



VRIJE  
UNIVERSITEIT  
BRUSSEL



Master's thesis to obtain the degree of Master in Educational Sciences

# **COLLABORATION PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN PART-TIME ARTS EDUCATION AND AMATEUR ARTS**

**MICHIEL BOLLIU**  
**2017-2018**

Amount of words:14528

Promoter(s): Prof. dr. De Backer Free  
Psychology & Educational Sciences

SUMMARY MASTER'S THESIS  
(to include after the title-page + 1 separate page A4)

**Surname and name:** Michiel Bolliou

**Student ID:** 512392

**Title of the master's thesis:** Collaboration partnerships between Part-Time Arts Education and Amateur Arts

**Promoter:** Prof. dr. De Backer Free

**Summary:** This research focuses on the interaction between Part-time arts education (PTAE) and amateur arts (AA) in Flanders and Brussels. Today, PTAE is subject to an important policy reform, starting in the school year 2018-2019. One of the ambitions of the reform is to stimulate partnerships with AA. The purpose of this study was to explore why PTAE schools engage in partnerships with AA organizations and how different determinants influence the practice.

A qualitative research methodology was used, focusing on the perspective of school leaders on account of their central role in the management of the school. This study interviewed 22 school leaders of 21 PTAE schools in the province of East Flanders.

The research results show the will of PTAE schools to engage in partnerships with the field of AA, as most schools are exploring the opportunities and forms of collaborating. However, the understanding of the reforms' ambition is different among schools.

Our findings show that not all PTAE schools experience interdependencies with AA, which are mutually addressed in a partnership. Still, most school leaders highlighted 'the exposure to the arts and arts practice' as a mutually shared interdependency. More specific, three different interdependencies became apparent during the interviews. Furthermore, this study identified seven motives for PTAE schools to engage in CPs with AA organizations, based on student benefits, school benefits and benefits to the larger community.

The factors that facilitate the partnerships imply mutuality and reciprocity, open and frequent communication and leadership. Furthermore, this study found facilitating aspects more related to the process and structures of the partnerships and resources. A multitude of factors that hinder the partnerships between PTAE and AA were identified: a set of hindering perceptions about AA organizations and schools' social and political environment; and more practical and organizational concerns.

## Inhoud

## Acknowledgements

7

### List of abbreviations ..... 8

I Introduction ..... 9

II Literature study ..... 11

2.1 *Part-time arts education (PTAE) and the amateur arts (AA) in Flanders and Brussels* ..... 11

2.1.1 *Part-time arts education (PTAE) in Flanders and Brussels* ..... 11

2.1.2 Amateur arts in Flanders and Brussels ..... 12

2.1.3 The connection and disconnection between PTAE and AA ..... 13

2.1.4 The new decree and final objectives ..... 14

2.2 *Collaborative partnerships* ..... 15

2.2.1 Collaboration, cooperation and coordination ..... 16

2.2.2 Interdependency and motives for collaboration partnerships ..... 16

2.2.3 Motives to engage in a collaboration partnership ..... 17

2.2.4 The composition of stakeholders ..... 19

2.2.5 The collaboration process ..... 19

2.3 *Facilitating factors and barriers influencing collaboration partnerships* ..... 22

2.3.1 Factors influencing collaboration partnerships ..... 22

2.3.2 Facilitating factors influencing collaboration partnerships between schools and art organizations ..... 23

2.3.3 Barriers influencing collaboration partnerships ..... 24

2.4 *Summary* ..... 25

III research questions ..... 27

IV Methodology ..... 28

4.1	<i>Research instrument</i>	28
4.2	<i>Participants</i>	28
4.3	<i>Data collection procedure</i>	29
4.4	<i>Data analysis methods</i>	29
V	<i>Findings</i>	31
5.1	<i>The policy reform</i>	31
5.2	<i>Past, current and future partnerships between PTAE schools and AA organizations</i>	32
5.3	<i>Interdependencies and motives</i>	33
5.3.1	<i>Interdependency</i>	33
5.3.2	<i>Motives</i>	35
5.4	<i>Factors facilitating the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations</i>	38
5.4.1	<i>Creation of a win-win situation</i>	38
5.4.2	<i>Mutual Respect for Autonomy and singularities</i>	38
5.4.3	<i>Shared vision and goals</i>	38
5.4.4	<i>Mutual norms of trust</i>	39
5.4.5	<i>The impact of process and outcome evaluation</i>	39
5.4.6	<i>History of partnerships</i>	39
5.4.7	<i>Collaborative governance and organization</i>	39
5.4.8	<i>Selection criteria for partners</i>	40
5.4.9	<i>Communication</i>	40
5.4.10	<i>Support of mediating entities</i>	40
5.4.11	<i>Skilled staff</i>	41
5.4.12	<i>Leadership</i>	41
5.4.13	<i>Facilitating accommodation</i>	42

5.5 Factors hindering the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations.....	42
5.5.1 Lack of information and feelings of disinterests .....	42
5.5.2 Negative perceptions about the quality within the AA .....	43
5.5.3 Unfavorable social climate and political pressure.....	44
5.5.4 Feelings of competitiveness .....	45
5.5.5 Physical distance.....	45
5.5.6 Lack of time and funding .....	45
5.5.7 Limited time for planning .....	46
5.5.8 Workload for teachers and students.....	46
5.5.9 An increase in bureaucracy.....	46
5.5.10 Lack of opportunities to discuss the content and form.....	47
5.5.11 Inadequate links to the curricula of the schools .....	47
VI Discussion and conclusion .....	48
6.1 Collaboration between PTAE schools and AA organizations and the policy reform.....	48
6.2 What interdependencies do PTAE schools experience in a collaboration partnership with AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders? .....	49
6.3 What are the motives for PTAE schools to engage in a collaboration partnership with AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?.....	50
6.4 Which determinants facilitate the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?.....	51
6.5 Which determinants hinder the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?.....	52
VII Recommendations .....	54
7.1 Practical recommendations .....	54
7.2 Policy recommendations.....	55

7.3 Limitations.....	56
7.4 Follow-up research .....	57
References.....	58
Appendix A: List of of the 9 pluralistic AA organizations based on art discipline .....	65
Appendix B: Cooperation, Coordination, & Collaboration .....	66
Appendix C: Factors influencing the success of collaboration .....	69
Appendix D: Interview Scheme.....	70
Appendix E: Informed consent.....	73

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Prof. dr. De Backer Free of the Department of Educational Sciences at VUB. I could not have imagined having a better mentor.

I also wish to express my gratitude to all the school leaders who made this qualitative research possible.

My deepest gratitude goes out to my loving parents, sisters and friends for their support and encouragement throughout my years of study. Thank you!

List of abbreviations

AA: Amateur Arts

ALC: Alternative learning context

APP: Artistic pedagogical project

CP: Collaboration partnership

PTAE: Part-time arts education

RQ: Research question

## **I Introduction**

Part-time arts education (PTAE) in Flanders and Brussels, and amateur arts (AA) are of great importance in stimulating art experiences, art and cultural participation (Van der Hoeven, 2005).

Today, PTAE is subject to an important policy reform. The legislative framework of 1990 is outdated and insufficient in maintaining the new pedagogical insights and contemporary developments in the art world (Vlaamse Regering, 2015).

Starting in the school year 2018-2019, three ambitions will be enforced: one of them is to establish a link with arts, nursery and compulsory education. Within the last ambition, the reform wants to stimulate partnerships with AA. With the interaction between AA and PTAE, the reform decree aims to make the social mission of PTAE more explicit. By means of collaboration and mutual harmonization, the decree sees opportunities for PTAE and AA organizations to focus on art education (Vlaamse Regering, 2015).

Bamford (2007) concluded that in Flanders AA and PTAE activities tend to exist in relative isolation from one another. Research shows how AA, despite their large cultural educational offer, have little or no partnerships with formal education and PTAE (Vermeersch & Vandenbroucke, 2011). The disconnection between formal education and AA can be found worldwide (e.g. Carruthers, 2005; Higgins, 2012; Temmerman, 2005). One of the recommendations made by Bamford (2007) was to invest in a study on the interaction between the formal facilities in PTAE schools and the wider provisions of AA organizations. In this way, one could find out how PTAE can contribute to the expansion and development of AA and vice versa.

Today, a community of stakeholders is responsible for the success and development of students (Anderson-Butcher & Ashton, 2004). Schools experience difficulties in achieving their missions and goals without the contributions of others (Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, Bean, Flaspohler, Boone, & Kwiatkowski, 2008). As a result, governments and schools are increasingly integrating "collaboration" into their policies and partners are asked or obliged to participate in partnerships that aim to improve or innovate workings (l'Enfant, 2008). As partnerships, by definition, involve more than one stakeholder and schools are complex

working environments, creating collaborative partnerships (CPs) need a range of conditions, practices and activities, such as: setting common goals, funding, planning ... (Ellis, 2009). Research on partnerships indicate that there is a 'scientific relevance gap' as the practical needs and interest of managers and school leaders are not always included in research. The research output may be interesting, but not likely to be applicable (Bell, Ouden, den, & Ziggers, 2006).

Until now, the interaction and exchange between AA organizations and more formal PTAE schools has not been investigated thoroughly. The purpose of this study is to explore why PTAE schools engage in partnerships with AA organizations and how different determinants influence the practice.

## **II Literature study**

In the following chapter the structures of PTAE and AA are described. Next, we discuss what they have in common and how the forthcoming policy reform in PTAE aims to connect the two sectors.

Next, the concept of collaboration partnerships (CPs) between schools and partners will be discussed. Furthermore, we will elaborate on the collaboration process. Finally, we report on the preconditions and challenges in developing a sustainable CP.

### **2.1 Part-time arts education (PTAE) and the amateur arts (AA) in Flanders and Brussels**

#### **2.1.1 Part-time arts education (PTAE) in Flanders and Brussels**

PTAE assembles the arts education of children, youngsters and adults, in four fields of study: visual art, music, word craft and dance. The three specific objectives of PTAE are: supplementing school education; the education of art practitioners; and the preparation for higher art education (Vlaamse Regering, 1990). The various PTAE courses are not part of compulsory education but are a form of leisure education, in which participants receive a certificate after successfully completing a program (Elias, 2002; Vlaamse Regering, 1990).

As PTAE falls under the government of the Ministry of Education and Trainings, PTAE schools can only organize courses, according to an established educational structure and set of final objectives (Van Petegem, Elias, De Maeyer, & Van Leeuw, 2005; Vlaamse Regering, 1990). Each program consists of various hierarchic levels or degrees, in which the entry and through-flow conditions are age-related (Van Petegem et al., 2005; Vlaamse Regering, 1990). From the school year 2018-2019 onward, the entry age for all fields will be 8 years (Vlaamse Regering, 2017a). Pupils can engage in one or more courses at one of the 168 government-accredited and subsidized PTAE schools in Flanders and Brussels (Vlaamse Regering, 2017a). PTAE schools are categorized into three types, based on the offer they provide:

- academies for Visual Arts;
- academies for Music, Word Art and Dance or academies for Performing Arts;
- art academies, that offer Visual and Performing arts. (Vermeersch, Capéau, Van Itterbeeck & Groenez, 2011)

### **2.1.2 Amateur arts in Flanders and Brussels**

Defining an all-encompassing definition of AA is not undisputable. AA are very differentiated according to the discipline and context in which amateur artists work (Forum voor Amateurkunsten, 2016). Some amateur artists work individually or cooperate in group, some practice one discipline or work in a multidisciplinary way, some work at home, in a leisure environment or prefer to study in the context of the PTAE (Piessens & Claes, 2002).

Elias (1990) states that in AA, the pleasant creative development and process prevail, in contrast to the professional arts in which the result predominates. Also, professional artists will be able to exhibit at professional locations and their work might be considered as heritage after a certain time (Elias, 2002). The Forum for Amateur Arts (2016) states that the term 'amateur arts' is primarily a policy term, a concept that is used by policy makers and administrators. The Forum summarizes the AA activities as: to touch others, by artistic expression, out of love for art. What defines AA is the combination of an artistic, a social and an educational component.

The emotional value associated with the term AA is also not all-encompassing. Amateurism is often mistakenly considered to be of poor quality (Elias, 2002; Forum voor Amateurkunsten, 2016). Yet, a population study of the emotional value of the word 'amateurkunsten' or AA, shows that people associate more positive themes such as enthusiasm, socialism, originality, creativity and dedication with the term 'amateur' art (Vanherwegen, Siongers, Smits & Vangoidsenhoven, 2009).

Since 2009, the AA, which fall under the government of the Ministry of culture, have become organized in a policy framework to bundle its forces. As a result, 9 pluralistic AA organizations (appendix A) work with policy plans and receive operational resources for a period of 5 years. These AA organizations are situated in multiple art disciplines (Forum voor Amateurkunsten, 2016).

