

## Repositório ISCTE-IUL

---

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2025-02-26

Deposited version:

Publisher Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Lopes, R. V., Costa, P., Perestrelo, M. & Tomaz, E. (2024). Participatory artistic practices in southern peripheries: Impacts and challenges. In Pedro Costa, Ricardo Venâncio Lopes and Anja Pletikosa (Ed.), *Stronger peripheries: Building a southern coalition in performing arts*. (pp. 584-628). Lisbon, Portugal / Zagreb, Croatia: DINÂMIA'CET-iscte —Centro de Estudos sobre a Mudança Socioeconómica e o Território —Instituto Universitário de Lisboa.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://strongerperipheries.eu/activeapp/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/Stronger-Peripheries-Building-a-Southern-Coalition-in-Performing-Arts.pdf>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Lopes, R. V., Costa, P., Perestrelo, M. & Tomaz, E. (2024). Participatory artistic practices in southern peripheries: Impacts and challenges. In Pedro Costa, Ricardo Venâncio Lopes and Anja Pletikosa (Ed.), *Stronger peripheries: Building a southern coalition in performing arts*. (pp. 584-628). Lisbon, Portugal / Zagreb, Croatia: DINÂMIA'CET-iscte —Centro de Estudos sobre a Mudança Socioeconómica e o Território —Instituto Universitário de Lisboa.. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

---

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

---

# Participatory Artistic Practices in Southern Peripheries: Impacts and Challenges

Ricardo V. Lopes  
Pedro Costa  
Margarida Perestrelo  
Elisabete Tomaz

## 1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to reflect on the impacts of Stronger Peripheries (SP). The impact assessment for a project such as this is necessarily complex, multidimensional and requires a time frame and a distance that are not easily compatible with the scope of a four-year project. With this in mind, we structure our panoramic assessment exercise into three different—but complementary—levels: (i) a processual evaluation, focused on the implementation of the activities of the SP project and in comparing researchers' observations with factual data collected from the project activities; (ii) a systematization of challenges that participatory processes pose and that cultural agents face in applying these processes in the future in this kind of international collaborative projects; and (iii) an exploratory synthesis of the diverse types of impacts (artistic, social, economic, etc.) felt by the communities involved in the project, based essentially on the different partners' self assessment, of the activities undertaken during their artistic tandems.

For this purpose, different methodological approaches

research team and by the project partners throughout the four years of the project (e.g. through the Quality of Participation Toolkit). Methods applied included direct observation, semi-structured interviews, surveys and focus groups.<sup>1</sup> Multiple discussions were held among the research partners and the project artistic partners (in person and online) on the overall functioning of the project, on particular aspects of the activities' implementation (residencies, selection processes, etc.) and on challenges for future projects together. Some of the workshops (e.g. Futuring workshops, the quality of participation workshop, etc.) provided a space for these discussions, which enabled partners and the teams involved to reflect critically on these topics. Additionally, conferences and seminars allowed partners and participants to share knowledge, practices and concerns with the academic and practice/policy-oriented communities in several countries/contexts. All this in-

1 In addition to collecting extensive amounts of factual infor-

formation is mobilized here from a critical perspective, through the lens of a research partner (DINÂMIA' CET-iscte), providing an opportunity to reflect on the impacts of the project and the challenges faced in rethinking how participatory practices are carried out in the performing arts in Southern Europe.

## 2. Processual Evaluation of the Implementation of Activities during Stronger Peripheries

The first level in our assessment relates to the implementation of activities during the SP project, and on comparing researchers' observations with the data collected during the project activities.

The project design shaped how the project and consequently this impact analysis unfolded. The framework of the project consisted of three main, interwoven axes (see Section 1 of this book for details):

- (i) collaborative artistic strategies, organized in tandems;<sup>2</sup>
- (ii) capacity-building actions, empowering the performing arts world in the diverse countries involved;<sup>3</sup> and
- (iii) reflection on cultural policy models, with a focus on cultural policies in southern peripheries, at local, national and European scales.<sup>4</sup>

The artistic production element was organized through the tandem design. This option aggregated two partners around a creative production process (or, in some cases, three partners, with an extra residency). In each participating country, artists applied to open calls for the tandems, and five shortlisted artists participated in a tandem workshop.<sup>5</sup> The tandem workshop process allowed artists to meet partners and present their work in an international context. The selected artist<sup>6</sup> for each tandem workshop developed a project related to the tandem topic, which included undertaking research and creative residencies, work-

ing with hosting communities in the territories of both partners, and premiering the final pieces in both partner countries (for more details about the tandem structure see Section 1 of this book).

In practice, the partners, artists and communities involved in these tandems were highly heterogeneous. For more information about this variety, and the consequent diversity in how the different institutions involved operate and in the respective creative processes, please refer to the tandem presentation section (Section 3, "Stronger Peripheries Artistic Creations").

