

The introduction of Venture Philanthropy and Vouchers based model in Cultural Heritage Management to enhance Community Engagement

Angelo Miglietta¹, Sonia Pancheri²

Abstract

After an overview of the current Italian situation in the field of Cultural Heritage, is it clear that the overlapping of roles in p.a. is the cause of the actual unsustainability of the sector. This investigation proposes a new approach and an alternative solution for the Cultural management: Venture Philanthropy (VP) (Grossman et al.1997). For-profit best practices of a private management, can ensure a long-term investment strategy as well as fertilize the field with managerial skills. However, the authors are not suggesting that Italian State should stop funding the culture. Beyond the constitutional obligation (art. 9), the State has a strong interest in supporting culture because of the considerable positive externalities (quality of welfare, social inclusion and development of the creative industry and tourism). The authors, indeed, mean to reinforce the State in its rules of regulator, harmonizer of wealth and policy maker. Combine private management and state funds in Cultural Heritage is possible through a *copernican revolution* in the system: switch financial supports from the supply to the demand through the introduction of vouchers (Friedman 1962). Voluntary organizations, cooperatives and associations are so well structured and so familiar with the territory in which they act to result more efficient than p.a., but however they are excluded from government contracts. The model proposed in the text encourages the creation of private local enterprises, pursuing a soft monetary profit and a social engagement, that act like associations. Moreover, a private management, whose goal is self-sufficiency and independence from government agencies, focuses intensively on the relationship with its local stakeholders: audiences, institutions, major companies, social entrepreneurs and philanthropists. The theoretical premises offered in the text, provide points of reflection for future real implication. The current limitations of the research are due to the absence of a case study, that otherwise would have allowed the collection and observation data. To overcome these limits, it will be essential to structure a pilot trial of the use of vouchers in a cultural site.

Keywords: Cultural Heritage Management, Venture Philanthropy, Voucher, Community Engagement

¹ Angelo Miglietta, Full Professor of Business Administration and Entrepreneurship and Innovation for Creativity and Start up, Deputy dean delegated to Innovation and Development, IULM University Milano
angelo.miglietta@iulm.it

² Sonia Pancheri, PhD. Candidate Communication and Market: Economics, Marketing and Creativity, IULM University Milano
pancheri.sonia@gmail.com

1. Introduction

This paper follows the wake of the conceptual framework of the management of Cultural Heritage, currently widely articulated and debated in Italy, but not only. The purpose of this theoretical article is to reflect on a combination of a widely debated management systems, Venture Philanthropy and vouchers, and their application in Cultural Heritage field. The authors present an original hypothesis of their own, offering an intuition linked with other application. This theoretical premises provide points of reflection for future real implication. Currently, research limitations are due to the absence of case studies, that otherwise would have allowed the collection and observation of data. To overcome these limits, it will be essential to structure a pilot trial of the use of vouchers in a cultural site.

Italy has a unique Cultural Heritage in the world, not only for the artistic capital inherited from a long and complex history, but also because it is the only case of asset that generates losses instead of producing value.

This inefficiency isn't episodic but rather systemic. It results from a overlapping roles. The government in fact absolves opposed functions: in addition to being the author of the rules it is at the same time the main player and arbiter on the cultural ground, that is in itself a particularly and delicate field characterized by a lack of experience of the management.

The most significant consequences of this improper overlapping and mingling between regulator and regulated can be synthesized in the following critical issues:

- Low quality of rules. Instead of defining valid and inflexible guidelines with high standards, the rules are often bent to facilitate specific situations of individual institutions.
- Absence of a *super partes* judge. In any context, when a subject sets the rules and at the same manages the field, is impossible that it can also perform an impartial judging role.
- Mismanagement. Beyond stereotypes, Italian Heritage (archaeological sites, museums, libraries and monuments) is threatened by Statal inefficiency, as clearly appears in the budgets

Article. 9 of the Italian Constitution indicates among the fundamental principles of the Republic the promotion and development of culture, scientific and technical research, and the preservation of the landscape and historical and artistic heritage³. Hereby, is it clear that the Constitution indicates an moral criteria for the conservation of Heritage, it does not suggest an economic/financial engagement of the State in the field. So, why does the Italian State act as the financial authority responsible for the cultural asset? The different arguments of the literature contribute overall to compose the theoretical substrate holding the legislation. The leading doctrine states that the absence of government intervention would result in market failures (Leon and Tuccini 2011), that instead must be prevented because the enjoyment of the artistic-natural resources is an inalienable right of every individual.