In order to be recognized as an AA organization by the Flemish Government, organizations must demonstrate that they can function as a documentation and information center for all practitioners and more local, independent AA organizations. These organizations have their own website and publish specialized magazines and working materials, develop training courses, organize public events and various competitions, set up projects for a broad target group and pursue an international working (Vlaamse Regering, 2000).

Furthermore, on 19 June 2006, the Forum for Amateur Arts was founded. The forum serves as a support and consultation center and representative of the nine AA organizations. The forum stimulates and coordinates collaboration and works on a favorable image of the AA sector (Forum voor Amateurkunsten, n.d.).

### **2.1.3 The connection and disconnection between PTAE and AA**

There is a strong and natural connection between PTAE and AA, as both, in their own specific way, are engaged in art practice and education (Vlaamse Regering, 2015). Bamford (2007), concluded that PTAE schools use a formal, academic approach, while the AA use a more informal approach. Bamford (2007) explains how the differences between PTAE and AA fall within the objectives that characterize them. These objectives are described as 'learning in art' and 'learning through art'. Within PTAE, the main goal is to gain knowledge and skills 'in' art, within AA, art is used as a means to develop social and civilian skills. However, there is no strict division between learning 'in' and 'through' art, as both elements are covered in all kinds of learning processes (De Braekeleer, 2003; De Braekeleer, 2010). The difference lies in the premise, which is essential to obtain a good understanding of PTAE and AA (Forum voor Amateurkunsten, 2007).

Furthermore, The Flemish government states that the practice of art in leisure time is the most important social finality of PTAE (Vlaamse Regering, 2015). PTAE contributes to the personal development of the individual, but is especially important for the AA organizations. The quality and topicality of PTAE programs directly contribute to the quality and dynamics in the AA sector. Therefore, the Flemish Government argues that the connection between PTAE and local AA organizations should become self-evident (Vlaamse Regering, 2017b).

Despite the strong and natural connection, Bamford (2007) concluded that AA and PTAE activities tend to exist in relative isolation from one another. Also, the study of Vermeersch and Vandenbroucke (2011), which aimed to provide an overview of the cultural educational practice of all actors in the non-formal learning context, including the AA sector, shows that AA, despite their large educational offer, had little connection with formal education.

Similar findings can be found worldwide. For example, Temmerman (2005) describes the disconnections that commonly occur between Australian young people's engagement with

music-making at school, at home and in the community. A similar conclusion was made by Carruthers (2005) in the American context: although connecting the community and schools can be beneficial for both, this connection is not always established. In the UK, the potential of meaningful connections between formal education and the community music, which represent a wide range of music educational programs that take place apart from ordinary school music programs, is not fully achieved (Higgins, 2012).

#### **2.1.4 The new decree and final objectives**

Today, PTAE is subject to an important policy reform. The legislative framework of 1990 is outdated and insufficient in maintaining the new pedagogical insights and contemporary developments in the art world (Vlaamse Regering, 2017a). Starting in the school year 2018-2019, three ambitions will be enforced: the simplification of the regulatory environment; the anchoring in the field of education; and connection to the arts, nursery and compulsory education. Within the last ambition, the reform wants to stimulate partnerships between PTAE and AA. With the interaction between AA and PTAE, the level decree aims to make the social mission of PTAE more explicit (Vlaamse Regering, 2015).

The new decree also aims to update its final objectives. In contrast to other educational levels, there are currently no basic competences, final attainment levels, developmental objectives or specific final objectives for the PTAE (Vlaamse Regering, 2018). In the new decree, PTAE becomes competence-based and qualifying education, as the competences acquired by pupils are widely applicable: in a cultural, labor and/or educational context and in the social sphere (Vlaamse Regering, 2018).

The new final objectives not only ensure a definitive embedding of PTAE within the field of education, but also create clear expectations about the intended learning outcomes (Vlaamse Regering, 2018). For example, the final objectives for the fourth degree of a program, become 'professional qualifications'. The creation of a common language between PTAE and local cultural actors, AA, art education organizations and art institutions is aimed to stimulate collaboration among each other. The development of 'professional qualifications' created a framework, in which the field of education and the cultural field can communicate unambiguously about qualifications and competences contained therein (Vlaamse Regering, 2018). As a result, the civil effect of acquiring artistic competences in PTAE is strengthened,

as well as the relevance of these competences in the socio-cultural sector, in particular AA. The 'professional qualifications' were developed by relevant representatives of the social field in which the graduates end up, including the AA sector (Vlaamse Regering, 2018).

Another asset of the new decree, is the alternative learning context (ALC). Comparable to workplace learning, PTAE pupils can gain skills outside the school setting, as part of their program. For example, students can participate in an amateur theater company, music ensemble or assist a visual artist (Vlaamse Regering, 2018). Research confirms that these kind of informal (musical) activities can provide opportunities for learning that are equal to, or more valuable than (music) learning that happens in a formal school setting, as students learn by watching, observing and listening to others (Waldron & Veblen, 2009). In the new decree, the ALC is no longer a favor, but a right of the PTAE pupil, in which the school remains ultimately responsible for the learning process. The new decree will determine the conditions under which a regular pupil can partially or completely replace a course with learning activities in an alternative learning context, relevant to the final objectives (Vlaamse Regering, 2018).

## **2.2 Collaborative partnerships**

In recent years, governments and schools are increasingly integrating "collaboration" into their policies and partners are asked or obliged to participate in partnerships that aim to improve or innovate workings (l'Enfant, 2008; Hogeboom, Koch, Potiek, & Veldhuizen, 2012). Vermeersch and Vandenbroucke (2014) explain the increased interests in partnerships between schools and cultural organizations, such as AA, by several elements. First of all, partnerships are stimulated by the ministry of Culture and ministry of Education, through funding. Secondly, the distinction between 'school time' and 'spare time' has faded, which encourages schools to look beyond school walls and school hours. Last, cultural organizations are, more than ever, convinced that the link between classroom education and out-of-school culture is an excellent opportunity for arts and cultural education (Vermeersch & Vandenbroucke, 2014).

Despite the potential of inter-organizational collaboration, a significant problem carries through: imprecise and incoherent conceptions of collaboration plague practice, research, and policy (Lawson 2004; Ray, 2002). Different authors use different interpretations for the concept of 'collaboration' (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres & Robinson, 2003; Huxham & Vangen,

2005; Kaats & Opheij, 2014; Thomson & Perry, 2006; Thomson, Perry & Miller 2009). As the term collaboration appears to have a different meaning in different contexts, it creates a lack of consistency of the word's usage (Sydow, Schüssler & Müller-Seitz, 2015; Thomson et al., 2009). The container concept; 'collaboration' requires further elaboration, as the variety of terms used to identify such partnership can cause problems when studying the phenomenon (Kaats & Opheij, 2014).

### **2.2.1 Collaboration, cooperation and coordination**

In literature three main inter-organizational relationship processes are identified: cooperation, coordination and collaboration (Mattessich, Murray-Close & Monsey, 2001; Thomson & Perry, 2009). The three processes differ in terms of their depth of interaction, integration, commitment, and complexity (Reilly, 2001; Thomson & Perry, 2009).

Mattessich et al. (2001) described the concepts of cooperation, coordination and collaboration in relation to; vision and relationships; structure, responsibilities and communication; authority and accountability; and resources and rewards (Appendix B). In this framework, cooperation is placed at the low end of the continuum and collaboration at the high end of the continuum, as each of the activities need more time to develop, need more supports and resources to sustain (Lawson, 2003). Gray (1989) reminds us that at the start of the collaboration, both cooperation and coordination may occur as part of the collaboration process.

### **2.2.2 Interdependency and motives for collaboration partnerships**

Schools and organizations more and more experience they cannot always achieve their missions and goals without the contributions of others (Lawson et al., 2003). This awareness can be found in several 'artistic pedagogical projects' (APP) or vision statements of PTAE schools, in which CPs are explicitly mentioned. For example: "... the schools' cultural profile stands by intense CPs with external partners such as local schools, the city library, the Cultural Center De Herbakker, and various cultural and local organizations" (Kunstacademie Eeklo, 2013, p.2). Other examples can be found on PTAE schools' websites: "The Academy continues to unravel by collaborating with other institutions such as: museums, cultural center, social

services, primary and secondary schools, other PTAE schools ..." (SASK, nd.), "The Academy wants to be a "home for the amateur arts". This objective is achieved through various activities in and outside of the school through exhibitions, concerts, happenings, ... (Kunstacademie Knokke, nd.).

CPs involve a new or renewed relation between two or more stakeholders. These stakeholders have a stake in the action, which makes them motivated to develop a collaborative relationship (Lawson, 2004). Kaats and Opheij (2014) argued that collaboration must always yield benefits. What these benefits might be, differ across and between stakeholders. In general, collaboration has the potential to produce multiple benefits, as it is made to fit the needs and opportunities that create novelty (Lawson et al., 2003). Gray (1989) found that when organizations mutually address a problem or challenge, organizations are more likely to do a broader, more in-depth analysis of issues and opportunities. According to Kaats and Opheij (2014) the most defining precondition to CPs is that stakeholders experience an interdependency or perceive they need each other and believe that joint efforts can achieve goals that neither of the partners could obtain by themselves.

### **2.2.3 Motives to engage in a collaboration partnership**

Although the Flemish Government argues that the connection between PTAE and local AA organizations should become self-evident (Vlaamse Regering, 2017b), no study identified the interdependencies and motives of PTAE schools and AA organizations to engage in a partnership. Silk and Augustine (2017) who studied CPs between schools and artistic organizations, identified multiple motives to engage in CPs. These motives fell into three primary categories: benefits to students; benefits to schools and districts; and benefits to arts and cultural organizations.

#### **2.2.3.1 Student Benefits**

On the level of the student, research supports the idea that academic achievement can be positively influenced through powerful CPs and lead to students who are more successful in school activities, continue and enjoy their education (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Lawson 2004; Oppenheim, 1999; Silk & Augustine, 2017). More specific to the context of CPs between

schools and art organizations, exposure to the arts is often the main motive (Silk & Augustine, 2017).

CPs with art organizations can provide innovative experiences for students, for example: learning opportunities that are more student-driven and focus on process over product. Another motive is to provide opportunities for students to get acquainted with possible career paths in the arts. Furthermore, partnerships can provide students with opportunities to develop more and other competencies in a discipline's specific skills set (Silk & Augustine, 2017). Last, learners who struggle in certain subjects possibly thrive in a CP, experience success, thus enhancing their self-efficacy (Hogeboom et al., 2012; Silk & Augustine, 2017). CPs also have the potential to enhance students' confidence, trust and a sense of belonging (Donelan, Irvine, Imms, Jeanneret, & O'Toole, 2009). As a final note, partnerships in which the needs of students and schools are placed at the center of their mission, seem to be more sustainable and successful than others. The emphasis on student learning is a strong indicator for more effective and more sustainable CPs (Seidel, Eppel, & Martiniello, 2001)

### **2.2.3.2 School and district Benefits**

Within the level of the school, Henderson and Mapp (2002) found five motives to engage in CPs: (1) improvement of school facilities; (2) improvement of school leadership and staffing; (3) higher-quality learning programs; (4) new tools and programs to improve instruction and; (5) extra funding for after-school programs. Research by Lawson (2004) confirm these motives.

The founding's of Silk and Augustine (2017), which are specific to CPs between schools and art organizations, mention how school benefits occur when the CP is shared with the broader school community. When this occurs, it enhances teacher practices as it provides teachers with a range of formal and informal professional learning opportunities such as workshops, planning, observing and so on. School culture also becomes improved when CPs are shared with the wider school community by exhibitions and performances for other students, families and wider community.

Last, Donelan et. al (2009) mention how the art partnerships impacts the school in aspects such as: broadening the school's approach to teaching and learning; forming cross-curricular links; enhancing the school's profile; and unifying the whole school in one project.

#### **2.2.4 The composition of stakeholders**

The selection of the right partner is of critical significance for the success of forming a CP (Stephens, fulk, & monge, 2009). The potential composition of stakeholders involves important determinations: the aims and goals of the collaboration; stakeholders' capacities (e.g. expertise); resources; legitimacy (e.g. histories of working together). All these aspects influence the motives and the initiation of a CP (Child, Faulkner & Tallman, 2005). Douma (1997) states that the success of a CP depends on an effective and efficient alignment or 'fit' between partners. This fit is related to concepts such as complementary balance, mutual benefits, harmony and interdependency.

#### **2.2.5 The collaboration process**

In search for a more systematic approach for understanding the collaborative process between PTAE and AA, this study uses a theoretical model by Thomson & Perry (2006). Their collaboration process model is based on the 'antecedent – process – outcome' model of Wood and Gray (1991). The three stages of their model include: (1) the preconditions stage: what enables and/or motivate stakeholders to participate in a CP; (2) the process stage: how the collaborative activities are initiated; and (3) the outcome stage: when partners assess the results of the collaborative endeavor (Thomson & Perry, 2006).