The beginning of the project, in December 2020, was affected by the COVID-19 crisis. The global health crisis had repercussions for relational practices within the project (among partners, within teams, with artists and communities) and meant multiple readjustments to activities. On the one hand, for practical reasons, some activities had to be postponed, particularly considering the earlier tandems. On the other hand, other activities were reorganized and new procedures were defined as a result of the pandemic. This involved changes to the general project programming which in some cases involved merging of presentational activities/workshops (minimizing travel and maximizing the duration of stays<sup>7</sup>), whereas other activities (e.g. project meetings) were spread throughout different stages of the project as they could be better managed in other formats, namely online, which also helped to maximize attendance by partners and their teams.<sup>8</sup>

Time was identified repeatedly in project discussions as a key factor and the main challenge to its success. Effectively, time was a cross-cutting concern: time to develop deeper relationships between partners, artists and communities; time to install consistent creative and research processes; time to meet artists' and communities' expectations; time to manage tasks and activities; time to select and involve participants; time to assess results and impacts; time to balance professional and personal lives, etc.). Time management is thus a central challenge in all participative processes as will be explored below.

Time is fundamental to building stronger relations; to inspiring empathy, trust and confidence among people and between institutions, as well as to creating safe spaces for taking risks, for innovating and for creating. In general, these relationships flowed naturally and grew through the course of the project as people spent more time together and gained confidence in each other (despite the challenges posed by COVID-19). Some partners (e.g. Artemrede, POGON, Bunker,

7 COVID-related constraints raised awareness of the ecological and economic limitations of travel-intensive activities in this kind of project/network.

8 These changes also minimized the negative budgetary impacts resulting from the challenges posed by pandemic-related con-

2 Twelve tandems involving two to three partners working together (in 34 hosting communities) leading to the creation of 14 new artistic productions, which premiere in both countries and eventually tour in other contexts.

3 Multiple workshops, seminars and conferences throughout the four-year project; development and application of two tool-kits-improving skills and awareness both in project partners and in artistic/cultural communities related to the project in all these countries.

4 Through conferences, books and policy guidelines.

5 The names of the 60 shortlisted artists/collectives can be consulted in the tandem description chapters (in Section 3 of this book), as well as in Figure 3 of this chapter.

L'arboreto) already had some prior experience together (based on an informal pre-existing “southern coalition” of cultural partners). However, for others (and particularly for many people within each institution), this was the first common project and this process of co-constructing a shared community (with shared objectives, values, principles and pleasures) evolved naturally. The Stronger Peripheries community has been thus in a process of permanent co-construction, which needed to be installed before (but that continued during) the process of reaching out to other broader (artistic and territorial) communities.

Team dynamics was another important matter. The relationship between partner institutions and working teams was often conditioned by changes in teams' compositions, affecting interpersonal affinities, and strategic (re)orientations. On the one hand, the replacement or temporary absence of protagonists (teams that are naturally renewed, the termination of employment contracts, maternity leave, precariousness, etc.) meant relationships saw new starting points and new social negotiations. On the other hand, where institutions underwent strategic changes, as well as any subsequent tensions (e.g. related to friction between the project's objectives and the strategies of some partners), led to solidarity mechanisms and intensive dialogue to overcome conflicts and reach new compromises (which in the case of some partners included active spontaneous movements in support of dismissed workers<sup>9</sup>).

Partners' attitudes towards the project were diverse, as would be expected. Each partner action throughout the project was shaped by the characteristics, interests, and missions of the institution (for instance, to be a festival, a programming space, a municipality network), but also by the features of the teams and individuals available for each specific activity (e.g. the city council member who was able to travel to that specific event).

The structure of the tandems was an important feature that shaped the whole of the rest of the project. The notion of tandem was central to the artistic process, being a fundamental mechanism by which partners, artists and the communities could trigger connections and build relations. The structure of the tandem enables connections and pre-establishes some rules for two or three different artistic/territorial communities in different countries to cooperate. This builds a “second level” of community.<sup>10</sup> It is meant to enable the delivery of an artistic production of greater value, consistency and interest than if it was produced just by one partner in one specific community or

territory. That is, it is supposed to add value by itself. But this can also be challenging, and the diversity of results and outputs reveals how varied the processes and encounters in the diverse tandems throughout the project were.

In fact, tandems were heterogeneous in their operations. Each pairing understood the project in their own way. For example, artist selection took contrasting forms, and the types of participation and community(ies) envisaged varied. But variety was also observed in other areas, such as what participants understood young, less internationally recognized artists to be, how more established or emergent artists should be prioritized, and so on. As a result, each tandem developed its own operational approach. The diversity of concepts and approaches—and the tensions this created—prompted ongoing reflection throughout the project on whether creative and artistic processes, as well as the productions themselves, should, at their core, retain some degree of uniformity. This discussion persisted throughout the project's implementation, continually influencing the approach to new tandems. Ultimately, the partners acknowledged the need to discuss the appropriate level of flexibility and freedom in these areas in future projects.