³ "The Republic shall promote the development of culture and of scientific and technical research. It shall safeguard the natural landscape and the historical and artistic heritage of the Nation."

Moreover: conservatives argue that the preservation of Cultural Heritage for future generations must be guaranteed through the State; art historians argue that decisions on preservation of artistic heritage can only be prosecuted without a the cost-benefit ratio; others claim that the educational role of cultural products for the community requires the public management (Cavazzoni 2009); according to pessimistics, a model of free-market money-oriented could threaten the quality of fruition (van der Ploeg 2005). This interpretation supports the political attitude of the public administration to reserve not only the legislation but also the administration of Cultural Heritage. It would be the theory of *merit goods* (Musgrave 1982) to justify government intervention in the cultural field, recognizing only to State the ability to pursue the general interest of the community. Therefore, is it clear how management of Cultural Heritage, in the most large definition, has been added among the policies pertaining the State, in different ways and degrees in each country, and has become a core activity of the government directly through controlled entities (Accettura 2003). As seen, the current doctrine considers the government management the only solution of Cultural Heritage, preventing other options, such as the inclusion of private. Deepening these arguments, it is easy to see that the dilemmas are a mere judgment value and that the alleged necessity of the government purse is actually justified only by paternalism or, worse, by political interests. And so, even in this field, the decisions of the State shall replace market logic without bringing real benefits to society. As a matter of fact, unfortunately the dissonance between intentions and reality is emblematic. If in 1955 Italy spent in culture 0.80% of its budget (Grossi 2014), in 2014 State has allocated to the entire sector of goods and cultural activities only 0.19% of the state budget, amounting to 1,595 million euro⁴.

Budget cuts have led to dramatic results of conservation and valorization of Italian Cultural Heritage, negatively impacting also on tourist attraction. Inevitably, in a context of increasing lack of government, the only viable alternative was the involvement of private actors. In 2014, Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism (MIBACT) issued a national call to action to philanthropic individuals, non-profit organizations and businesses looking for liberal donations in order to alleviate the situation. This new decree, *Art Bonus*, consists in a tax credit equal to 65% of charitable contributions that individuals or companies make in favor of Statal Cultural Heritage. The charitable contributions are destined to: 1. maintenance, protection and restoration of public cultural works (eg. monuments, historic buildings, works of art); 2. support of public cultural institutions (eg. museums, libraries, archives, archaeological areas and parks), opera/symphonic foundations and traditional theater; 3. realisation, restoration and upgrading of facilities of public institutions dedicated to performances⁵. *Art Bonus* is considered revolutionary for Italy, but unfortunately, by benchmarking with other advanced nations, is it clear that this intervention is not a real innovation and the limits are many. This actualization implicitly seems to declare that we need more money for culture, that the Italian State does not have this amount, but that the government offers to private parties huge incentives. But, is the lack of

⁴ www.beniculturali.it/

⁵ www.artbonus.gov/it

funds, the real problem? No, the difficulty seems largely depend on mismanagement of Cultural Heritage. Tangible and intangible capitals should be handled with the utmost care. Therefore, is invoked a more responsible and wise direction, that can only be achieved by providing a rigid separation between the functions of regulation and management, adopting a non-statal approach.

2. The introduction of Venture Philanthropy to support private management in Cultural Heritage

Starting from the analysis of the current stage of the Italian Heritage and the wide and contradictory literature reference, the authors intent to propose a new management model applicable to the sector. In this section we'll try to introduce a model assuming a philanthropic approach based on the assumption that the problem is not the availability of financial resources, but rather the effectiveness and efficiency of their use.

