes and systems, and improving communication.

**6.3.2 Practical Implications**

This thesis work suggests managerial implications on the perspectives of governmental institutions and project managers. Governing co-creative projects is challenging due to the dynamic project environment with high level of uncertainty, complexity and risks, therefore requiring project participants to be adaptive through fostering creativity that leads to innovation. It is not possible for an organisation to acquire complete knowledge about the project environment. This study provides practical insights into the management by presenting the key elements for effective co-creation, which are trust, freedom, creativity, inner motivation, and innovation that should be underpinned by effective two-way communication, knowledge sharing, and fruitful collaboration. Trust and freedom are essential to nurture creativity, to ignite inner motivation and to cultivate innovation. This environment and co-creative elements should be maintained in a proportional balance for successful delivery of the projects.

The findings show that communication is crucial in communicating the ideas of the whole ECoC and how the co-creation through open source strategy works. Building and maintaining good relationships with the co-creators is also essential, because this element will determine the level of commitment and the willingness to contribute knowledge that eventually affect the project performance and outcomes. Furthermore, real problems in the co-creative projects are also addressed so that the governmental institutions and project managers can learn and improve their management practice in the future when dealing with cultural projects with similar characteristics that of Umeå 2014. European Commission has officially stated Umeå 2014 as a good practical example for Leeuwarden, the ECoC 2018 (European Commission, 2013b, p. 10). Other future ECoCs can improve their management practice through learning from Umeå’s experiences as a guide for governing co-creative cultural projects. The case of Umeå 2014 will also provide learning points for the government to improve their cultural project schemes in terms how to motivate cultural operators to participate and contribute to the long-term development of the creative industries. Similar perspectives also apply to other institutions in the lower and higher levels (e.g., European Commission, ministry of culture, municipalities, art council, local cultural associations, etc.).

**6.4 Future Research Directions**

The main investigation is within the context of Umeå 2014, clearly showing that the research results are specifically applicable for Umeå. However, the research findings can also be a reference for other ECoCs or similar cultural projects outside Europe. The authors suggest also the need to conduct longitudinal studies on the effect of project governance structures on co-creation and project performance (cf. Wåhlin, 2012). Investigating that matter in the middle or at another point of the project life cycle might reveal problems not predicted or not revealed in the current research.
Although the findings of this thesis work are applicable only within the context of Umeå 2014, the European Commission has suggested that Umeå’s co-creation approach through open source strategy should be applied to other ECoCs. For example, Leeuwarden, which has just won the ECoC 2018, was suggested by the European Commission to follow Umeå’s approach. By researching different contexts, it is possible to find common denominators and/or contrasting results within the same research subjects, thus increasing the transferability of the research.

This study took the perspective of the Umeå 2014 Project Team and only took limited considerations of the project owners’ perspectives. Future research directions can be aimed to include confirmative information gained from all project owners of Umeå 2014 in order to verify the truth and effectiveness of the project governance approach implemented by the Umeå 2014 Project Team. Since there are more than 300 projects within Umeå 2014, it is suggested that this research can be complemented with quantitative approaches. Possible research directions within this domain are to categorise the communication strategies for different types of projects. Another interesting topic that is worth researching is the measurement of project success after the ECoC year considering that the long-term objectives are the main aim of Umeå 2014.
7 Truth Criteria

This chapter is a post hoc evaluation of the research findings due to the fact that any research should be conducted based on rigorous procedures and methodology. The post hoc evaluation will revolve around validity, reliability, and confirmability.

The most essential criteria for evaluating research are the reliability, validity and generalisability. Reliability is “the degree to which the indicator or test is a consistent measure over time” (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 266), which means that if the respondent gives the same response at a different time and the same observation is made, then the answer is reliable (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 266; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 600). Validity refers to measures that actually assess what they are designed for (David & Sutton, 2011, p. 268; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p. 78; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 603). These criteria are appropriate most for a positivist approach and quantitative research. For non-positivist approaches and qualitative research, the meanings of reliability and validity are slightly different and adjusted to the interpretivist scientific ideal (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 410; Remenyi et al., 2009, p. 114-115). Criteria implemented for evaluating the non-positivist approach are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Remenyi et al., 2009, p. 114-115).

7.1 Validity

Internal validity, which is also called “credibility” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 219), questions whether the research investigates what it is designed to (Malterud, 2001, p. 484). To ensure good quality and obtain the complete knowledge of the respondents, the authors had to verify the contents of the transcripts (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 410; Remenyi et al 2009, p. 114). The respondents were requested to validate the transcriptions after the interview was conducted.