Variety was also the norm in terms of connecting with the tandem topics. Each of the 12 tandems was assigned one of the six pre-defined topics (“Daily Bread”, “Having a Voice”, “Bridging the Gap”, “Work and Happiness”, “Connecting Dots”, “Right to the Future”), where they were freely interpreted by the artists and partners involved. This diversity can be related to the very nature of the topics, the artistic approaches, the cultural milieus of each country, region or city, and the characteristics of the partners or individuals involved, as well as their specific interests. Although each thematic topic was assigned to two tandems, each were interpreted in substantially different ways, as can be observed in the artistic presentations in Section 3 of this book.

In some artistic processes there was no direct relationship with the theme, although it formed the starting point for research and creation, while in others the partners undertook in-depth research with the community around the issue (cf. Figure 1). In terms of the artistic creation process, diversity was seen through different degrees of openness, constraint, relationship with a community, intensity of mediation or connection with the territory, for instance (cf. Figure 2).

9 Pergine Spettacolo Aperto and Pro Progressione.

10 This was particularly challenging in the cases of partners that are networks of municipalities (Artemrede, Transversal,

Figure 1: Tandem topics and co-producers involved

TANDEM	TOPIC	ARTIST	CO-PRODUCER 1	CO-PRODUCER 2	CO-PRODUCER 3
Tandem #1	Work and Happiness	Slovenian	Bunker	Cluj Cultural Center	L'arboreto
Tandem #2	Connecting Dots	Portuguese	Artemrede	Occitanie en scène	
Tandem #3	Daily Bread	Italian	Pergine Festival	Pro Progressione	L'arboreto
Tandem #4	Having a Voice	French	Occitanie en scène	Teatro di Sardegna	L'arboreto
Tandem #5	Bridging the Gap	Greek	PCAI	Artemrede	L'arboreto
Tandem #6	Right to the Future	Romanian	Cluj Cultural Center	POGON	L'arboreto
Tandem #7	Work and Happiness	Croatian	POGON	Artemrede	
Tandem #8	Connecting Dots	Italian	Teatro di Sardegna	Bunker	L'arboreto
Tandem #9	Daily Bread	Catalan	Transversal	Teatro di Sardegna	L'arboreto
Tandem #10	Having a Voice	Portuguese	Artemrede	Transversal	
Tandem #11	Bridging the Gap	French	Occitanie en scène	Transversal	L'arboreto
Tandem #12	Right to the Future	Hungarian	Pro Progressione	Occitanie en scène	

Source: own elaboration

Figure 2: Characterization of the activities held in each tandem

### Tandem #1 Work and Happiness

**Selected Artist**  
Neja Tomšič

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Cluj-Napoca (7)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Cluj-Napoca (7)  
Mondaino (15)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
Mladi Levi Festival, Cukrana, Ljubljana (3)  
Tranzit House, Cluj-Napoca (2)

**Touring (total performances per country)**  
Slovenia (8)  
Austria (1)  
Serbia (1)  
Portugal (1)

**Artistic Domain**  
Theatre essay and an installation with an audio guide.

**Topic of Work**  
Railway workers' park, gentrification processes, urban transformation and socioeconomic inequalities.

**Territories**  
Working class park in Cluj-Napoca (and the Antioniadis park in Alexandria).  
A piece of research into how common public spaces (such as parks and playgrounds) are impacted by the sociopolitical organization of work and the corresponding concept of free time.

**Community**  
Community used as source of knowledge (individual interviews and visits).  
Artists and activists involved in the activities for the preservation of the Railway Workers' Park as a public green space in Cluj-Napoca, Roma community activists, Roma community members who lived in the park.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
Local facilitators (one from the project and another from community).

**Audiences**  
Not directly active: audience attends the performance, sitting/interacting on stage.

## Tandem #2 Connecting Dots

**Selected Artist**  
Inês Jacques

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Moita (18)  
Narbonne (13)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Narbonne (16)  
Moita (22)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
Fórum Cultural José Manuel Figueiredo, Moita (2)  
Théâtre + Cinéma—Scène Nationale Grand Narbonne (1)

**Touring (total performances per country)**  
Portugal (1)

**Artistic Domain**  
Dance performance.

**Topic of Work**  
Alternative “new world” and modes of living.

**Territories**  
Specific neighbourhoods/areas in each municipality.  
Territorialization was marked by sociocultural profile of people involved (Moita and Narbonne).

**Community**  
Hosting communities (people in Moita and Narbonne) involved in the creative production (co-construction)  
Members of the hosting community involved in performance on the stage (together with professional dancers).  
Hosting communities from Moita (mostly students, domestic workers, unemployed and retired people) were different from those in Narbonne (encompassed a wide range of professions and included a significant number of amateur artists).  
In total 48 people from both communities were involved.  
Participants' contributions formed the basis of the piece's text, dramaturgy and visual universe, as well as the choreographic score.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
To meet people in territories and mediate sessions.  
In the Moita case the connectors lived in Vale da Amoreira (Moita) and one of them had previous experience with Artemrede projects; this helped to reach a community and to develop the workshops.  
In Narbonne the profile of the connector (who was of Portuguese descent) differed from the one in Moita and essentially existed to help Inês to overcome linguistic barriers and help with texts.