##### **2.2.5.1 The precondition stage**

The precondition stage is where stakeholders come together to start the CP. The review above, provides various motives and benefits as to why schools form partnerships with art organizations. Factors that are critical in the precondition stage include: the way of assembling a group of stakeholders (Wood & Gray, 1991); determining criteria for partner selection (Douma, 1997; Stephens et al., 2009); prior experience in CPs (Mattessich, et al., 2001; Stephens et al., 2009); developing mutual goals and objectives (Mattessich et al., 2001); and

the establishment of trust before moving to the process stage (Kaats & Ophei, 2014; Mattessich et al., 2001; Silk & Augustine, 2017).

### **2.2.5.2 The process stage**

Wood and Gray (1991) described the process component as a 'black box'. Based on research on the practical implications of collaboration, Thomson et al. (2009), described the collaboration process as: formally and informally interactions through a sequence of negotiation, development of commitments and carrying out those commitments. It is a complex construct of five dimensions that need to be managed in order to collaborate effectively. These five dimensions are: governance, administration, mutuality, norms of trust and reciprocity and organizational autonomy. A favorable intensity of these dimensions is hard to indicate, as the collaborative process is uncertain. The key to a successful collaboration process is to seek balance among the five dimensions by continuous monitoring, adjustment and discussion (Thomson & Perry, 2006).

#### ***Collaborative governance and administration***

An important element for the collaboration process is a framework of rules and practices that ensures accountability, fairness and transparency (Ostrom, 1990). The set of rules that govern the behavior of partners offer a structure to work together in a more efficient way (Wallin & Von Krogh, 2010). Reaching agreements on a set of rules does not mean everyone has to agree, as long as they are willing to support the decision once it is made (Thomson, 2001).

Another important factor to collaborative governing is the partners' willingness to monitor themselves and impose consequences on unwilling partners. This adds to the trustworthiness of the stakeholders (Thomson & Perry, 2006). Next to monitoring, formal and informal, face-to-face communication is of great value in the process of building a mutual commitment (Ostrom, 1990).

Furthermore, an administrative structure can be used to move from governance towards activating the partnership (Ring & van de Ven, 1994; Thomson & Perry, 2006). According to Thomson and Perry (2006) the key is to find the right combination of social capacity to build

relationships and administrative facilities by coordination and creating elements of hierarchy. In addition, Blomqvist, Hurmelinna & Seppänen (2005) state that formal, written contracts, help partners to avoid future disputes and enables risk reduction.

### ***Organizational Autonomy***

The autonomy and interdependency of stakeholders need to be balanced out in a healthy tension, in order to create a sustainable CP (Thomson & Perry, 2006). When stakeholders lose too much of their autonomy and with that, their specialized identity, the CP is not a collaboration, but a take-over (Kaats & Opheij, 2014).

A defining element of CPs is that partners share a dual identity: they maintain their own identities and organizational structure, separate from the collaborative identity. Partners tend to protect their own identities by maintaining individual control, which needs to be balanced by the willingness to share information about their own workings and abilities. This increases partners' understanding and adds to the sustainability of a CP (Hogeboom et al., 2012; Thomson & Perry, 2006). According to Himmelman (1996), this willingness is one of the distinguishing characteristics of CPs.

### ***Mutually Beneficial Relationships***

Powell (1990) says shared interests are usually based on a passion that goes beyond an individual organizations' mission, for example, making art practice and art education accessible for all. The commonalities among partners can be a similarity of mission, target populations or professional culture (Thomson, 2001).

### ***Norms of Trust and Reciprocity***

Mattessich et al. (2001) argued that mutual respect, understanding and trust are important indicators for sustainable partnerships. Here, a reputation for trustworthiness proves critical to any partnership (Ostrom, 1990). The process of establishing trust and reciprocity takes time and maintenance and can't be forced or pressured (Thomson, 2001).

### **2.2.5.3 The outcome stage**

The last area in the collaboration model of Thomson and Perry (2006), is the outcome stage, where the success and/or effectiveness of the CP is measured by making sure the expected outcomes are established.

Also, the accuracy of the CP should be assessed (Thomson & Perry, 2006). By means of summative evaluation and feedback mechanisms, partners can take inventory and decide whether the CP should continue, be transformed or ended (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Research notes how CPs can be a risky and uncertain process (Reilly, 2001; Thomson & Perry, 2006). The assumption that CPs generally lead to positive outcomes, is not always the case. In fact, ineffectiveness or undesirable outcomes are imaginable (Reilly, 2001; Longoria, 2005). When a negative outcome occurs, the CP can damage the reputations of stakeholders (Reilly, 2001; Thomson & Perry, 2006).

## **2.3 Facilitating factors and barriers influencing collaboration partnerships**

### **2.3.1 Factors influencing collaboration partnerships**

Based on a literature review on factors influencing successful collaboration, Mattessich et al. (2001) developed a framework describing numerous factors essential to the success of CPs in government, human services, and non-profit organizations (Appendix C). Mattessich et al. (2001) and Anderson-Butcher et al. (2008) claim that this framework can help schools to avoid barriers, false-starts and long-term disappointments. The success factors are grouped into six categories:

- environment (1) is defined as the context of the CP: geographic location, political climate, and wider community;
- membership (2) involves the perspectives and skills of stakeholders and the culture of the organizations participating in CPs;
- process and structure (3) includes the management and operational systems of the collaboration;
- communication (4) involves the sharing and receiving information and opinions;
- purpose (5) include the goals and objectives of the CP; and

- resources (6) involve the financial and human incentives needed to create the CP (Mattessich et al., 2001)

Rattelade and Sylvestre (2012) mention limitations to studies that confirmed, or found similar characteristics corresponding to the six categories of Mattessich et al. (2001). They mention how the characteristics of sustainable CPs are often presented as independent from each other. In their view, these studies fail to consider how these elements develop and evolve during the CP. Rattelade and Sylvestre (2012) advise us to consider how the elements may influence one another throughout the duration of the CP.

### **2.3.2 Facilitating factors influencing collaboration partnerships between schools and art organizations.**

In addition to the more general framework of Mattessich et al. (2001), we will discuss the findings of Silk and Augustine (2017), which are specific to CPs between schools and art organizations. Silk and Augustine (2017) identified six facilitating factors:

- proximity to and diversity of cultural assets (1);
- presence of intermediaries serving as brokers (2);
- access to adequate, supporting funding (3);
- support of multiple champions for arts education (4);
- presence of shared vision and goals (5); and
- collaborative effort (6) (Silk & Augustine, 2017)

First facilitating factor is the proximity to and diversity of cultural assets, as for example, artists or organizations become more able to travel to schools and vice versa (Silk & Augustine, 2017). The other way around, Rowe, Werber, Kaganoff and Robyn (2004) mention the lack of proximity as a challenge to the success of CPs, as schools not always find arts organizations that offer, or are interested in partnerships, in close proximity of the school.

The second factor is the presence of intermediaries serving as brokers, as they help schools and organizations raise awareness of arts partnership opportunities. For example, a local art coordinator can help connecting organizations and schools (Bodilly & Augustine, 2008; Rowe et al., 2004; Silk & Augustine, 2017). Research mentions how inadequate information and/or a lack of awareness on art organizations prevent schools from initiating CPs.

Information on past or current partnerships are spread across individual websites, and opportunities are often not shared with and among schools. As schools are not always aware of the range of opportunities available, they do not pursue them (Rowe et al., 2004; Silk & Augustine, 2017; Vermeersch & Vandenbroucke, 2011).

The third facilitating factor is the access to adequate and supporting funding at the initiation and throughout the development of the partnership (Mattessich et al., 2001; Rowe et al., 2004; Silk & Augustine, 2017).

Fourth, the support of multiple champions for arts education was identified as facilitating (Silk & Augustine, 2017). Partnerships become more sustainable when supporters advocate for the CP throughout its duration (Bodilly & Augustine 2008; Seidel, et al., 2000; Silk & Augustine 2017).

The fifth facilitating factor is the presence of a shared vision and mutual goals that use the strengths of stakeholders. When a CP addresses the needs of the school, staff and students, the CP is more likely to meet the needs of the other stakeholders (Ellis, 2009; Kaats & Opheij, 2014; Rowe et al., 2004; Seidel, et al., 2000; Silk & Augustine 2017). CPs need a clear purpose with sufficient priority, that adds value to both parties. It is the shared vision and ambition that gives meaning to the CP (Kaats & Opheij, 2014).

Last facilitating factor is the collaborative effort created by stakeholders. By developing successful working relationships and frequent communication, the partnership becomes grounded in mutual respect (Silk & Augustine, 2017). Mutual understanding and engagement makes stakeholders more flexible when initial plans need to be adjusted (Kaats & Opheij, 2014; Rowe et al., 2004; Seidel et al., 2000; Silk & Augustine, 2017).

### **2.3.3 Barriers influencing collaboration partnerships**

Research on CPs between schools and art organizations mention various factors hindering the development or initiation of partnerships. For example, schools are commonly obstructed in engaging in a CP by lack of time, funding, information, communication, and process evaluation (Dreeszen, Aprill & Deasy, 1999; Seidel et al., 2000). Similarly, Peck, Gulliver and Towell (2002) mention how partners involved in a CP are often concerned about time management, workload and an increase in bureaucracy.

CPs can struggle without the comfort of trusting relationships. Organizations, schools and teachers are often so busy accomplishing their own work, they do not invest in building relationships and establishing trust with partners (Lawson, 2004).

When partnerships do become implemented and sustained, a lack of time and capacity for regular check-ins will affect the partnership unfavorably. Schools and organizations need to alter this challenge by identifying and communicating on areas for improvement while maintaining a focus on to the overall vision and intentions (Silk & Augustine, 2017).

Lawson (2004) notes how political and social climates can create obstacles that prevent stakeholders to engage in a CP, as for example, the timing may not be supportive of partnerships and/or their vision and goals (Lawson, 2004). Silk & Augustine (2017) mention how partnerships sometimes fail to compete with higher-priority school needs coming from (local) governments. As a result, not all principals will prioritize CPs. Furthermore, Rummery (2002) notes that we cannot assume that CPs are valuable in itself. Sometimes governments and policy makers may ask for CPs, but if the motive is pressure or insistence, the potential of the CP may be low or without an impact.

## **2.4 Summary**

We started this literature study by describing the specific structures of PTAE and AA in Flanders and Brussels. We saw how the forthcoming policy reform in PTAE aims to connect the two sectors. Although the Flemish Government argues that the connection between PTAE and local AA organizations should become self-evident (Vlaamse Regering, 2017b), no study identified the interdependencies and motives of Flemish PTAE schools and AA organizations to engage in a partnership.

In search for a more systematic approach for understanding the collaborative process between PTAE and AA, we discussed the collaboration process model by Thomson & Perry (2006). Furthermore, Wood and Gray (1991) and Mattessich et al. (2001) argue, that in understanding CPs as a process that yields specific outcomes, certain examinations and considerations are needed. Stakeholders involved in a CP, have to take inventory of the factors that enable the effectiveness of the collaboration process and what factors hinder the

accomplishment of the CP. For this reason, we reported on the preconditions and challenges in developing a sustainable CP.

### **III research questions**

Until now, the interaction and exchange between AA organizations and more formal PTAE schools has not been investigated thoroughly. The purpose of this study is to explore why PTAE schools engage in partnerships with AA organizations and how different determinants influence the practice. The objective is to identify facilitating and hindering factors for a sustainable partnership between PTAE school and AA organizations. This study aims to answer the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: What interdependencies do PTAE schools experience in a collaboration partnership with AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?

RQ2: What are the motives for PTAE schools to engage in a collaboration partnership with AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?

RQ3: Which determinants facilitate the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?

RQ4: Which determinants hinder the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?

## **IV Methodology**

In this study, a qualitative research methodology was used. Based on the literature study, an interview scheme was created in order to address the research questions. Interviews allow us to study phenomena that include individual needs and opinions (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Also, the subject of CPs among PTAE and AA is not yet investigated in depth. For these reasons, this study used open-ended questions and allowed the discussion to diverge from the interview scheme. The interviews aimed to yield more information than was planned to ask for and foster the opportunity to elaborate more on interesting aspects of CPs and the underlying ideas (Denzin, 1970).

There are also disadvantages in using interviews as a research method, one of them being the subjectivity and therefore possibility of bias in the analysis (Silverman, 2001). The interviews were recorded and transcribed, in this way the original data were available at all times and a possible bias could be reduced.

### **4.1 Research instrument**

The interview used 22 open-ended questions. The first 6 questions discussed school leaders' opinions on the policy reform, their understanding of CPs between PTAE and AA, and background information on past, current and future CPs with AA. Next, 6 questions highlighted the interdependencies and motives of PTAE school leaders and AA organizations to engage in a partnership. Last, 10 questions focused on the factors that facilitate and/or hinder the collaboration process. The questions were arranged according to a fixed pattern, starting with introductory questions, leading to key questions and final questions. (Bleijenbergh, 2015). The questionnaire (Appendix E) is designed and conducted in Dutch as it was the native language of the respondents.