External validity or “transferability” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p.219) is not about generalising the findings, but is about thoroughly investigating a specific situation and to explain the outcomes. Hence, generalisability does not apply in the conventional view since the nature of the non-positivist research does not intend to generalisations (Remenyi et al., 2009, p.116). The findings cannot be transferred due to the unique situation and environment of the current case study (Bryman & Bell 2007, p. 413). The authors are aware that the results of the Umeå 2014 case study are unique, however it is believed that there will be some learning points that can be used as a valuable reference for other European cities that will apply for the ECoC designation or will become an ECoC in the near future.
7.2 Reliability

Lincoln & Guba (1985, p. 219) label the reliability as “dependability”. In a non-positivist research, reliability or dependability investigates a particular event in under specific circumstances, because it refers to the transparency of the research method and process (Remenyi et al., 2009, p. 116). The empirical data of this research are stored in an accessible digital format that provides instant and easy access so that future researchers can take advantage and investigate these data if needed. Transcriptions, reports and excel documents are also available for further investigation. This “auditing” approach is referred as dependability (Bryman & Bell 2007, p. 414).

7.3 Confirmability

The authors are aware that absolute objectivity when conducting a research is impossible. Confirmability or “objectivity” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 219) refers to the attempt of the authors to dissociate their beliefs, their shaped personal views and values from and avoid posing influence on the research findings and result (Bryman & Bell, 2007, p. 414).
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**Personal Communication**


Appendix 1: Interview Guide

Theme 1 – Organisational Structure

Introduction

Introducing interviewers’ research background and purpose

Understanding interviewee’s:
- Background (previous experience),
- Responsibilities and roles in the organisation
- Influence in the decision-making

Umeå Municipality
Understanding the roles of Umeå Municipality in general and in Umeå 2014:
- General roles of Umeå Municipality
- The role of Umeå Municipality in the European Capital of Culture
- The role of Umeå Municipality as the enabler to foster creativity of the citizens
  → to help the city become “creative city” → to achieve sustainable growth

Umeå 2014
The organisational structure of Umeå 2014 (board committee, EC, company, etc.):
- How is the relationship of Umeå 2014 Project Team with the board committee?
- What kind of organisational structure is Umeå 2014? Flatter or hierarchical?
- How many people are involved in Umeå 2014?

About Umeå 2014:
- Process of application: How did you involve the citizens?
- Local community’s participation in Umeå 2014 from the application process until now?
- Open source strategy?
- What are the long-term objectives of Umeå2014? (empowerment + 2050 plan)
- Future benefits for the local community?

Theme 2 – The Concept of Co-creation
Implementation of co-creation process:
- Why did you choose this concept of co-creation to develop the project?
- How did you inspire people to co-create? (e.g., Cultural Boost, network)
- What are the benefits of co-creation?
- What have been achieved so far through co-creation?
- What are the main obstacles in implementing the co-creation approach?
- How did you overcome these obstacles?

The mechanism of co-creation:
- How were the main strategic projects built?
- Where and how these ideas came from? (e.g., the opera, UxU, etc.)
- What is the general procedure for open source project proposals?
  - Ask about Cultural Boost and how they co-create and/or help project owners to find funding
  - Coaching, networking, brainstorming, liaison, supporting, etc.
• How do you deal with projects submitted by anyone? (proactive submission)

Environment of Co-creation:
• Freedom:
  o How much freedom is given? How much control is put? How do you balance these two to make co-creation successful?
• Trust:
  o How to grow, build and establish trust:
    ▪ Between project owner vs. sponsors vs. board vs. citizens (stakeholders vs. shareholders)
• Sense of community/collectivism:
  o How do you encourage the citizens to participate?
  o What are the immediate and long-term benefits the citizens can gain from Umeå2014?
  o Do you think that people are proud of being a part of the community? (City branding and awareness)
• Inner motivations:
  o What is the main motivation of: Project owners? Umeå Municipality? Citizens?  Non-monetary vs. monetary benefits?
  o How do you motivate?
  o What kind of incentives?
• Sense of ownerships  creativity and innovation
  o Do you think that the project performance is better because the people feel that they are a part of the creation? Sense ownership of a project leads to higher commitment and endeavour to achieve project success
• Network, Connection, and Collaboration
  o What kind of networks do you have?
  o How do you connect each party to co-create together?
  o Do you have an example for big, medium, and small co-creative projects?
• Challenges and obstacles in co-creation:
  o What are the obstacles during the process of co-creation?
  o How do you cope and overcome the obstacles?

Theme 3 – Project Governance
• The alignment of strategic and project objectives in every level of governance
• How does Umeå Municipality govern and control and support the projects?
• What is the governance structure for each type of project?

Theme 4 – Project Classification and Prioritization
• How the projects are selected, classified and prioritised? Is it based on the source of funding or the amount of funding? Or based on something else?
• What are the main obstacles in the prioritisation?
• Have you established a governance structure or not? If yes, which kind of?
• If not, what are your current practices for governing projects?