**Audiences**

## Tandem #3 Daily Bread

**Selected Artist**  
Kepler-452

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Pergine Valsugana (13)  
Budapest (11)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Pergine Valsugana (6)  
Mondaino (14)  
Pergine Valsugana (6)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
Municipal Theatre, Pergine Valsugana (1)  
Bethlen Theatre, Budapest (2)

**Touring (total performances per country)**  
Italy (6)

**Artistic Domain**  
Theatre performance.

**Topic of Work**  
“Traditional” families, families with migration stories, families with experience of memory degeneration.

**Territories**  
Territory covers the partners' different contexts (Italy and Hungary), and their memories in relation to the history of Europe (including events occurring at the time the residencies took place—e.g. floods in Italy), and personal stories of people in the communities (Pergine, Mondaino and Budapest).

**Community**  
Families living separated across two different countries (via siblings living in Hungary and Italy) and people living with dementia.  
Individuals with different backgrounds on the topic of “family”.  
A Hungarian migrant woman living in Italy with dementia (Alzheimer's) led to the exploration of memory loss.  
Psychologists and participants in the support groups in Alzheimer's centre.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
Specific groups of people in Italy (communities: e.g. people with Alzheimer's or people affected by floods).  
In Hungary the connector also was extremely important in overcoming linguistic barriers.

**Audiences**  
Participative audience: some people are involved in dialogues during the performance.  
The stage setup promotes the active involvement with actor and objects.

## Tandem #4 Having a Voice

**Selected Artist**  
ZONE -poème-

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Tarbes (14)  
Sardinia (14)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Mondaino (14)  
Tarbes (8)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
Le Parvis-Scène Nationale Tarbes-Pyrénées (1)  
Teatro Eliseo di Nuoro, Nuoro (1)

**Touring (total performances per country)**

Italy (1)  
Cyprus (1)  
France (1)  
Latvia (1)  
Montenegro (1)  
Greece (1)  
Kosovo (2)  
Romania (1)  
Malta (1)  
Croatia (1)  
Portugal (1)

**Artistic Domain**  
Dance performance.

**Topic of Work**  
Post war Balkans stories and peacebuilding processes and stories. Impacts of war on those who stand at its forefront and the concept of enemy.

**Territories**  
With the Balkans War as a backdrop, territories are related to through contact with experience of war (Tarbes) and military presence (Sardinia).  
Territory-specific objects present on stage, which form part of the performance at some level (e.g. ceramic pieces, texts and publications).

**Community**  
A community around the Balkans conflict.  
In Tarbes, the artists met ceramics students (who helped to create the piece's scenography elements), geopolitics students, as well as the director of the national veterans' office.  
In Sardinia, they met with a former general of the Italian army and a woman who represents an anti-militarization association.  
In Mondaino they met with a World War II specialist.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
Partners' team (facilitator).  
Ceramics student.

**Audiences**

## Tandem #5 Bridging the Gap

**Selected Artist**  
Eva Giannakopoulou

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Piraeus (12)  
Torres Vedras (12)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Mondaino (16)  
Athens (14)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
PLYFA, Athens (2)  
Teatro-Cine, Torres Vedras (2)

**Touring (total performances per country)**  
Greece (3)

**Artistic Domain**  
Theatre performance.

**Topic of Work**  
Hydrofeminism; feminist practice, political body.

**Territories**  
Local communities in Athens and Torres Vedras (connected with rivers, lakes, torrents and groups of women).  
Connection with sea and water elements adapted to each territory.

**Community**  
Co-creation of the piece and costumes with a group of women-artists from the Athens community, involved as performers on stage.  
Hosting communities from Athens and Torres Vedras (and their rituals) used as source of creative material.

Fishermen and other people with a life story connecting to the seaside.  
A group of women, aged between 55–65, undergoing menopause.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
In first residency in Piraeus, Eva preferred to have a peer-to-peer relationship with the local community.

In Portugal, a Torres Vedras resident and sound designer helped Eva to find people and places in researching territories. Later the connector undertook the piece's sound design.  
In Mondaino the role was shared between three women, who assisted Eva in mediating the interviews and workshops, as well as actively contributing to research on water communities, anchoring the topic in local specificities.

**Audiences**  
Not directly active: the audience attends the performance in the classic way (but there is an open debate with audiences at the end of each performance).

## Tandem #6 Right to the Future

### Selected Artist

Catinca Drăgănescu

### Research Residencies (days)

Zagreb (9)

Cluj-Napoca (4)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Mondaino (14)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

Reactor de creație și experiment, Cluj-Napoca (4)

POGON Jedinstvo, Zagreb (1)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Romania (3)

### Artistic Domain

Interactive performance.

### Topic of Work

Alternative future scenarios, sustainability, migration, integration, democracy and gaming.

### Territories

Imagined territories, based on alternative sustainable experiences.

Contacting with people and organizations working on alternative possibilities in Cluj-Napoca and Zagreb.

### Community

Organizations that work on alternative possibilities, visions or scenarios of the future.

People or groups with different ways of living.

Meeting organizations and individuals who are working on production issue topics.

Use of the interviews method.