### **4.2 Participants**

This study chose to question PTAE school leaders, on account of their central role in the management and responsibility for the well-functioning of the school. School leaders are in position of a detailed overview on policy and practice, which make them significant sources in

this research, as they have “intimate familiarity” with the research subject (Lofland & Lofland, 1995; Lofland, 1997).

Furthermore, this study chose to focus on PTAE schools in the province of East Flanders. In this way, the study presents a general and diverse view on PTAE within one region: main institutions from smaller municipalities, medium-sized and large cities (Vermeersch et al., 2011).

All 34 PTAE schools in the province of East Flanders were contacted and asked to participate in the study. This study interviewed 22 school leaders of 21 PTAE schools. PTAE schools sometimes have more than one school leader, which explains why the amount of respondents and schools differ from each other. This study interviewed school leaders of Academies for Visual Arts, Academies for Performing Arts and Art Academies, finding a balance between the different disciplines within the PTAE schools.

#### **4.3 Data collection procedure**

The participants were first contacted by e-mail in February 2018. The interviews took place between February and March 2018. All interviews are conducted at school leaders’ offices, at school, in search for a setting where respondents felt comfortable to talk about the topic (Bleijenbergh, 2015). The time requested for each interview was 60 to 90 minutes. An informed consent was agreed, which allow us to analyze the data in a later stage during the research process (Appendix D). Moreover, the interviews are conducted in Dutch, as it was the native language of the respondents. However, as the report is written in English, the interviewees answers that have been highlighted as results in this report were translated to English.

#### **4.4 Data analysis methods**

Due to the large amount of data that was generated, a data reduction process was used to support the analysis. The first step included reading through the transcripts and highlighting interesting and potentially relevant data to address the RQs. After getting familiar with the data by reading and re-reading, labels were added to the text, using MAXQDA, a software program for qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods research. This resulted in identifying

emerging themes and broader patterns. Later, we reviewed the themes and patterns to make sure they fit in the data. In the analysis process we concentrated on finding new themes by putting aside assumptions and preconceptions of the subject, as suggested by King & Horrocks (2010).

## V Findings

### 5.1 The policy reform

Generally, respondents support the reform, as they think it offers possibilities to renew their educational offer and further develop their school identity. However, all school leaders also expressed concerns and discontent.

There is a perception among respondents that the reform fosters hidden financial cuts, unspoken by the government. They feel that they have to achieve their mission with fewer resources. As a result, some schools would have preferred to leave things as they were because it is their opinion that the new possibilities that have been created cannot be realized without the input of extra resources. In the words of one respondent: *"it will simply be a copy-paste, of the old structure onto the new policy"* (R12).

Furthermore, most school leaders think that the implementation of the reform is starting too soon and find the deadline of September 1, 2018, unattainable. Also, the lack of accurate information and slow pace at which the new policy developments are being communicated, raises questions among respondents.

There is a great dissatisfaction with the final objectives for the fourth degree, the so called 'professional qualifications', which were formulated by the AA sector. School leaders say they have not been consulted or involved in the development. As a result, not all school leaders support these final objectives.

*Then out of the blue, without going into a discussion, the AA sector, which actually delineates an unclear terrain, decides what the professional qualifications for PTAE students are. And then we see how these professional qualifications and objectives are formulated very amateurishly and that is meant to be pejorative ... there are things that we actually laugh about, rather than take seriously. (R13)*

Last, the reforms' ambition to stimulate CPs with AA was generally supported, however, their understanding of this ambition was different. The diversity in understanding is also apparent in the examples of CPs mentioned by respondents. In addition, no respondent mentioned a central guideline or set of standards considering the ambition of the government to promote collaboration between schools and AK.

## **5.2 Past, current and future partnerships between PTAE schools and AA organizations**

All respondents described how their school is involved in different kinds of partnerships, with different kind of partners, next to AA organizations. They noted how partnerships are a crucial part of their APP. Although all respondents expressed highly specific ideas about partnerships with the AA, none of the schools formulated these ideas into a written vision statement.

Throughout all interviews, respondents felt the need to express the unique identity of the PTEA in relation to the AA. Respondents describe PTAE as: education, process-oriented and high-quality, the AA sector was described as a form of leisure activity, focused on more short-term engagements.

*The academy is a concrete place with a structure, something tangible, with a certain atmosphere. There is a vision. There is an infrastructure which makes things possible. The school is something you can use whenever you want. On the other hand, an AA organization is actually an empty box, but in a good way. It is easier to use for shorter, stimulating projects, for people who are less focused on the proactive, but rather on occasional activities, such as group travels or studio visits. PTEA is much more physical, something of a long duration. In the AA there are no restrictions to participate in an activity. Here, you have to be a student and be proactive. You can not only participate in the activities, you have to be active in the studio yourself. The added value of the AA is that it is more plausible (R14)*

Although it is not the intention of this study to identify CPs between PTEA schools and AA organizations, the following became clear: all respondents are or were engaged in one or more forms of partnership and continue to build alliances with the AA. Most partnerships are found in the disciplines of Music and Visual Art and to lesser extent in the discipline of Word Arts. No respondent mentioned examples in the discipline Dance.

There are also differences in the amount of examples within the disciplines itself. For example, the wind and percussion instruments lend themselves better to collaborate with harmonies, fanfares and brass bands. Furthermore, most examples were forms of coordination and collaboration, rather than forms of cooperation.

In general, the examples of partnerships between PTAE schools and AA organizations, are diverse and range from simple to more complex undertakings. The scope of interaction, integration, commitment, and complexity is hard to capture. For example, some partnerships ask for a short-term commitment, others imply a long-term commitment. Some initiatives are sporadic, some recurrent. Schools are involved in partnerships with one or multiple stakeholders. Some partnerships are local and some are nationwide. Partnerships occur at school, on-site and on off-site locations. Some partnerships include one particular discipline, some are interdisciplinary.

### **5.3 Interdependencies and motives**

Respondents were asked what interdependencies they experience with AA organizations and what their motives are to engage in a partnership. The interdependencies reflect the missions and goals, which PTEA schools think they cannot achieve without the contributions of other stakeholders, specifically the AA sector. The motives, on the other hand, reflect the benefits schools aim to achieve. These motives are not necessarily shared by AA.

#### **5.3.1 Interdependency**

Not all schools experience necessities or challenges, which are mutually shared with the AA and addressed in a partnership. Still, most of the respondents experienced interdependence, leading to CPs with the AA. Generally, school leaders highlighted 'the exposure to the arts and arts practice' as a mutually shared interdependency. More specific, three different interdependencies became apparent during the interviews: 'the orientation and transitions of future audiences to the fields of PTEA and AA'; 'the expansion of target audiences'; and 'the promotion of a certain field of art'.

##### **5.3.1.1 Orientation and transitions of future audiences to the fields of PTEA and AA**

Respondents aim to promote and develop future audiences for the field of AA, by creating CPs that raise awareness and introduce students to the workings of AA organizations. By doing so, schools want to orientate and help students connect to the field in which they will possibly end up after completing their programs. Vice, versa, by creating a compelling

exposure to the arts, to learning experiences and the offer of PTEA schools, respondents think they can access new potential students and audiences within the field of AA.

#### **5.3.1.2 The expansion of target audiences**

Some PTAE schools want to attract and include a more diverse and broad audience, an ambition that, according to school leaders, coincides with the ambitions of certain AA organizations. By engaging in a partnership, schools and AA organizations aim to broaden their target audiences and work on the inclusion of minority groups and socially underprivileged populations, hoping the CP will result in participants who enjoy the arts and feel competent enough to engage in arts education.

*The necessity is the expansion of ours target groups. Through partnerships we are able to reach target groups that miss connection to PTAE. Especially when it concerns disadvantaged groups. PTAE has an elitist side, and for some the barrier is very large. Our pupils are often well- educated, two-earners, white, ... Often they also received 'culture' at home. With partnerships, we are able to reach groups that do not find the way to PTAE or even do not know we exist. (...). It was a fantastic project, with results. Some participants, people out of poverty, eventually remained a student here. Mission succeeded. They can further develop themselves artistically and take a step closer to society. They also built up a social network. The place, the art academy can be accommodated that. They make a financial contribution to stay here, that is not easy for them, so they must think it's worthwhile what they became acquainted with during the project. (R21)*

#### **5.3.1.3 The promotion of a certain field of art**

According to respondents, PTAE schools and AA organizations share the need to promote the practice and appreciation of less known or apparent art forms, instruments and/or working methods. In these CPs the unique characteristics, specific outcomes and potential benefits are brought to the attention.

### **5.3.2 Motives**

*We don't really 'need' a collaboration, but there can be added value in working together, depending on the objectives and motives that you have in mind. For us, a shared need is not a necessity to start a partnership, but every support to promote our APP is welcome. (R15)*

Not all respondents experience an interdependency with the field of AA. However, all school leaders formulated several motives to engage in a CP with the AA. Respondents' motives fell into three categories: student benefits, school benefits and benefits for the larger community.

#### **5.3.2.1 Students benefits**

Almost all schools claim to be student-focused, as a result, students and their needs are often placed at the center of the CP. Respondent 6 emphasized this: "The added value that a collaboration can give to the students, is why we work together. I think that is actually the only thing that counts: that it benefits students." (R6)

#### ***Students' social and personal development***

Students' involvement in group processes was most mentioned as a motive to engage in a partnership with the AA. Through CPs, students become involved in a set of social interactions, interchanges and activities, where they learn to interact with peers, learn to monitor their point of views, learn to respect others and learn to compromise in order to contribute to the group.

*Developing competences related to collaboration, functioning as a group, taking into account other people, helping people, that is our motive to work together with the AA. So students learn what it is to work out a project together with a number of people and to sacrifice something for it. That it has benefits. Students feel they belong somewhere. They build something up with other people and they have a kind of pride. That's why we*

*do it. To let people be creative, develop projects together and develop certain competences that they can use in other areas of their lives. (R6)*

### **Students' motivation**

Some respondents spoke about how CPs are used to improve students' motivation, as partnerships help them to become more confident and successful at their art practice.

*In collaborating with the AA, we want the pupils to experience the strengths of both sides. On the one hand their education, and on the other hand, the joy they experience in their art. That those two sides blend in with each other. That they experience that their study improves, that they can do a lot more. Give students the opportunity to experience that they can play difficult pieces and excel in it. The motivation of the students is our biggest intention, which is why we collaborate with AA. (R19)*

### **Time-gain for students**

Schools mention how by collaborating with AA organizations to establish official ALCs, students are able to reduce their time investment in their art practice and education. Students often participate in an amateur theater company, music ensemble or assist a visual artist, in addition to their PTAE course and for some students, the combination can be too demanding.

#### **5.3.2.2 School benefits**

Within the level of the school, schools mention three motives to engage in a CP with the AA: compliment the schools' educational offer and services; the recruitment of new students; and professional development of staff.

#### **Compliment the schools' educational offer and services**

School use CPs to complement the schools' educational offer and services, in the fields they feel unable to emphasize or provide specific expertise for.

*For example: how do I take pictures of my work, how do I show my work, how do I create a portfolio, ... These are things that are not always covered in the course. Through a collaboration, a workshop or a guest lecture, we can offer these things. KunstWerk has that expertise, more than we do. (R21)*

Respondents also mentioned how they were eager to create opportunities to experiment with new contexts and approaches to teaching and learning, that may not be available in the context of the school. As a result, students become acquainted with other art forms, methods, feedback, locations, repertoires, and so on. The flexibility and ability to interact with diversity is seen as an essential feature of being or of becoming an artist.

### **Recruit new students**

Schools already organize happenings and events to promote their workings, in addition they use CPs with AA, to access new audiences and recruit students.

### **Professional development of staff**

One school leader mentioned how the school used a CP with an amateur artist as a method of professional development for teachers.

*Another reason to collaborate with the AA: look for external expertise. I'll give an example: the bronze-caster. The sculpting teacher, learned to cast bronze once, but he wanted to update his skills. We invited a local bronze-caster, an amateur artist, for a collaboration project. This was interesting for the students, but the starting point was the professional development of the teacher. (R18)*

### **5.3.2.3 Community benefits**

The social aspect and group processes of the arts and CPs, was also mentioned as an enrichment for the wider community. Respondents use CPs as an opportunity to bring the school and community together. Here, the motive is to improve the local cultural offer, through happenings, exhibitions and performances, for other students, families, and the wider community.

*We do it to enrich the city. I think, as an art academy you have the obligation to. I think we are part of the 'DNA' of a city. The 'DNA' of culture. We help to make that 'DNA' stronger and help consolidate that for the future by actively collaborating with the AA organisations. (R6)*

#### **5.4 Factors facilitating the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations**

School leaders were asked which determinants facilitate the collaboration process and how these factors contribute to the success and sustainability of a partnership. Respondents mentioned 11 determinants: the creation of a win-win situation; respect for each other's' autonomy and singularities; mutual norms of trust; a shared history of partnerships; collaborative governance and organization; selection criteria for partners; communication; the support of mediating entities; leadership; skilled staff; and facilitating accommodation.