Theme 5 – Project Performance
Project performance:
• How do the current project governance structures contribute to the project performance?
• The results of co-creation
  o Do you think that the results of co-creative have been fruitful so far?
  o What is the current status (outcomes) of the Umeå2014 Programme?
  o Is every project objective still aligned with the Umeå2014’s objective?

Theme 6 – Possible improvements in governance structure
What should be modified or changed in the governance structure in terms of control, incentives, and creativity? How?

Theme 7 – Conclusions
Confirm our proposition:
The project governance structures are not fixed. Instead, the organisation should be very highly dynamic and adaptive to each situation and implement the appropriate governance structure in accordance to the current situation it is facing which will enhance project performance and contribute to project success.

Theme 8 – Closure
Concluding remarks, reassurance for consent regarding confidentiality and use of information
## Appendix 2: Interview Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length (min.)</th>
<th>Location (Umeå)</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Position &amp; Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nov. 26, 2013</td>
<td>55:25</td>
<td>School of Business and Economics, Umeå University</td>
<td>Stina Lindholm</td>
<td>Coordinator, External Funding: External funding, contacts towards the private sector and questions regarding EU-projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nov. 28, 2013</td>
<td>79:20</td>
<td>Umeå 2014 Office</td>
<td>Marcus Weinehall</td>
<td>Coordinator/Project Manager of the Glass House: Responsible for Glashuset and handles all related reservations and services; involved in some of the EU-projects that the Umeå 2014-team is part of and does presentations of Umeå2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nov. 29, 2013</td>
<td>78:15</td>
<td>Umeå 2014 Office</td>
<td>Robert Tenevall</td>
<td>The “Cultural Boost”, project proposals: All applications to Kulturskjutsen (“Cultural Boost”); in charge of the Umeå2014 project database and for the lectures on project funding that Umeå2014 is setting up with other parties, aimed to increase knowledge in how to find external funding for a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nov. 29, 2013</td>
<td>52:35</td>
<td>Umeå 2014 Office</td>
<td>Jan Björinge</td>
<td>Manager/CEO: Overall responsibility for the capital of culture project towards the capital of culture committee and the Umeå municipal executive board; CEO of the capital of culture company and does work on the overall financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dec. 2, 2013</td>
<td>60:55</td>
<td>Umeå 2014 Office</td>
<td>Shauna Adams</td>
<td>Program Producer: Overall responsibility for laying out the program for the capital of culture year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dec. 2, 2013</td>
<td>43:48</td>
<td>Umeå 2014 Office</td>
<td>Margareta Ling</td>
<td>Coordinator: Coordination of the Capital of Culture year program group; receiving and keeping track on all project proposals that are sent to Umeå 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dec. 2, 2013</td>
<td>32:50</td>
<td>Umeå 2014 Office</td>
<td>Ellacarin Blind</td>
<td>The National Union of the Swedish Sámi People (Svenska samernas riksförbund): A part of the Sámi artistic council and works on external financing of Sámi projects; conveying contacts between Sámi organisations and other partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dec. 3, 2013</td>
<td>61:09</td>
<td>Umeå 2014</td>
<td>Dan Vähä</td>
<td>Administrative Manager:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dec. 4, 2013</td>
<td>30:00</td>
<td>Umeå 2014</td>
<td>Fredrik Lindegren</td>
<td>Artistic Director:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dec. 4, 2013</td>
<td>81:32</td>
<td>Skype Interview (Stockholm-Umeå)</td>
<td>Tina Eriksson Fredriksson</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, Programme Planning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dec. 5, 2013</td>
<td>59:24</td>
<td>Stadhuset Umeå</td>
<td>Albert Edman</td>
<td>Head of Urban Development and Sustainability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dec. 10, 2013</td>
<td>44:36</td>
<td>Umeå 2014</td>
<td>Kirsí Abrahamsson</td>
<td>EU Officer, Umeå Municipal International Office:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Interview Respondents

### Appendix 3: Secondary Data – Interview Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length (min.)</th>
<th>Location (Umeå)</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Project Name &amp; Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3. Secondary Data - Interview Respondents
Appendix 4: Secondary Data – Interview Questions

Interview questions:

1. What is the name of the project?
2. What is your project about? Please describe the purposes and aims
3. How is it funded?
   a. Self-funded (nothing from Umeå 2014)
   b. Kulturskjuts-project (20,014 SEK)
   c. Co-funded from Umeå 2014 (More than 20,014 SEK)
4. How many organisations and/or associations are involved in your project? One, two,...
5. How often/how much are you in contact with the Umeå 2014 project team?
6. What support do you get from the Umeå 2014 project team?
7. What type of information is the Umeå 2014 project team asking from you? (i.e., progress updates, progress reports, written/spoken)
8. Do you know if you need to provide a written report to the Umeå 2014 project team?
9. To what extent is the Umeå 2014 project team involved in the development of your program event? (Very little, Little, Much, Very much). Why?