The inspiration behind this analysis is taken from the famous article *Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists* by Allen S. Grossman, Christine W. Letts and William P. Ryan published in April 1997 on Harvard Business Review. The article faced an innovative discussion on philanthropy, introducing the concept of Venture Philanthropy (VP). The approach theorized emphasizes the need to introduce best management practices borrowed from profit companies in philanthropic activities. The origins of this approach can be traced in the late 60s, when in 1969 the American philanthropist John D Rockefeller III, in a hearing before the US congressional committee leading to tax reform act, coined the term Venture Philanthropy (John 2006). However, the term exploded in the late 90s, when VP has actually acquired a more mature appearance on the market due to a combination of financial and social factors and a great scientific support (Grossman et al. 1997, Porter and Kramer 1999). There isn't a single textbook accepted definition of VP and any meaning evolves as practice changes (Morino Institute; EVPA). The most simple definition, describes Venture Philanthropy as an approach that applies venture capital principles to social economy, operating across a spectrum of organisations acting in the Third Sector (charities, social enterprises, socially driven commercial businesses) (John 2006).

The major goal of philanthropy is to improve welfare state (health service, education, social security, environmental care), in particular in the last years of government spending review with substantial cuts in corollary activities. Well-being and social cohesion are among the main targets of philanthropists, kicking off the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship: a capitalism that makes the investment to advance the living conditions of the whole community (Perrini and Vurro, 2013). With the systematic introduction of the VP in Cultural Heritage sector, the government could really challenge privates in contributing create great value and do not operate only as a passive actor (a deposit from which draw in case of need as it seems to aim *Art Bonus*).

The approach of the Venture Philanthropy provides a comprehensive investment strategy, which includes the initial assessment of the investment, of the sustainability of the organization and the eventual exit strategy when is reached a full financial autonomy

(Grossman et al. 2013). Since late 90s, VP is globally spreading, and if some specific practices are adapted to local conditions, however is possible to maintain a set of widely accepted key characteristics (John 2006). European Venture Philanthropy Association, since 2006, has identified the six salient features of VP model (Scholten 2006). In the following chart we describe how each feature of VP impact on the Cultural Heritage sector.

<i>VP feature</i>	<i>Impact on Cultural Heritage</i>
High engagement	<p>The cultural field has gone from sporadic free donations to a proactive philanthropy founded on the high emotional involvement of investors in the projects supported through continuous operations in the medium-long period. Venture philanthropists have a close relationship with the entrepreneurs they support, driving innovative and scalable models of social change. In several occasion, Venture philanthropists are used to take board places of the supported organisations, and all are far more intimately involved at strategic and operational levels than are traditional non-profit funders.</p>
Multi-year support	<p>In any field, good management requires long-term programs. The main limits of government funding programmes are related to the predominance of strict budgeting parameters, aimed to favour short-term objectives (Emanuele 2012). Inevitable consequence of depending on statal cash flows is uncertainty achievement of scientific objectives. VP typically provides support at least three-to-five years, with an objective of helping the organisation to become financially self-sustaining by the end of the period.</p>
Tailored financing	<p>Venture philanthropists offer investment approach to determine the most appropriate financing for each organisation. Depending on fixed mission, they can operate across wide spectrum of investments. A tailored financing approach also breaks the negative circle of reliance on government funds and stimulates creativity in seeking funds (Cavazzoni, 2009).</p>

Organisational capacity-building	VP focuses on building the operational capacity and long-term viability of the organisations in their portfolios, rather than funding individual projects or programmes. They recognize the importance of on-going evidence based process to improve financial/organizational/communication ability of the team. Skilshare is determinant to let the organisations supported achieve measurable and sustainable results, a great social impact and internal efficiency. Currently, the Italian situation in the management of Cultural Heritage, due to cut costs, describes a chronic staff shortages and a sequential lack of generational turnover in public administration.
Non-financial support	In addition to financial support, VP provides value-added services such as advisory and counseling support in strategic planning, marketing and communications, executive coaching, human resource. Venture philanthropists offer an access to network of potential partners, help to develop contacts with other investors, such as business angels and financial institutions (John, 2007).
Performance measurement	As any business company, cultural organization must be able to measure its own performance. In this case, the assessment takes account not only economic and financial results, but also social-cultural externalities. VP investment is performance-based, placing emphasis on good business planning, measurable outcomes, achievement of milestones, and high levels of financial accountability and management competence. The current management does not take into account the measurement of the performance. Therefore is not possible to determine whether the administration respects the economic sustainability. Without audit, is not possible value and fix.