Workshops for students and gaming design methods. This experience was key in designing their collaborative role within the performance.

### Mediators/Connectors

Partner's facilitator used to introduce the artists to alternative collectives.

Helped to establish connections between the artists and young students.

### Audiences

Active audience: most people in the audience (in different groups) impact/are affected by the course of the performance (involved and/or observed in different tasks—some spectators are watching the other groups via CCTV).

## Tandem #7 Work and Happiness

### Selected Artist

Vedrana Klepica

### Research Residencies (days)

Santarém (26)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Zagreb (56)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

POGON Jedinstvo, Zagreb (2)

Teatro Sá da Bandeira, Santarém (2)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Serbia (1)

### Artistic Domain

Text-based, post-dramatic theatre performance.

### Topic of Work

Climate change and wildfires, loss and human survival mechanisms in the face of crisis.

### Territories

With the background of climate change and wildfire events (affecting all of Southern Europe and particularly Portugal and Croatia), research is mostly linked to the Centro Region in Portugal, one of the areas most affected by wildfires in recent years.

### Community

Community used as source of knowledge.

Interviews to several people and organizations.

Environmental organizations, spatial planning and forest management organizations, climate activists, scientists, architects, artists, journalists, psychologists (experts in mourning), firemen, victims of fires.

### Mediators/Connectors

Connect with local people and territories.

In Portugal, a professional connector (with an artistic profile) was hired.

They were used to facilitate the encounters, and mobilized students and participants, as well as to enable translation, in order to overcome language barriers.

### Audiences

Not directly active: the audience attends the performance in the classic way.



## Tandem #7 Work and Happiness

### Selected Artist

Petra Hrašćanec & Ksenija Zec (21:21)

### Research Residencies (days)

Zagreb (27)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Santarém (15)  
Zagreb (19)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

POGON Jedinstvo, Zagreb (2)  
Teatro Sá da Bandeira, Santarém (2)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Portugal (1)

### Artistic Domain

Dance solo + participative performance (dinner).

### Topic of Work

Chemical and emotional reactions occurring during encounters, and the question of control in artistic processes.

### Territories

Local communities in Zagreb and Santarém were used to promote social encounters to expand emotional and chemical exchange and transformation.

The artists met with different territories/cultures who influenced the result.

### Community

Community used as source of knowledge but (some members) also took the role of spectators in the participative dinner.

Researched the topic of emotional and chemical exchange and transformations by meeting with different social groups.

Dance students from the Zagreb Academy of Dramatic Arts were involved in the creative process.

Workshops/encounters with performing arts and dance students and practices with elderly people from a day care centre.

Encounter with a traditional cook in Portugal.

### Mediators/Connectors

Connect with local people and territories.

In Portugal a professional connector (with an artistic profile) was hired, who mobilized participants and overcame language barriers.

### Audiences

Dance solo—not directly active: the audience attends the performance in the classic way.  
Participative dinner—active audience: a dinner performance, all individuals take part as diners and are assigned small tasks to accomplish.

## Tandem #8 Connecting Dots

### Selected Artist

Chiara Bersan/corpoceleste

### Research Residencies (days)

Mondaino (12)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Cagliari (15)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

Su Siccu, Cagliari (1)  
Mladi Levi Festival, Ljubljana (1)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Italy (9)

Netherlands (2)

Germany (5)

UK (1)

Belgium (4)

### Artistic Domain

Dance performance.

[Site-specific performance]

### Topic of Work

Identity, empowering marginalized voices, provoke dialogue.  
People with disabilities.

### Territories

Partners' territories were used to expand on ongoing research on the relationship between bodies, disabilities and space (occupying spaces-urban areas).

Public space movement—specific environment built by the body of people with disabilities and their presence.

### Community

Hosting communities involved in the creative production and in performance.

Participants/audience engaged in dialogue, workshops and rehearsals, contributing with ideas, experiences, perspectives and stories.

### Mediators/Connectors

Partners involved in facilitation and mobilization of local communities' participants..

### Audiences

Active audience: the audience walk through public spaces led by a group of people with disabilities. Actors and audiences establish a new vocabulary for movement and new relationships with urban daily life in a city (iteration as performed in Cagliari, Sardinia—other stage versions of the performance have then ensued).

## Tandem #8 Connecting Dots

### Selected Artist

Valentina Medda

### Research Residencies (days)

Cagliari (15)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Ljubljana (6)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

Faro di Capo Sant'Elia, Cagliari (1)

Mladi Levi Festival, Ljubljana (2)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Italy [film] (6)

Italy [performance] (3)

Belgium [film] (2)

USA [film] (1)

Portugal [performance] (1)

Romania [performance] (1)

### Artistic Domain

Performance & Film & Book.

[Site-specific performance: Faro di Capo Sant'Elia; banks of the Ljubljanska River]

### Topic of Work

Mediterranean tradition.

Rituals of mourning purported by women.

Migration from the Global South.

### Territories

Mediterranean (its rituals and its contemporary challenges).

Site-specific interventions, based on tradition of territories

of the Mediterranean (and Ljubljana).