##### **5.4.1 Creation of a win-win situation**

Commonly marked as a facilitating factor, was the prospect of benefits for all stakeholders. By clarity of interests and mutual expectations, schools seek a win-win situation.

##### **5.4.2 Mutual Respect for Autonomy and singularities**

In addition to the creation of a win-win situation, respondents think mutual acceptance and respect for each others' specialized identity and autonomy adds to the success of a collaboration process.

##### **5.4.3 Shared vision and goals**

Schools emphasized, in order to collaborate successfully, there is a need for a clear vision and explicit goals with sufficient priority, shared by all partners. This enables partners to identify needs and resources and how to address and utilize them.

#### **5.4.4 Mutual norms of trust**

Mutual trust among stakeholders was mentioned many times as facilitating. Schools need to know that partners will keep their promises and respect shared agreements.

*You must establish clear agreements and follow-ups. Both partners must act on what they promise. That's why it does not always work, but you feel it when partners take it seriously, it's about trust. If there is trust, everything runs much smoother. (R20)*

#### **5.4.5 The impact of process and outcome evaluation**

In relation to the norms of trust, a few respondents mentioned the willingness of stakeholders, to monitor their commitment to the CP, as a facilitating feature. Schools see the importance of process evaluation and outcome evaluation, as it generates feedback on the effectiveness of the partnership and provides opportunities to adjust the process and goals throughout the partnership.

#### **5.4.6 History of partnerships**

Some schools have a respectable history in CPs with local AA organizations. Respondents mention how former, positive experiences increase the success of partnerships, based on a reputation for trustworthiness.

*A successful CP always has consequences in one way or another. Either, in the sense of a 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, edition or in the form of a new partnership initiative. You get more confidence in working together. You become convinced that more things are possible with that organization in the future. (R11)*

#### **5.4.7 Collaborative governance and organization**

By paying attention to the governance and professional organization, school leaders aim to add to the sustainability of the CP. By mutually agreeing on a set of clear roles and responsibilities, they seek for accountability and transparency. One respondent pointed out that the importance of collaborative governance becomes greater depending on the group size. Furthermore, some of the respondents noted how they were working on the collaborating

governance of the official ALCs, resulting in a more formal contract, in which school leaders want to bind AA organizations to a set of rules.

#### **5.4.8 Selection criteria for partners**

Also in anticipation of future ALCs, school leaders are formulating selection criteria for partners.

Schools are convinced reviewing partner compatibility is of critical significance for the success of ALCs, as they stay accountable for the quality of the learning process of their students. The selection criteria mentioned by school leaders are: the person responsible for the ALC has to have a degree in the arts and a certificate of pedagogical competence, apply evaluation methods, monitor students' attendance, and so on. These criteria have to be approved by the government, before PTAE schools can apply them.

#### **5.4.9 Communication**

Almost all respondents mentioned how frequent and effective communication was an important basis for establishing a sustainable partnership. Schools create informal and formal communication links, as they think both forms are equally important.

*I think our CPs are successful because of the fact that we often contact our partners and that this contact is frequent. We keep on stimulating each other. It's a process that remains continuous, (...) the communication process in itself is important to me. It has to be maintained. (R5)*

#### **5.4.10 Support of mediating entities**

Some respondents think the support of intermediaries makes collaboration easier. These mediating entities help schools and organizations raise awareness of partnership opportunities, actively advocate for art partnerships and help pass information between schools and AA organizations. A diverse range of mediating entities were mentioned: school leaders, teachers, pedagogical coordinators, local government actors, students, alumni, and so on.

*The harmony (AA organization) is very much anchored locally. The man who coordinates the harmony knows all our teachers. He makes contacts, makes people enthusiastic to enroll in the academy and looks for ways to interact with each other. He is actually a sort of ambassador for the academy and the AA. (R6)*

#### **5.4.11 Skilled staff**

In addition to the support of mediating entities, some respondents mention the comfort of skilled staff, with the social capacity to build meaningful and trustworthy relationships.

*Another challenge is the practical elaboration. You need teachers who have experience and have the right skills. You have to be able to use the right people when it comes to a CP. If these persons are available in the first place. You also need to support and guide them in that unusual and specific context. Sometimes it is hard to find someone who has the right expertise. It is like searching for a white raven. On the other hand, it is also looking for channels where we can go for extra guidance, support or training. (R21)*

#### **5.4.12 Leadership**

A few respondents mention how they used their leadership as a connecting factor, looking for ways to stimulate and inspire staff to look for partnerships of all kinds.

*You have to encourage artistry with as many people as possible. This is possible by partnerships. As a principal, you can integrate collaboration into your APP. Then you have a basis to launch these kinds of projects. (...) I think you have to radiate in the first place. You have to be steeped in the idea, the idea of working together. You have to see that as obvious. You cannot force it. You have to be able to feed the will to collaborate, play a pioneering role, be an advocate for partnerships. As a leader, you have to be the personification of what you put forward in your APP. (R22)*

#### **5.4.13 Facilitating accommodation**

Some respondents mentioned how their school buildings facilitated partnerships with the AA, as they could offer AA organizations an exhibition space, a rehearsal space or a professional music studio. One respondent mentioned how the architect of their new school building was asked to take into account openness and versatility when designing.

*We gave the architect of the new building the assignment not to design 'a school'. We said: "do it differently". No separate classrooms, we do not want that. The building must trigger. We have also taken into account the AA organizations in the design. For example, if the harmony wants to rehearse here, we made sure that the kettledrums are easy to move. (R2)*

### **5.5 Factors hindering the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations**

Respondents were asked what challenges they experienced during the collaboration process and how these were addressed by them. Schools solely mentioned challenges related to the initiation of partnerships, rather than mentioning the threats to the implementation process or outcome of the partnership.

The hindering determinants are: a lack of information and feelings of disinterests, negative perceptions about AA; an unfavorable social climate and political pressure; feelings of competitiveness; physical distance; lack of time and funding; limited time for planning; workload for teachers and students; an increase in bureaucracy; lack of opportunities to discuss the content and form and an inadequate link to the schools' curricula.

#### **5.5.1 Lack of information and feelings of disinterests**

Several school leaders mentioned that the AA field is so divided and widespread that they cannot possibly be aware of all local and national AA organizations and their operations. Respondents experience a lack of information about AA organizations and how they can be of value for the school and its goals and mission. Vice versa, schools have the impression that some AA organizations do not show interest in their workings and offers.

*I see little interaction, also towards each other. Are they going to each other's performances? Let alone that they come to see a public show in the academy out of interest. I wonder if that happens. I think little or never. Do they ask themselves questions like: "What happens in an academy where we can be pollinated by?". Do they know what our way of working is? What texts, music, ... we use? These are all issues that have never been discussed. There is a lack of mutual interest for each other. (R22)*

One respondent mentioned that they received magazines and newsletters of all government approved AA organizations except from KunstWerkt. The respondent was not aware of their offer as the school was not subscribed to their magazine or newsletter. Furthermore, some respondents expressed that even though they experienced resistance and disinterest from AA organizations, they were not discouraged.

*I can tell you this: last week, I met with the local AA organization. I invited about twenty. Eight of the twenty have responded to our invitation. So there are not many of them, but my energy never goes to those who are not there. I am happy with those eight. I do not let myself be discouraged by the obstacles. (R20)*

### **5.5.2 Negative perceptions about the quality within the AA**

Several school leaders expressed unfavorable ideas about the field of AA. Among these respondents there is a perception of amateurism, ignorance and inferior artistic quality. As a result, these school leaders are not keen on collaborating. In addition, school leaders fear that through collaboration, the school will be associated with poor artistic quality.

*In the AA, it is not always qualitative. I dare to say, it sometimes is shameful in terms of quality. Now, I think that is not a problem in itself, but it is a problem when you connect your academy with it, because then it seems like everything that can be seen on such an exhibition, that you endorse it as a school. I think most principles would prefer to have nothing to do with it. (R10)*

Two respondents countered these negative connotations by saying that 'amateurism' or 'quality' are subjective.

*I know that my colleagues can be very pompous about 'quality'. Look, you have professional music conductors and amateur music conductors. You could say: working together must be professional, be all about quality. But quality in art is so subjective. I have already met a lot of non-professional musicians who score higher tops than professional people. It is not because you are an amateur, that you are therefore less good. (R2)*

### **5.5.3 Unfavorable social climate and political pressure**

Respondents mention that in the field of the AA, organizations are sometimes unwilling to collaborate with each other because of rivalry, caused by the organization's political background and/or associated histories. Respondents point out how this infighting, hinders the development of partnerships with multiple stakeholders.

*AA organizations sometimes find partnerships threatening with respect to their individuality and their own functioning. (...) We also cannot manage to have all those organizations to work together in one CP. It is not possible through ideology: the left wing, the Catholic association, 'the whites' and 'the blacks' as during the war. Those ideologies really are still there. That is something to work on in the future within the AA. If we can get them to work together, then I think there will also be more possibilities in a CP with the academy. We have also experienced that there is jealousy when we partner up with some AA organizations. The other organizations blame us that we only collaborate with their competition. Sometimes their histories stand in the way of collaboration. (R19)*

Furthermore, a few schools mentioned how political entities or persons who control certain resources, try to pressure schools to participate in CPs with certain AA organizations.

*Then you have to decide with whom you are going to collaborate and who not. Local politicians are sometimes part of these AA organizations which makes you obliged to work together (...) It is a political game. At one point your local mayor, who manages your resources, could say: "oh, that grand piano we talked about, we might postpone that for another year..." (R3)*

Although respondents say they do not give in to this pressure, it was mentioned as unfavorable for partnerships. As one respondent points out: *"Compulsion does not work in a creative environment. That is impossible."* (R10).

#### **5.5.4 Feelings of competitiveness**

Schools sometimes sense rivalry towards and from AA organizations that offer educational programs. In their opinion, these organization form a jeopardy, as both are competing for students and the funding they bring. This results in competition, rather than collaboration. All school leaders who offer the discipline Dance, mentioned competitiveness as the main reason why there are no partnerships with AA Dance organizations.

#### **5.5.5 Physical distance**

Respondents mentioned physical distance between AA organizations and schools as a logistical concern that influences their engagement. First, some schools do not think it is relevant to engage in CPs that cannot be integrated locally. Secondly, when projects are conducted off-site, schools think the physical distance makes it more difficult, as teachers and/or students need to travel and consider means for transportation. As a result, schools prefer to work at locations in a relatively small perimeter around the school.

This factor seemed of great importance for a school who uses CPs to reach out to more disadvantaged populations. As for these participants, the verge towards PTAE is greater, schools like to let the partnership take place at school and let participants become familiar with the surroundings: *"First, we let a teacher work there, only later on the participants come to the Academy. In this way we hope to reduce the barrier to the school. I think that physical movement is very valuable."* (R21)

#### **5.5.6 Lack of time and funding**

Schools mention time and resources as a necessity to develop the CP, which schools do not always have access to. In their opinion, CPs need to be tailored to be not too time

consuming or costly, if not, school avoid the partnerships. For example, one school mentioned how they have put a CP on hold, to take a time off, to rethink the concept and think of a more efficient and less time-consuming formula.

#### **5.5.7 Limited time for planning**

Schools tend to plan a school year ahead, taking into account multiple agendas: the school schedule, the teachers' instructional planning and the students' schedule. When engaging in a CP, school leaders take these agendas into consideration. Although schools state how their calendars are flexible in order to address opportunities that occur along the school year, some CP are not suitable, because, for example, the CP would take place during the students' evaluation period.

#### **5.5.8 Workload for teachers and students**

Respondents mention how a heavy workload for teachers and students is hindering schools to engage in a partnership. School leaders do not want to overburden their team, students and parents as they are often preoccupied with work-related issues and time constraints.

#### **5.5.9 An increase in bureaucracy.**

Respondents mention how an increased administrative workload discourages them to engage in a partnership.

*I am disappointed that the new decree does not make it easy for us to work together. The entire hassle with submitting project files, preparing files, deadlines, ... the paperwork and the planning burden is so great. The workload is already so big, just to achieve the goals that we have to achieve. Collaboration should be much more evident, without all the hassle (R21)*

#### **5.5.10 Lack of opportunities to discuss the content and form.**

Respondents noted how they need time to mutually develop and discuss the content and form of a CP. One respondent points out: *'We refuse if the formula has already been laid down, if we are simply asked to carry out the project and cannot brainstorm about it or supplement it ourselves. We are not an event agency'.* (R19)

#### **5.5.11 Inadequate links to the curricula of the schools**

Respondents emphasized the importance to link partnerships to the schools' educational programs and curriculum, in order to implement the CP as a substantive part of the learning trajectory of students.