Tab 1. VP features applied on Cultural Heritage management

In a context of good regulation, the private companies in charge of managing the museums, cultural sites or archaeological parks, rather than speculative reality, look like social enterprises. This type of enterprises should not be understood as mere speculation and profit-driven exploitation of the Cultural Heritage, but instead may contribute to re-establish the welfare state. The main assumption of the introduction of this approach is the conservation of Cultural Heritage and the preservation of environment and not a speculative

activity. Currently, the real main risk to be concerned about is the inability to ensure the transmission of Cultural Heritage to future generations due to inappropriate management.

In any case, if a private enterprise that runs a cultural place were able to reach and exceed the break-even point and gain a profitable utility, the performance should be rewarded for its efficiency because it would mean that it has developed excellent competitive processes.

Of course, there are critical issues to deal with the introduction of private player in cultural management. The main concern against is that with the opening to the free market, heritage may be damaged by market failures. However, inequalities are implicit characteristics of Cultural Heritage industry, regardless the administration that manage the property (private or public). Indeed, it is normal to expect deep differences of success among artplaces due to different conditions, such as kind of place, location, accessibility. In the next paragraph we'll try to suggest a a solution.

The second concern is about control. The problem is to ensure monitoring of for-profit enterprises delegated to the administration of Cultural Heritage. First of all, it must be said that in a framework of good rules, private enterprises are definitely more disciplined and less irresponsible governmental entities (Miglietta and Quaglia 2014). Indeed, if public administrations may draw from the government funds in case of need - and for this reason complain situations of need often worse than reality - private enterprises must obey the law of the market, either through ticket sales or fundraising or loan. Moreover, this system would benefit a double check. The first supervisor would be the public authorities. This approach reinforces the importance of the state and ennobles the role of it: the inalienable duty of protecting the common good results in the exercise of quality control services produced by private companies and the redistribution of wealth through issuance of vouchers. An auditing system will aim to control the protection of the establishment managed by private company and check that it is ensured to citizens a defined standards fruition. The second supervisor are represented by citizens. Founding principles of this approach is the sovereignty of the consumer: the individual pursues the satisfaction of their needs by making rational consumption choices (Mazzanti 2003). Users are co-controller of State, expressing their evaluation, comments and opinions freely with appropriate open access tools. Moreover, as we'll see in the next paragraph, the introduction of vouchers system to support demand reinforces citizens in their referee roles.

3. A Copernican revolution in the system of financing culture: support of the demand, instead of supply, through the introduction of vouchers.

Currently, with few exceptions in health and education fields, public services are funded directly by the State, in order to ensure easy access to the taxpayer. In other words, the public system subsidizes the supply of services by allocating resources to PA. An alternative approach is to set up a system in which public subsidies don't go to p.a. that provide services, but to users .

Authors are not proposing the exclusion of the State from the theme of culture. They are rather claiming that the State should be strengthen it in its powers of *regulator* (Friedman 1962) as arbiter and guarantor of legal application of the Code; *harmonizer*, to the extent that outlines the objectives of quality and benchmark common; *policy maker*, or by carrying out a legislative function from the perspective of cultural welfare (van der Ploeg 2005). Equally, the authors do not claim that government should stop funding culture, because, beyond the constitutional requirements (Art. 9 of Italian Constitution), State has strong interest in encouraging cultural consumption to generate positive externalities. The production of cultural services in fact has a very strong impact both on meta-economic level, taking into account its specific role in social cohesion and identity, and on economic level, for example, culture is explicit driver in industry of luxury goods. If it is legitimate that the citizens stand costs of Heritage preservation for the high educational value and for the transfer to future generations, it is wrong that the support is used the delivery of the service. As a matter of facts, among the most heavy limits of public financing to the supply there is the interference of the bureaucracy, which also tends to gradually increase sphere of influence leading to a politicization of decision-making. Financing supply with government funds, means entrust qualitative judgment of cultural planning to politicians, that too often show themselves opportunistically oriented. These critical issues are not only Italian matter (van der Ploeg 2005).

How is it possible to combine private management and government funding in this field? Subject of this paragraph is the inversion of traditional roles of Cultural Heritage management, a premise of a copernican revolution in the system: switch from the supply management to the financial support of the demand through the introduction of vouchers (Friedman 1962)⁶. This proposal is to be considered *copernican*, because of the role-reversal in the allocation of public funds: from supply, to the demand, through vouchers.