### Community

Involvement of hosting community in the co-production process and in performance (professional and non-professional women). Local singers and performers of various ages from different social backgrounds.

Collaborations with local designers and cooperatives for costume creation.

### Mediators/Connectors

From the partners' production team; they helped to find the people involved.

### Audiences

Not directly active: the audience attends the performance in the classic way but sitting/interacting in the public space where the performance happens.

## Tandem #9 Daily Bread

### Selected Artist

Moon Ribas and Quim Girón

### Research Residencies (days)

Cagliari (8)

Mataró (21)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Cagliari (15)

Mataró (14)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

Festival 2 Terços —Can Gassol, Mataró (2)

Cagliari (2)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Catalonia [Spain] (2)

Portugal (2)

### Artistic Domain

Performance.

### Topic of Work

Underground, relation with subsoil, planet, telluric movement, interaction technology-nature.

### Territories

Local communities (of Cagliari and Mataró) whose lives/work/research are connected to the underground and its specific territories (caves, mines, etc.).

Drawing analogous links with the underground (including, for instance, the exploration of the voices of a choir, underpinning of the human vocal system).

Relationship that humans have with the subsoil and the planet.

### Community

Community used as a source of knowledge and creative material.

The artists got to meet and interview different people related with research in underground topics (as miners, archaeologists, geologists and speleologists).

Local amateur choirs whose faces and voices featured in the performance.

### Mediators/Connectors

From the partners' production team; they helped artists to get to know the local groups and people involved.

### Audiences

Active audience: individuals in the audience influence the lighting in the performance (with a lantern on their heads) and are all directly connected to the "earth" through bracelets (seismographers feeling earthquakes from all over the world).

## Tandem #10 Having a Voice

**Selected Artist**  
Tiago Cadete

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Pombal (15)  
Granollers (15)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Granollers (16)  
Pombal (4)  
Alcobaça (10)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
Cine-Teatro João d'Oliva Monteiro, Alcobaça (3)  
TAG—Teatre Auditori de Granollers—Llevant Teatre (2)

**Touring (total performances per country)**  
Italy (1)  
Portugal (4)  
Portugal [installation] (45)

**Artistic Domain**  
Sound performance-installation.

**Topic of Work**  
Migration, voices of migrant communities, memory and identity.

**Territories**  
Local communities of Alcobaça-Pombal, and Granollers regions formed the basis for the selection of Latin American immigrants.

Migrants' territories (physically and imaginary).  
Migrants in similar life circumstances.

**Community**  
Community used as source of knowledge (individual interviews, etc.), and creative material. The testimonies collected were used directly as creative material in the play. Their voice is directly unveiled on stage.  
Latin American migrants living in Alcobaça/Pombal region and Granollers (Catalonia), 11 different Latin nationalities.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
Connectors hired in both communities.  
Open calls in Portugal and Catalonia were essential to find suitable connectors (Latin American priest, an artist and a community mediator), that made it possible to "create" a specific hosting community within larger Latin American immigrant communities.

**Audiences**  
Not directly active: audience just attends the performance but sitting on stage while the sound performance/installation is displayed from the empty seats of the stalls.

## Tandem #11 Bridging the Gap

**Selected Artist**  
Hamdi Dridi, Cie Chantiers Publics

**Research Residencies (days)**  
Narbonne (28)  
Villanova i la Geltrú (18)

**Creative Residencies (days)**  
Mondaino (13)  
Narbonne (16)

**Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)**  
Théâtre + Cinéma—Scène Nationale Grand Narbonne (2)  
Teatre Principal de Villanova i la Geltrú (1)

**Touring (total performances per country)**  
Portugal (1)  
Hungary (1)

**Artistic Domain**  
Dance performance, dance jam/DJ set and food sharing.  
[some site-specific performance already happened in communities and territories]

**Topic of Work**  
Memory, cooking, dance and migration.  
Family, self-awareness.

**Territories**  
Narbonne and Villanova i la Geltrú communities were used as source of choreographic material.  
Considering that Villanova i la Geltrú is a port city with a fishing tradition, the artists team proposed involving fishermen and their communities.  
The port was taken as the centre of fishermen's livelihood and conviviality.

**Community**  
In Narbonne, the team worked with a community of people with different sociocultural backgrounds, ages and genders, students, dancers and theatre amateurs. The process helps to identify working gestures as a possible source of choreographic material.  
In Villanova i la Geltrú the process was undertaken with a community of fishermen.  
In both cases "to be" was a central part of the community process and was developed through interviews, video recordings and photography registers.

**Mediators/Connectors**  
In Narbonne the artists relied on Théâtre+Cinéma public relations team's expertise in community outreach.  
In Villanova i la Geltrú a local actress, cinema director and coach, accompanied the artists throughout their stay.

**Audiences**  
(\*\*)

## Tandem #12 Right to the Future

### Selected Artist

Nóra Juhász

### Research Residencies (days)

Budapest (12)

Tarbes (9)

### Creative Residencies (days)

Tarbes (14)

Budapest (14)

### Premieres (\*) (place, number of performances)

Három Holló, Budapest (2)

Le Parvis—Scène Nationale Tarbes Pyrénées (2)

### Touring (total performances per country)

Portugal (1)

Serbia (1)

### Artistic Domain

Theatre, hybrid performance.