## **VI Discussion and conclusion**

This chapter discusses the most important research results as an answer to the research questions. Here, our findings are confronted and compared with the literature study. Next, recommendations, both practical and about policy, are formulated. Finally, the limitations of this study are mentioned and follow-up research is proposed.

### **6.1 Collaboration between PTAE schools and AA organizations and the policy reform**

Before we discuss our findings in relation to the RQs, more general findings are discussed. This enables us to place our findings and research questions into context.

Bamford (2007) concluded that in Flanders AA and PTAE activities tend to exist in relative isolation from one another. Our findings however, found how schools are integrating "collaboration" into their policies and practices to improve their workings, as mentioned by l'Enfant (2008) and Hogeboom et al. (2012). All of our respondents mentioned to be involved in different kinds of partnerships, with different kind of partners, including the AA. Although school leaders integrate 'partnerships' as a crucial part of their APP, none of the schools formulated their highly specific ideas on partnerships between PTAE and AA, into a written vision statement.

Similar to the findings of Vermeersch and Vandenbroucke (2011), our respondents mentioned that they value partnerships with AA organizations, as they believe a link between classroom education and out-of-school culture produces valuable opportunities for arts education. As a result, the reforms' ambition to stimulate CPs with AA, is generally supported.

However, our data show that among school leaders, imprecise and incoherent conceptions of collaboration circulate, as found in literature (e.g. Bamford et al., 2003; Lawson, 2004; Ray, 2002; Thomson et al., 2009). Not all respondents understand the reforms' ambition in the same way. School leaders and teachers need to have absolute transparency about what is expected of them and what strategies should be set up (Dalziel & Schoonover, 1988). Yet, some respondents mentioned how they have no clue as to implement the reform, which forms of partnerships to pursue and how to apply them in regard to the specific natures of the art disciplines. None of our respondents mentioned the existence of central guideline or set of

standards considering the ambition of the government to promote collaboration between schools and AA.

Furthermore, most current partnerships are found in the disciplines of Music and Visual Art and in a lesser extent in the discipline of Word Arts. No respondent mentioned examples in the discipline Dance, indicating there is still a significant disconnection with the AA. Also, there are great differences in the quantity and quality of partnerships within the different disciplines. Most examples were forms of coordination and collaboration, rather than forms of cooperation.

## **6.2 What interdependencies do PTAE schools experience in a collaboration partnership with AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?**

Our findings confirm that schools experience they cannot always achieve their missions and goals without the contributions of others, as found by Lawson et al. (2003). However, the interviews show that not all PTAE schools experience interdependencies with AA, which are mutually addressed in a partnership.

School leaders highlighted 'the exposure to the arts and arts practice' as a mutually shared interdependency. More specific, three different interdependencies became apparent during the interviews.

The first and most important interdependency is 'the orientation and transition of future audiences to the fields of PTEA and AA'. Here, schools aim to promote and develop future audiences for the field of AA, by creating CPs that raise awareness and introduce students to the workings of AA organizations. This finding reflects the idea that the practice of art in leisure time is one of the most important social finality of PTAE, as stated by the Flemish Government (Vlaamse Regering, 2015). Vice versa, by creating a compelling exposure to the arts, to learning experiences and through the offer of PTEA schools, respondents think they can access new potential students within the field of AA.

The second interdependency identified, is the 'expansion of target audiences'. PTAE schools want to appeal to a more diverse and broad audience, an ambition that coincides with the ambitions of certain AA organizations. By engaging in a partnership, schools and AA organizations aim to broaden their target audiences and work on the inclusion of minority

groups and socially underprivileged populations. Vermeersch and Vandenbroucke (2011) already found this shift in the focus of PTAE: in the past, schools focused on specialized talent development, today, PTAE wants to be more inclusive. This finding is also in line with the research of Lawson et al. (2003), who concluded that social problems and challenges (e.g. the inclusion of socially underprivileged populations) of are often a trigger for schools and organizations to initiate CPs.

Last interdependency identified, is the need to promote the practice and appreciation of less known or apparent art forms, instruments or working methods. In these CPs the unique characteristics, specific outcomes and potential benefits are brought to the attention.

### **6.3 What are the motives for PTAE schools to engage in a collaboration partnership with AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?**

This study identified seven motives for PTAE schools to engage in CPs with AA organizations: improve students' social and personal development, enhance students' motivation, allow time-gain for students, compliment schools' educational offers and services, the recruitment of new students, professional development of staff and the improvement of the local cultural offer.

Similar to the findings of Silk and Augustine (2017), the identified motives can be categorized in: benefits to students, benefits to schools and benefits to the local community. Different from the findings of Silk and Augustine (2017), is the fact that schools did not explicitly mentioned to be motivated by benefits to the AA organizations.

The student benefits: 'improve students' social and personal development', 'enhance students' motivation' and 'compliment schools' educational offers and services', confirm the findings of Silk and Augustine (2017). The motive to 'create a time-gain for students', was not found in literature. Perhaps, this is because the motive is inherent to the fact that PTAE is not part of compulsory education but are a form of leisure education.

The school benefits: 'compliment schools' educational offers and services' and 'professional development of staff', corroborate with the findings of Henderson and Mapp (2002). The motives; 'recruitment of new students' and 'the improvement of the local cultural offer' were also not found in literature.

#### **6.4 Which determinants facilitate the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?**

Most mentioned facilitating determinants imply mutuality and reciprocity, i.e. the creation of a win-win situation; shared vision and goals; mutual respect for autonomy and singularities; and mutual norms of trust. The mutuality in these determinants provides a foundation for producing common views out of differences, based on each other's needs, as mentioned by Ellis (2009), Kaats and Opheij (2014) and Rowe et al. (2004). Our findings show how clarity of interests and mutual expectations are crucial in the collaboration process, as mentioned by Kaats and Opheij (2014).

In relation to the facilitating effect of 'mutual respect for autonomy and singularities', Kaats and Opheij (2014) note that when stakeholders lose too much of their autonomy and with that, their specialized identity and legitimacy, the initiative is not a collaboration, but a take-over or a fusion.

Furthermore, respondents mentioned facilitating aspects more related to the process and structures of the partnerships, i.e. collaborative governance and organization; process and outcome evaluation; and the development of selection criteria for partners. As mentioned by Ostrom (1990), these determinants create clear frameworks of roles and tasks to ensure accountability, fairness and transparency. As a result, some respondents noted how they were working on a more formal contract, governing future ALC partnerships. Here, school leaders are convinced that formal, written contracts, help partners to avoid future disputes and enable risk reduction, as mentioned by Blomqvist, Hurmelinna & Seppänen (2005). Our findings also show how school leaders find comfort in determining criteria for partner selection to make CPs less risky, as mentioned by Douma (1997) and Stephens et al. (2009).

Schools emphasized how they are convinced of the benefits of summative program evaluation and feedback, as suggested by Thomson & Perry (2006) and Wood & Gray (1991). School leaders also confirmed the facilitating effect of open and frequent communication, which was identified as an essential factor to the success of CPs by Mattessich et al. (2001)

The support of mediating entities in establishing formal and informal communication links, was mentioned as extremely helpful. These mediating entities also help schools and

organizations raise awareness of partnership opportunities and actively advocate for art partnerships, as mentioned by multiple studies (e.g. Bodilly & Augustine (2008), Rowe et al. (2004), Silk & Augustine (2017), Vermeersch & vandenbroucke (2014).

A few respondents mention their leadership as a facilitating factor, looking for ways to stimulate and inspire staff to look for partnerships of all kinds. Literature shows how partnerships are strongly influenced by school culture and management interventions of school leaders (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2008; Silk & Augustine, 2017). Kaats and Opheij (2014) emphasize that in partnerships, leadership needs to be a connecting factor.

### **6.5 Which determinants hinder the collaboration process among PTAE schools and AA organizations, according to PTAE school leaders?**

The first set of hindering determinants we found was a mix of negative perceptions about AA organizations and the schools' social and political environment, i.e. a lack of information about each other's workings and feelings of disinterest; negative perceptions about the quality within the AA; an unfavorable social climate and political pressure; and feelings of competitiveness.

Some school leaders described the AA organizations as amateurish, ignorant and with inferior artistic quality. It must be noted that not all school leaders share these ideas. The Forum for Amateur Arts is aware of these unfavorable associations, but claims these are based on misconceptions about the field (Forum voor Amteurkunsten, 2016). In addition, school leaders fear that through collaboration, the school will be associated with poor artistic quality. Schools fear the CP could damage their reputation, as found by Reilly (2001) and Thomson & Perry (2006).

Furthermore, school leaders feel hindered by an unfavorable social climate and political pressure. Rummery (2002) notes how sometimes governments and policy may require a partnership approach, but if the motive is governments' pressure or insistence, the potential of the collaboration may be low and without impact. Moreover, the feelings of competitiveness towards AA organizations who offer educational programs hinder all school leaders to engage in any kind of partnerships, especially in the discipline Dance.

The second set of hindering factors are practical and organizational concerns, i.e. the physical distance between AA organizations and schools, lack of time and funding, limited time for planning, heavy workload for teachers and students, an increase in bureaucracy, lack of opportunities to discuss the content and form; and inadequate links to the curricula of the schools. These factors echo the findings of Dreeszen et al. (1999) and Seidel et al. (2000). Similarly, Peck et al. (2002) mention how partners involved in a CP are often concerned about time management, work overload and an increase in bureaucracy. Bamford (2007) also found that geographical isolation and costs hinder partnerships between AA and formal education.

## **VII Recommendations**

The findings of this study explored why partnerships between PTAE schools and AA organizations are implemented and how different determinants influence the practice. As result, this study proposes a few practical and policy recommendations.

### **7.1 Practical recommendations**

Generally, our findings show the will of PTAE schools to engage in partnerships with the field of AA. As most schools are still exploring the opportunities and forms of collaborating, this study recommends the PTAE schools and AA organizations focus on the improvement of their current partnerships, rather than developing more and/or more-complex partnerships. This will allow them to build towards a supporting history of more successful CPs (Mattessich, et al., 2001; Stephens et al., 2009).

Secondly, this study proposes that school leaders become aware of their part in the success and sustainability of partnerships on account of their central role in the management and responsibility for the well-functioning of the school. Leadership and leadership styles seems to play a vital role in the management and implementation of the reform and its' ambition to promote partnerships between PTAE and AA. Capturing a vision and building mutual commitment is one of the most important role leaders can play in the implementation of an educational reform (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014). For example, school leaders can develop, formulate and communicate their needs and ideas on partnerships between PTAE and AA, in a vision statement. This could help improve communication and information sharing between schools and AA, which proved to be beneficial for initiating partnerships (Rowe et al., 2004; Silk & Augustine, 2017; Vermeersch & Vandenbroucke, 2014).

Next, if schools want to encourage the initiation of partnerships, this study suggests that schools, as well as AA organizations, think of more efficient ways to share and distribute information on their organizational structure, needs, motives, offers and curricula. For example, information could be made accessible in forms of brochures or websites. By these user-friendly information channels, partnerships can be promoted and showcased. This can be accompanied with: descriptive information; contact information; links to support and additional funding; meaningful checklists; supporting networks; and so on. We also suggest that the

descriptive information can be strengthened in more informal, face-to-face meetings at school. This could offer potential AA partners a view of classroom activities and facilitating accommodations, providing AA organizations more in-depth understandings of the workings of PTAE schools.

Last, schools can improve their current and future partnerships by generating the comfort of skilled staff, with the social capacity to build meaningful and trustworthy relationships. This study suggests that school leaders support and improve the skills of staff by stimulating partnership oriented professional development initiatives and coaching. As mentioned by some respondents, teacher training programs can also play a role in the development of this unique set of skills and attitudes.

## **7.2 Policy recommendations**

Literature shows the support of mediating entities in the creation of partnership between schools and art organizations (Bodilly & Augustine 2008; Rowe et al., 2004; Silk & Augustine 2017). School leaders mentioned teachers, pedagogical coordinators, local government actors, students, alumni, and so on, as possible brokers for partnerships. The intrinsic motivation of these brokers derives from their involvement with possibly both organizations, leading to more nuanced and successful CPs (Diephuis & van Kasteren, 2004). Their intrinsic motivation and knowledge and understanding of PTAE schools' workings, planning, curricula, and so on, can provide guidance to AA organizations that are looking for ways to collaborate. They can help avoid and anticipate on hindering factors, as identified in this study. We suggest that policymakers and school leaders make efforts to identify and value these mediating entities and coach them in the further development.

Secondly, Policy makers have to note that PTAE school leaders experience a lack of accurate information on new policy developments and that their understanding of the reforms' ambition to promote partnerships is differing. In order to implement reforms successfully, educational leaders need to be able to unambiguously identify the essential features of the reform plus their underlying behaviors and beliefs (Fullan, 2016). School leaders and teachers need to have absolute transparency about what is expected of them and what strategies they should use (Dalziel & Schoonover, 1988). However, none of the respondents mentioned a

central guideline or set of standards considering the ambition of the government to promote collaboration between schools and AA.