In essence, vouchers are allocated by State to citizens in order to pay tickets (full amount or a part of it) of museums, sites, archaeological parks etc. Currently government institutions are forgetting that the main indicator of success depends on demand. With vouchers system, citizens freely choose to reward the cultural institution that provide them the best experience, without any influence of the costs. In this appreciate the transfer of funds by the state based system, the success of a location totally depends on the quality of the service provided by a visionary management. This circular system can be considered closed when State recognizes to each private cultural institution the amount corresponding to the vouchers gained as entrance fee and provides new vouchers to citizen.

It is important to underline the educational value of vouchers. Is essential to clearly indicate the cost of ticket entrance. The voucher may cover the full price or part of the amount, it depend on citizen income, but the key is to brought to the market value the cost of the ticket, reinforcing consumer awareness of the actual value of cultural asset (van der

⁶ The theme of the voucher in public spending has first been presented in a systematic manner by Friedman in 1962, but has led doctrinal assessments and to limited practical experiments, only in education and healthcare fields. The proposal of "voucher school" is perhaps the best known idea among Friedman's theory.

Ploeg 2005). The use of vouchers allow citizens to measure the value of the service that is enjoying and allow people to appreciate the transfer of funds from State.

Moreover, this system may help to identify different categories of taxpayers, releasing vouchers ranging from full coverage of the amount of tickets for needy people, to a simple reduction for taxpayers less disadvantaged.

In addition to partial payment of the ticket amount, vouchers may be connected to further benefits, activating a second level vouchers scheme, that may incentives cultural consumption of citizens with a tailored return, possibly not only in the cultural sector. For example, is possible to develop a system of discounts for essential goods and services for unemployed people or deductions fees for students.

Voucher system could also ends the concern of market failures in this field: after visiting a popular museum, it could be activate a second level voucher that allows a free entry to a cultural site less easy to reach or less fashionable. These incentives allocate the distribution of wealth between the various sites, helping to control tourist flows, which it is a serious problem in Italy.

The system could even be structured through a double mechanism of incentive: by rewarding citizens who have higher cultural consumption (giving even more vouchers to spend in this or others fields) and awarding private administrations of the cultural property that get best results (in terms of ticketing, reviews, projects, etc..).The redistributive role of the State, manifested by the rational allocation of vouchers to citizens, is aimed to ensure equal access to culture for community (Leon and Tuccini 2011).

Combining principles of Venture Philanthropy and the endowment of demand in the field, we can enhance the Cultural Heritage sector in the optical market and free choice, without any speculative finality (Mc Ewan 2004) and indeed removing the problem of sustainability of the welfare state.

4. Enhancing Community Engagement

In any field, the redefinition of State role as just proposed, not only increases efficiency, but also encourages citizens' initiative to create new enterprises. Many private institutions already play subsidiary public function, serving as a valid alternative to the community. For example, healthcare turnover, daily growing due to the aging of population, has attracted big Venture Philanthropists that immediately gained government consent, because of the system is no longer sustainable. VP has spurred and economically supported free citizens to associate themselves and has encouraged the emergence of companies that operate, with good results, in the context of the national health service.

The model of the English Big Society provides some essential cues in this perspective. Core themes are empowering communities, redistributing power from the state to citizens and promoting a culture of volunteering. The plan is apparently simple: move services from the central state to local communities to ensure that citizens of the community take the necessary actions for their welfare. The service provided directly within the community can cut costs, avoiding bureaucratic procedures and increasing effectiveness (Evans 2011) .

The third sector is one of the main partners for European governments in policy development and implementation (Johnston and Brandsen 2016). Currently there are thousands of admirable voluntary organizations, associations, social cooperatives and private foundations that act on real needs and on community wellbeing better than p.a. mostly because of their inner point of view.

In Italy, the obstacles to adopt this model, is not the lack of civil society individuals ready to commit, but rather the persistent statal vision of executives and academics of Cultural Heritage.