### Topic of Work

Technology, education, video gaming and future possibilities.

### Territories

The work developed in Budapest with children from the VIII District gave the community a territorial definition for the characteristics of participants. This differed from other groups of communities, that were not necessarily based on a specific territory.

The model of workshop applied in Hungary and Tarbes led to different results for future possibilities—this is to be expected when you depart from completely different ages, sociocultural contexts and backgrounds.

### Community

In Budapest: weekly encounters with a community of children aged 10–14 from the VIII district with a vulnerable socioeconomic background.

In Tarbes: children and young adults (students: in multimedia and information studies; drama course; materials and surfaces; in English; and in geopolitics).

In parallel, another creative “community”, was assembled by the main artist: a diverse transdisciplinary team comprising a dancer, a theatre director, an actress, a creative writer and a video maker who helped to achieve these future possibilities.

### Mediators/Connectors

A children’s rights and child protection expert.

### Audiences (\*\*)

The artist selection process was based on open calls in all participating countries. The level of participation across calls varied, ranging from more than one hundred applications in some cases (Tandem #3) to less than ten in others (Tandem #12). This diversity can be explained by several variables including the liveliness of local cultural milieu, the attractiveness of the project (and its funding) in comparison with other local/national support available for cultural activities, the position/reputation of the local partner in the local performing arts scene, the communication/dissemination strategies adopted for the call, or the requirements set out in the application itself. The level of bureaucracy and linguistic barriers involved in this kind of project may intimidate potential participants from applying, which may be more relevant in certain territorial and social contexts (more “peripheral” ones within our “southern periphery”). The open calls were inclusive of all nationalities, ages, genders and other important segmentation characteristics (but naturally the applications were conditioned by these attributes in each context). From the applications to these open calls, the tandem co-producers selected five shortlisted artists for each tandem, who went on to present their projects in the tandem workshops. These 60 artists reflect the variety of national/regional cultural contexts, as well as of the selection processes conducted in each case (cf. Figure 3).

Figure 3: Profile of the 60 shortlisted artists across all tandems

## Tandem #1

CO-PRODUCERS #1 Bunker, #2 Cluj Cultural Centre, #3 L'arboreto				
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*
Inan Sven du Swami	performance	M	1994	Slovenia
Loup Abramovici and Tomaž Grom	performance, music	M	1979 / 1972	France, Slovenia
Name	visual arts	M	1985	Slovenia
Nika Švab	dramaturg, writer	F	1991	Slovenia
Klemen Kovačič, Počemučka	performance collective	M	1998	Slovenia
<b>Neja Tomšič, Nonument Group</b>	<b>performance, visual arts</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1982</b>	<b>Slovenia</b>

(\*) without considering the (pre)presentations in Mondaino

(\*\*) information unavailable at the time of analysis.

## Tandem #2

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 Artemrede, #2 Occitanie en scène					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Ana Borralho and João Galante / casaB	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F+M	1972	Portugal	
André Amálio and Tereza Havičková / Hotel Europa	documentary theatre, hybrid/transdisciplinary	M+F	1977	Portugal and Czechia	
David Marques	dance	M	1985	Portugal	
<b>Inês Jacques</b>	<b>dance, hybrid/transdisciplinary</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1978</b>	<b>Portugal</b>	
Sara Marasso / Il Cantiere	dance, hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1970	Italy	

## Tandem #3

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 Pergine Festival, #2 Pro Progressione, #3 L'arboreto					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Alessandro Carboni	hybrid/transdisciplinary	M	1976	Italy	
Eleonora Pippo	theatre	F	1976	Italy	
Francesca Marconi	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1972	Italy	
<b>Nicola Borghe- si, Enrico Baraldi / Kepler-452</b>	<b>theatre</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>Italy</b>	
Claudia Sorace and Riccardo Fazi / Muta Imago	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F+M	1980	Italy	

## Tandem #4

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 Occitanie en scène, #2 Teatro di Sardegna, #3 L'arboreto					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Audrey Gary / Cie Juste Ici	dance, hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1981	France	
Christophe Rulhes & Julien Cassier / Le GdRA	theatre, hybrid/transdisciplinary	M	1975	France	
Kate Papi / Cie Obra	dance, hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1980	UK	
<b>Simon Capelle &amp; Mélodie Lasselin / ZONE -poème-</b>	<b>dance, theatre</b>	<b>M+F</b>	<b>1987</b>	<b>France</b>	
Yohan Bret / Cie L'An 01	theatre, hybrid/transdisciplinary	M	1987	France	