We suggest that policy makers should focus on providing schools with direction, by adding clarity and specificity about their goals and possible benefits. As the Flemish government, strives to grant schools as much as autonomy as possibly, it is interesting to note, that it is possible to be clear and precise without being rigid or too directing (Fullan, 2016). For example, the Flemish government could support the reform by providing guidelines or a set of standards considering their ambition, promoting the most effective partnership models and transactions, helping schools to avoid false-starts, challenges and disappointments. Schools need guidance, especially, on how to establish partnerships in respect to the different art disciplines, which was identified as troublesome.

### **7.3 Limitations**

This study has some limitations. First, only PTAE school leaders have been questioned. This study chose to focus on their central role in the management and responsibility for the well-functioning of the school, which make them significant sources in this research (Lofland & Lofland, 1995; Lofland, 1997).

Secondly, some concerns arise about the clarity of the data. During the interview, respondents were asked to focus on partnerships with AA organizations. Possibly, respondents approached the subjects more generally than specifically applied to the AA. In addition, because of respondents imprecise and incoherent conceptions of collaboration, school leaders used a variety of terms to identify and discuss their partnerships, making it necessary to pay extra attention to nuances in order to compare data more precisely (Thiel, 2010).

Last, studies on partnerships between schools and art organizations are highly contextual regarding the different art disciplines, the characteristics of the participants of the PC, the nature of the schools and communities where the initiatives take place, and so on. Also, the local cultural and educational policy play a significant role. As a result of the contextual nature, it is delicate to generalize research findings to other contexts (Donelan et al., 2009).

#### **7.4 Follow-up research**

This study generated a more general view on the characteristics of past and existing partnerships between PTAE schools and AA organizations. An exploratory and descriptive field analysis could identify which form of partnerships constitute the majority of cases, assessing their outcomes and identifying the characteristics of the most effective CPs.

In addition, a study could further explore the subject, by including the perspectives of other key actors, such as: AA organizations, mediating entities, teachers and students. Here, qualitative research could extend the identification of interdependencies, motives, hindering and facilitating determinants.

The different perspectives could also be used to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of partnerships between PTAE and AA. An evaluative SWOT analysis could further describe the characteristics of CPs and provide a base for the development of partnership strategies, shifting the attention from problem analysis towards solutions.

## References

- Anderson-Butcher, D., & Ashton, D. (2004). Innovative models of collaboration to serve children, youth, families, and communities. *Children & Schools, 26*(1), 39-53.
- Anderson-Butcher, D., Lawson, H. A., Bean, J., Flaspohler, P., Boone, B., & Kwiatkowski, A. (2008). Community collaboration to improve schools: introducing a new model from Ohio. *Children & Schools, 30*(3), 161-172.
- Bamford, J. D., Gomes-Casseres, B., & Robinson, M. S. (2003). *Mastering Alliance Strategy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bamford, A. (2007). *Quality and Consistency. Arts and cultural education in Flanders*. Brussels: Agency for Educational communication.
- Bell, J., Ouden, B., & Ziggers, G. W. (2006). Dynamics of cooperation: At the Brink of Irrelevance. *Journal of Management studies, 43*(7), 1607-1619.
- Bleijerbergh, I. (2015). *Kwalitatief onderzoek in organisaties*. Den Haag: Boom.
- Blomqvist, K., Hurmelinna, P., & Seppänen, R. (2005). Playing the collaboration game: balancing trust and contracting. *Technovation, 25*(5), 497-504.
- Bodilly, S., & Augustine, C. (2008). *Revitalizing Arts Education Through Community-Wide Coordination*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- Carruthers, G. (2005). Community music and the 'musical community': beyond conventional synergies. *International Journal of Community Music, 3*(1), 1-20.
- Child, J., Faulkner, D. & Tallman, S. (2005). *Cooperative strategy: managing alliances, networks and joint ventures* (2nd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalziel, M. M., & Schoonover, S. C. (1988). *Changing ways: A practical tool for implementing change within organizations*. New York, NY: American Management Association.
- De Braekeleer, J. (2003). Kunsteducatie in deeltijds kunstonderwijs, amateurkunsten en sociaal-cultureel werk. Verschillen en complementariteiten. *A-magazine, 4*(4), 2-6.
- De Braekeleer, J. (2010). 'Kunst- en cultuureducatie. Een poging tot overzicht'. In B. Dekeyzer (ed.), *Education through art* (pp. 13-25). Garant, Leuven-Apeldoorn.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. New York: Aldine.

Diephuis, R., & van Kasteren, R. (2004). *Voortgangsrapportage 2004. De initiatiefrijke school*, in opdracht van het ministerie van OCW. Culemborg/Enschede: Diephuis & Van Kasteren.

Donelan, K., Irvine, C., Imms, W., Jeanneret, N., & O'Toole, J. (2009). *Partnerships between schools and the professional arts sector*. Melbourne: DEECD.

Douma, M. U. (1997). *Strategic Alliances; Fit or Failure*. Enschede: University of Twente.

Dreeszen, C., Aprill, A., & Deasy, R. (1999). *Learning Partnerships: Improving Learning in Schools with Arts Partners in the Community*. Washington, D.C.: Arts Education Partnership, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Elias, W. (1990). Begripsafbakening 'kunst' en 'amateuristische kunst'. *Kunsten en Educatie*, 3(1), 12-17.

Elias, W. (2002). 'Kunst als koevoet, aspecten van de relatie tussen kunsteducatie en agogiek'. In W. Elias, & T. Vanwing (ed.), *Vizier op agogiek* (pp. 318-344), Garant, Leuven-Apeldoorn.

Ellis, M. (2009). *Designing the Arts Learning Community: A Handbook for K-12 Professional Development Designers*. L.A.: Los Angeles County Arts Commission.

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2007). The Qualitative Content Analysis Process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.

L'Enfant, R. (2008). 'Samenwerking tussen organisaties: handvaten voor een praktijk van netwerkvorming'. In Desmet, A., Baert, H., Bouverne-De Bie, M. & Verbeke, L. (ed.), *Handboek Samenlevingsopbouw in Vlaanderen*, Brugge, (pp. 615-630), Die Keure.

Forum voor Amateurkunsten. (n.d.). *Ontstaan*. Retrieved January 23, 2018, from: <http://amateurkunsten.be/ontstaan>.

Forum voor Amateurkunsten. (2016). *DNA van de amateurkunsten*. Retrieved May 20, 2018, from: [https://amateurkunsten.be/files/VISIENOTA\\_-\\_dna\\_van\\_de\\_amateurkunsten.pdf](https://amateurkunsten.be/files/VISIENOTA_-_dna_van_de_amateurkunsten.pdf)

Forum voor Amateurkunsten. (2007). *Meer wisselwerking tussen DKO en amateurkunsten: de weg naar versterkte cultuurparticipatie?* Gent: Forum voor Amateurkunsten.

Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change. 5<sup>th</sup> Ed.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Langworthy, M. (2014). *A Rich Seam: how new pedagogies find deep learning.* London: Pearson.

Gray, B. (1989). in Thomson, A.M., & Perry, J.L. (2006). Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review* 66(1), 20-32.

Wood, D., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(2), 139 – 62.

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement.* Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Higgins, L. (2012). *Community Music: In Practice and In Theory.* New York: Oxford.

Himmelman, A. T. (1996). 'On the theory and practice of transformational collaboration: from social service to social justice', in C. Huxham (ed), *Creating Collaborative Advantage* (pp 19-43). London: SAGE publications.

Hogeboom, B. Koch, J., Potiek, S., & van Veldhuizen S. (2012). *De kracht van samenwerking: Vormen van samenwerking tussen scholen en partners.* Amersfoort: CPS Onderwijsontwikkeling en advies Amersfoort.

Huxham, C. (1996). 'Collaboration and collaborative advantage', in C. Huxham (ed), *Creating Collaborative Advantage* (pp 1-18). London: SAGE Publications.

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Kaats, E., & Opheij, W. (2014). *Creating conditions for promising collaboration: alliances, networks, chains, strategic partnerships.* Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research.* London: Sage.

Kunstacademie Eeklo. (2013). *Info.* Retrieved January 25, 2018, from: <http://www.eeklo.be/academie/algemeen/info>

Kunstacademie Knokke. (n.d.) *Artistiek Pedagogisch Project*. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from: <http://maak.knokke-heist.be/pagina/artistiek-pedagogisch-project-app>

SASK. (n.d.). *Artistiek Pedagogisch Project*. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from: [http://www.academiesintniklaas.be/sites/default/files/Inschrijven\\_Info/APP.pdf](http://www.academiesintniklaas.be/sites/default/files/Inschrijven_Info/APP.pdf)

Longoria, R. (2005). Is inter-organizational collaboration always a good thing? *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 32(3), 123-138.

Lawson, H. (2003). 'Pursuing and securing collaboration to improve results'. In Braback, M., & Walsh, M. (Ed.), *Meeting at the hyphen: Schools-universities-communities-professions in collaboration for student achievement and wellbeing* (45-73). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lawson, H., Anderson-Butcher, D., Peterson, N., & Barkdull, C. (2003). Design Teams as learning systems for complex systems change: Evaluation data and implications for higher education. *Journal of Human Behavior and the Social Environment*, 7(1), 159-180.

Lawson, H. (2004). The logic of collaboration in education and the human services. *The Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 18(3), 225-237.

Lofland, J. (1997). *Doing Social Life: The quality Study of Human Interaction in Natural Settings*. New York: John Wiley.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Mattessich, P. W., Murray-Close, M., & Monsey, B. R. (2001). *Collaboration: What Makes It Work*. Saint Paul: Publishing Center.

Oppenheim, M. (1999). The critical place of community development in school transformation: The story of the Vaughn Family Center and Pacoima Urban Village. *Teachers Education Quarterly*, 26(4), 135-158.

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

Peck, E., Gulliver, P., & Towell, D. (2002). *Modernising Partnerships: An Evaluation of Somerset's Innovations in the Commissioning and Organisation of Mental Health Services*. London: Institute for Applied Health Social Policy.

Piessens, A., & Claes, G. (2002). *Routepanner voor amateurkunsten en sociaal-cultureel werk, volwassenenwerk in het lokaal cultuurbeleid : een doe-boekje voor gemeenten*. Brussel: Vlaams Centrum voor Amateurkunsten.

Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in organizational behaviour*, 12, 295-336.

Ray, K. (2002). *The nimble collaboration: Fine-tuning your collaboration for lasting success*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

Rattelade, S., & Sylvestre, J. (2012). Understanding Collaboration as a Dynamic Process: A Case Study of Collaboration in a Supportive Housing. *Scholarship in the Human Services*, 11(1), 1-20.

Reilly, T. (2001). Collaboration in action: an uncertain process. *Administration in Social Work*, 25(1), 53-74.

Ring, P. S., & van de Ven A. H. (1994). Developmental processes in cooperative inter-organisational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 90-118.

Rowe, M., Werber, L., Kaganoff, T., & Robyn, A. (2004). *Arts Education Partnerships: Lessons Learned from One School District's Experience*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation.

Rummery, K. (2002). 'Towards a theory of welfare partnerships'. In: Glendinning, C., Powell, M., & Rummery, K. (Ed). *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare* (229-245). Bristol: Policy Press.

Seidel, S., Eppel, M., & Martiniello, M. (2001). *Arts Survive: A Study of Sustainability in Arts Education Partnerships*. Cambridge, Mass.: The President and Fellows of Harvard College on Behalf of Project Zero.

Stephens, K. J., Fulk, J., & Monge, P. (2009). Constrained choices in alliance formations: cupids and organizational marriages. *Human relations*, 62(4), 501-536.

Silk, Y., & Augustine, C. (2017). *How to Support More and Stronger Arts Education Partnerships in Allegheny County Santa Monica*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation.

Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data. Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. California/New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sydow, J., Schüssler, E., & Müller-Seitz, G. (2015). *Managing inter-organizational relations: Debates and cases*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Temmerman, N. (2005). Children's participation in music: connecting the cultural contexts – an Australian perspective. *British Journal of Music Education*, 22(2), 113–123.

Thiel, S. (2010). *Bestuurskundig onderzoek: een methodologische inleiding*. Bussum: Coutinho.

Thomson, A. (2001). In Thomson, A.M. and Perry, J.L. (2006). Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 20-32.

Thomson, A. M., & Perry, J. L. (2006). Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 20-32.

Thomson, A., Perry, J., & Miller, T. K. (2009). Conceptualizing and measuring collaboration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 23-56.

Vanderschaeghe, P. (2001). Het deeltijds kunstonderwijs. *Gids sociaal-cultureel en educatief werk*, 30, 135-144.

Vanherwegen, D., Siongers, J., Smits, W., & Vangoidsenhoven, G. (2009). *Amateurkunsten in beeld gebracht*. Gent: Forum voor Amateurkunsten.