The reorientation of State resources in the cultural field would favor a broadens of the number of companies that provide cultural goods and services. For example, it allows the aggregation of young entrepreneurs who create a startup company to run a cultural property, coping with the problem of youth unemployment.

The goal is to recognize and enhance what already exists and correctly works, encouraging the multiplication of positive experiences. Capabilities provided by Venture Philanthropy would allow to overcome the financial unsustainability of the welfare system because they would save the public cost of the provision of such services (John 2006).

The proposed approach follows a vision of deep change of cultural policies, of meritocracy stimulation of private parties, and leadership of State and audience control. Decentralizing Cultural Heritage Management and empowering private enterprises could lead to a local development and communities cohesion.

Bibliography

- Accettatura B. (2003). I beni culturali tra ordinamento europeo e ordinamenti nazionali, www.aedon.it, 2
- Cavazzoni F. (2009). Per il bene della cultura, IBL Focus
- Cuccia T., Rizzo I. (2016). Less might be better. Sustainable funding strategies for cultural producers, *City, Culture and Society*, 7(2), 109–116
- DG For Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection - ECHO (2013). The use of cash and vouchers in humanitarian crises, European Commission, Ref. Ares(2013)317021
- Domenichini G. (2013). Il finanziamento di beni e attività culturali in Italia: ruolo e tendenze dei suoi principali attori, MPRA
- Emanuele E. (2012). Arte e Finanza, Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, Napoli
- Evans K. (2011). Big Society in the UK: A Policy Review, *Children e Society*, 25, 164–171
- Frey, B. (2011). Public support, in R. Towse, *A Handbook of Cultural Economics* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 370-377
- Friedman M. (1962). Capitalismo e libertà, IBL Libri, Torino
- Grossi R. (2014). 10° Rapporto annuale Federculture. Cultura: L'alternativa alla crisi per una nuova idea di progresso, 24 Ore Cultura, Roma
- Grossman A., Appleby S., Reimers C. (2013). *Venture Philanthropy: its evolution and its future*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston
- Grossman A., Letts C.W, Ryan W. (1997). *Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists*, Harvard Business Review, 75(2), 36-44, Boston
- Guccio, C., Mazza, I. (2014). On the political determinants of the allocation of funds to heritage authorities, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 34, 18-38
- John, R. (2006). *Venture philanthropy: The evolution of high engagement philanthropy in Europe*, (Working paper) Oxford, UK: Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Saïd Business School
- John, R. (2007). *Beyond the cheque: How venture philanthropists add value*, (Working paper) Oxford, UK: Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Saïd Business School
- Johnston K., Brandsen T. (2016). Collaborative governance and the third sector:something old, something new, in Ongaro E., van Thiel S., eds. *Public administration and management in Europe*
- Leon F. a., Tuccini V. (2011). *Economia del Patrimonio Culturale*, in AA.VV., *Diritto e gestione dei beni culturali*, il Mulino, Bologna
- Mazzanti M. (2003). *Metodi e strumenti di analisi per la valutazione economica del patrimonio culturale*, FrancoAngeli, Milano
- Mc Ewan P.J. (2004). The potential impact of Vouchers, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(3), 57-80
- Miglietta A., Quaglia G. (2014). *I nuovi orizzonti della filantropia*, Cittadella Editrice, Assisi
- Musgrave V.R.A.(1982). *Public finance in theory and practice*, McGraw Hill, New York

- Peacock A.T. (1969). Welfare economics and public subsidies to the arts, *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies*, 37, 323-335
- Perrini F., Vurro C. (2013). *La valutazione degli impatti sociali. Approcci e strumenti applicativi*, Egea, Milano
- Perrini F., Vurro, C. (2010). *Social Venture Capital & Venture Philanthropy: Modelli e processi d'investimento nell'innovazione sociale*, Egea, Milano
- Porter M., Kramer M. (1999). Philanthropy's new agenda: creating value, *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec, 121-130
- Robbins L.C. (1963). Arts and the state, 53-72 in AA. VV., *Politics and Economics: Essays in Political Economy*, Macmillan, London
- Scholten P, (2006). *Performance Measurement and Social Impact Assessment*, EVPA Members' Workshop, Jan, Coutts & Co, London
- Van Der Ploeg F. (2005). The making of cultural policy: a European perspective, *CESifo working papers*, n. 152