Van der Hoeven, Q. (2005). *De grens als spiegel: Een vergelijking van het cultuurbestel in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Van Petegem, P., Elias, W., De Maeyer, S., & Van Leeuw, A. (2005). *Studieloopbanen in het kunstgericht onderwijs: in-, door- en uitstroom in het secundair en hoger onderwijs*. Mechelen: Wolters Plantyn.

Vermeersch L., Capéau B., Van Itterbeeck K., & Groenez S. (2011). *Wie speelt de eerste viool?*. Leuven: HIVA-K.U.Leuven.

Vermeersch, L., & Vandenbroucke, A. (2011). *Veldtekening cultuureducatie. Beschrijvende studie met evaluatieve SWOT-analyse*. Leuven: HIVA-K.U.Leuven

Vermeersch, L., & Vandenbroucke, A. (2014). Just climbing over the school wall. Why cultural institutions do or do not collaborate with schools on arts and cultural education. In *ENCATC*

conference 'Rethinking Education on Arts & Cultural Management' edition:21 location:Antwerp, 5-7 November 2013

Vlaamse Regering. (1990). *Decreet betreffende het onderwijs-II (31 juli 1990)*. Retrieved January 20, 2018, from: <https://data-onderwijs.vlaanderen.be/edulex/document.aspx?docid=12677>

Vlaamse Regering. (2000). *Decreet betreffende de amateurkunsten Brussel: Vlaams Ministerie van Onderwijs en Vorming*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from: [http://www.sociaalcultureel.be/doc/Doc\\_AK/2014/20140213\\_Decreet%20betreffende%20de%20amateurkunsten\\_geco%C3%B6rdineerd\\_codex.pdf](http://www.sociaalcultureel.be/doc/Doc_AK/2014/20140213_Decreet%20betreffende%20de%20amateurkunsten_geco%C3%B6rdineerd_codex.pdf)

Vlaamse Regering. (2015). *Conceptnota DKO. Conceptnota van de Vlaamse Regering op voorstel van Vlaams Minister van Onderwijs Hilde Crevits*. Retrieved January 17, 2018, from: <https://onderwijs.vlaanderen.be/sites/default/files/atoms/files/Conceptnota-dko.pdf>

Vlaamse Regering. (2017a ). *Beleidsbrief Onderwijs 2017-2018 ingediend door viceminister president Hilde Crevits Brussel: Vlaams Ministerie van Onderwijs en Vorming*. Retrieved January 2, 2018, from: <http://docs.vlaamsparlement.be/pfile?id=1340560>

Vlaamse Regering. (2017b). *Voorontwerp van decreet betreffende het deeltijds kunstonderwijs*. Retrieved January 17, 2018, from: <https://onderwijs.vlaanderen.be/sites/default/files/atoms/files/Voorontwerp%20van%20decreet%20betreffende%20het%20deeltijds%20kunstonderwijs.pdf>

Vlaamse Regering. (2018). *Nota aan de Vlaamse Regering: Betreft: Ontwerp van besluit betreffende de einddoelen in het deeltijds kunstonderwijs - Principiële goedkeuring*. Retrieved April 20, 2018, from: [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1mzfSnMrC7\\_mr8\\_03DDe246bH6Fi2DAgv](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1mzfSnMrC7_mr8_03DDe246bH6Fi2DAgv)

Waldron, J., & Veblen, K (2009). Learning in a Celtic community: An exploration of informal music learning and adult amateur musicians. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 180*, 59-74

Wallin, M. W., & Von Krogh, G. (2010). Organizing for open innovation: Focus on the integration of knowledge. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(2), 145-154.

Wood, D., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27*(2), 139-162

## **Appendix A: 9 pluralistic AA organizations**

- Visual culture: Centrum voor Beeldexpressie vzw
- Arts: Creatief Schrijven vzw
- Dance: Danspunt vzw
- Visual arts: Kunstwerk[t] vzw
- Vocal music: Koor&Stem vzw
- Theater: Opendoek vzw
- Instrumental music: Vlamo vzw
- Folk and Jazz: Muziekmozaïek vzw
- Light music: Poppunt vzw

List of the 9 pluralistic AA organizations based on art discipline

**Appendix B: Cooperation, Coordination, & Collaboration**

Cooperation	Coordination	Collaboration
vision and relationships		
<p>basis for cooperation is usually between individuals but may be mandated by a third party</p> <p>organizational missions &amp; goals are not taken into account</p> <p>interaction is on an as needed basis, may last indefinitely</p>	<p>individual relationships are supported by the organizations they represent</p> <p>mission and goals of the organizations are reviewed for compatibility</p> <p>interaction is usually around one specific project or task of definable length</p>	<p>commitment of the organization and their leaders is fully behind their representatives</p> <p>common, new mission and goals are created</p> <p>one or more projects are undertaken for longer term results</p>
structure, responsibilities and communication		
<p>relationships are informal; each organization functions separately</p> <p>no joint planning is required</p>	<p>organizations involved taken on needed roles, but function relatively independently of each other</p> <p>some project-specific planning is required</p>	<p>new organizational structure and /or clearly defined and interrelated roles that constitute a formal division of labor are created</p>

<p>information is conveyed as needed</p>	<p>communication roles are established and definite channels are created for interaction</p>	<p>more comprehensive planning is required that includes developing joint strategies and measuring success in terms of impact on the needs of those served</p> <p>beyond communication roles and channels for interaction, many 'levels' of communication are created as clear information is keystone of success</p>
<p>authority and accountability</p>		
<p>authority rests solely with individual organizations</p> <p>leadership is unilateral and control is central</p> <p>all authority and accountability rest with the individual</p>	<p>authority rests with the individual organizations but there is coordination among participants</p> <p>some sharing of leadership and control</p> <p>there is some shared risk, but most authority and accountability falls</p>	<p>authority is determined by the collaboration to balance ownership</p> <p>leadership is dispersed and control is shared and mutual</p> <p>equal risk is shared by all organizations in the collaboration</p>

organization which acts independently	to the individual organizations	
resources and rewards		
resources (staff, time, funding and capabilities) are separate, serving the individual organization's needs	resources are acknowledged and can be made available for a specific project  rewards are mutually acknowledged	resources are pooled or jointly secured for a longer-term effort that is managed by the collaborative structure  organizations share in the products: more is accomplished jointly than could have been individually

Table: Cooperation, Coordination, & Collaboration; a Table describing the elements of each (Mattessich et al., 2001)

**Appendix C: Factors influencing the success of collaboration**

Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• history of collaboration or cooperation in the community;</li> <li>• collaboration group seen as a legitimate leader in the community;</li> <li>• favorable political and social climate.</li> </ul>
Membership characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mutual respect, understanding and trust;</li> <li>• appropriate cross-section of members;</li> <li>• members see collaboration as in their self-interest;</li> <li>• ability to compromise.</li> </ul>
Process and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• members share a stake in process and outcome;</li> <li>• multiple layers of decision-making;</li> <li>• flexibility;</li> <li>• development of clear roles and policy guidelines;</li> <li>• adaptability.</li> </ul>
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• open and frequent communication;</li> <li>• established informal and formal communication links.</li> </ul>
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• concrete, attainable goals and objectives;</li> <li>• shared vision;</li> <li>• unique purpose.</li> </ul>
resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sufficient funds, staff, and time;</li> <li>• skilled converner.</li> </ul>

Tabel describing the factors influencing the success of collaboration (Mattessich et al., 2001)

## **Appendix D: Interview Scheme (in Dutch)**

### **Introductie**

- onderwerp en onderzoek voorstellen
- aangeven wat er met de gegevens zal gebeuren
- opname met recorder + aangeven waarom notities gemaakt worden
- anonimiteit en vertrouwelijkheid benadrukken
- zijn er vragen?

### **Inleidende vragen**

Hoe staat u tegenover de hervorming van het DKO en de bijhorende ambities?

Wat verstaat u onder het opzetten van samenwerking met de amateurkunsten?

Welke meerwaarde schuilt er volgens u in een samenwerking met de amateurkunsten? Wat betekent het voor de DKO-school en de leerlingen?

Hoe zou u de visie van jouw school kunnen omschrijven ten aanzien van het samenwerken met externen in het algemeen, en de amateurkunsten in het bijzonder?

Welke samenwerkingsinitiatieven bestaan er vandaag de dag tussen uw school en de AK? In het verleden of toekomst?

Bij meerdere samenwerkingen: kan er overkoepelend gepraat worden? Zo neen, aangeven over welke samenwerking het gaat.

Is er één samenwerking die u graag wil belichten?

Waarom wil u juist deze samenwerking belichten?

Waarom kwam deze samenwerking tot stand?

Wat was de doelstelling?

Hoe zijn jullie te werk gegaan?

Welke actoren waren betrokken? Rol?

Waar vond het plaats?

Wat was de duur van de samenwerking?

Op welke manier werd de samenwerking zichtbaar?

Op welke manier werd de samenwerking geëvalueerd? Wat waren de conclusies?

Zijn er andere samenwerkingsinitiatieven uit voortgevloeid?

Hoe heeft uw team dit ervaren?

### **Motieven en onderlinge afhankelijkheid**

Wat was de aanleiding (of zijn de aanleidingen) om een samenwerkingsinitiatief op te starten met AK?

Wie nam het initiatief om een samenwerking(en) te starten?

Om welke redenen?

Wat was de doelstelling (of doelstellingen) in de samenwerkingsinitiatieven met AK?

Vanwaar deze keuze?

Werd de doelstelling bereikt? Was het realistisch?

Welke noodzaken ervaren jullie die kunnen beantwoord worden via een samenwerkingsverband met AK?

Welke kansen ziet u voor uw DKO-school in een samenwerkingsverband met AK?

Welke kansen kunnen jullie bieden aan AK door een samenwerkingsverband op te starten?

### **Randvoorwaarden**

Welke uitdagingen ervaren jullie om een samenwerkingsinitiatief op te zetten?

Waarom? Waar is dit volgens u aan te wijten Hoe kan deze uitdaging worden aangepakt (via welke kanalen, middelen, ...)

Welke uitdagingen ervaren jullie tijdens het samenwerken met een AK-organisatie?

Waarom? Hoe kan deze uitdaging worden aangepakt (via welke kanalen, ...)?

Welke vormen van samenwerking met de amateurkunsten vermijdt u vanwege te veel belemmeringen?

Welke zijn deze belemmeringen?

Welke voorwaarden zijn belangrijk voor het ontwikkelen van samenwerkingsverbanden met AK?

Wat moet er zeker wel gebeuren, en wat niet.

Kan u een voorbeeld geven van een samenwerkingsproces die volgens jou extreem succesvol was?

Waarom was dit succesvol?

Waar is dit volgens u aan te wijten?

Kan u een voorbeeld geven van een samenwerkingsproces die volgens jou onsuccesvol was?

Waarom was dit onsuccesvol?

Waar is dit volgens u aan te wijten?

Wat zorgt ervoor dat jullie blijven samenwerken met AK nu en in de toekomst?

Welke verschillen treden op in het samenwerken met AK op basis van de discipline?

Waar is dit volgens u aan te wijten?

Welke verschillen treden op in het samenwerken met AK op basis van de optie (vak) binnen een bepaald domein?

Waar is dit volgens u aan te wijten?

Wat zijn volgens u de belangrijkste randvoorwaarden om tot een duurzame samenwerking met AK te komen?

### **Slot**

Wilt u graag nog iets toevoegen?

## Appendix E: Informed consent

In het kader van mijn masterproef tot het behalen van de Master Educational sciences faculteit Psychologie en Educatiewetenschappen aan de Vrije Universiteit Brussel, onderzoek ik de randvoorwaarden bij samenwerkingsverbanden tussen het deeltijds kunstonderwijs en amateurkunstenorganisaties. Op basis van interviews met schooldirecties wil deze studie nagaan welke mogelijkheden en noden op dit vlak ervaren worden. Het tweede deel van de interviews focust op de aspecten die bijdragen tot een duurzaam samenwerkingsverband tussen een DKO-school en een Amateurkunsten organisatie. De focus ligt hierbij op DKO-scholen gelegen in de provincie Oost-Vlaanderen. Deze masterproef komt tot stand onder supervisie van Prof. dr. Free De Backer.

Het interview zal opgenomen worden, waarna het interview volledig anoniem verwerkt zal worden aan de hand van een kwalitatieve data-analyse. Uw privacy wordt hierbij gerespecteerd. Deze masterproef zal door derden geraadpleegd kunnen worden. De resultaten van het onderzoek zullen u worden bezorgd indien gewenst.

Indien u vragen of opmerkingen heeft, kan u mij altijd contacteren via onderstaande gegevens:

- Michiel.bolliou@hotmail.com
- 0473 17 13 14

Door dit document te ondertekenen geeft u te kennen dat u vrijwillig akkoord gaat met de inzameling en verwerking van de door u verstrekte gegevens. U bent vrij om in de loop van het interview te beslissen om toch niet verder deel te nemen of om bepaalde vragen niet te beantwoorden.

Naam .....

Plaats .....

Opgemaakt op ...../...../..... te .....

Handtekening