## Tandem #5

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 PCAI, #2 Artemrede, #3 L'arboreto					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Despina Sanida Crezia & Foteini Stamatelopoulos / Vigil	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1998	Greece	
<b>Eva Giannakopoulou</b>	<b>hybrid/transdisciplinary</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1977</b>	<b>Greece</b>	
Evi Souli, Marilena Georgantzi, Kostas Theodorakis / Stereo Nero	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F+F+M	1989	Greece	
Tzeni Argyriou	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1977	Greece	
Vassilis Noulas, Kostas Tzimoulis / Nova Melan-	hybrid/transdisciplinary	M+M	1985	Greece	

## Tandem #6

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 Cluj Cultural Centre, #2 POGON, #3 L'arboreto					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Alexandru Berceanu	immersive art and neuroscience	M	1978	Romania	
<b>Catinca Drăgănescu</b>	<b>theatre</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1984</b>	<b>Romania</b>	
Mihai Păcurar	visual arts	M	1978	Romania	
Oana Hodade	theatre & performance	F	1985	Romania	
Robert Bălan	theatre	M	1979	Romania	

## Tandem #7

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 POGON, #2 Artemrede					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Josipa Bubaš	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1979	Croatia	
Koraljka Begović	dance	F	1984	Croatia	
Mak Murtić & Nika Bauman	music, hybrid/transdisciplinary	M+F	1988		
<b>Petra Hrašćanec &amp; Ksenija Zec / 21:21</b>	<b>dance, hybrid/transdisciplinary</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1982</b>	<b>Croatia</b>	
Vedrana Klepica	theatre	F	1986	Croatia	

## Tandem #8

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 Teatro di Sardegna, #2 Bunker, #3 L'arboreto					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
<b>Chiara Bersani / corpoceleste</b>	<b>dance/performance</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1984</b>	<b>Italy</b>	
Collettivo amigdala /	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1980	Italy	
Federica Rocchi					
Davide Iodice	theatre	M	1968	Italy	
Simona Bertozzi	dance	F	1969	Italy	
<b>Valentina Medda</b>	<b>hybrid/transdisciplinary</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>Italy</b>	

## Tandem #9

CO-PRODUCERS					
#1 Transversal, #2 Teatro di Sardegna, #3 L'arboreto					
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*	
Aimar Pérez Galí	dance	M	1982	Catalonia—Spain	
Gastón Core	dance	M	1979	Argentina	
Carles Fernández Giua and Eugenio Szwarczer / La Conquesta del Pol Sud	documentary theatre	M+M	1973	Catalonia—Spain / Argentina	
<b>Moon Ribas and Quim Girón</b>	<b>dance, new circus and cyborg art</b>	<b>F+M</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>Catalonia—Spain</b>	
Roger Bernat / FFF	theatre	M	1968	Catalonia—Spain	

## Tandem #10

CO-PRODUCER				
#1 Artemrede, #2 Transversal				
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*
Costanza Givone / Fogo Lento	hybrid/transdisciplinary	F	1983	Italy
Paula Diogo and Alex Cassal / Mã Criação	theatre, hybrid/transdisciplinary	F+M	1977	Portugal + Brazil
Rafaela Santos and Fernando Giestas / Amarelo Silvestre	theatre	F+M	1972	Portugal
Ricardo Machado	dance	M	1983	Portugal
<b>Tiago Cadete</b>	hybrid/transdisciplinary	<b>M</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>Portugal</b>

## Tandem #11

CO-PRODUCER				
#1 Occitanie en scène, #2 Transversal, #3 L'arboreto				
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*
Bouziane Boue-Idja / Cie Dans6T	dance	M	1980	Tunisia
Céline Nogueira / Cie Innocentia Inviolata	theatre	F	1974	France
<b>Hamdi Dridi / Cie Chantiers Publics</b>	<b>dance</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>1988</b>	<b>Tunisia</b>
Loriane Wagner / Cie Portes Sud	dance	F	1982	France
Sumaya Al Attia	theatre	F	1988	Lebanon

## Tandem #12

CO-PRODUCERS				
#1 Pro Progressione, #2 Occitanie en scène				
Artists	Artistic profile	Gender	Age (date of birth)*	Nationality/Country of citizenship*
Kata Juhász	dance	F	1973	Hungary
Krisztina Urbánovits and Zsuzsa Száger / KV Company	theatre	F+F	1970	Hungary
Martin Boross / Stereo Akt	theatre	M	1988	Hungary
Máté Mészáros	dance	M	1980	Hungary
<b>Nóra Juhász</b>	<b>theatre, hybrid/transdisciplinary</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>Hungary</b>

\*Age of birth\* and "Nationality/Country of citizenship" refers to the "lead" candidate (in the case of collectives).

Source: own elaboration, based on information gathered by project partners

The tandem workshops were intended as the space in which artists would be chosen to participate in each tandem's creative process, as well as more generally to unite the local artistic scene with international partners involved in the project, increasing the opportunities for all five pre-selected artists to enter the international arena.

The workshops were designed to provide an informal atmosphere to facilitate sharing between partner institutions and artists. They usually took place over 4–5 days. Seminars, talks and artist presentations formed part of the programme as well as activities oriented towards sociability and artistic performances. Scheduled opportunities for formal matching between artists and partners were also provided in addition to conversations/interviews with research teams.<sup>11</sup>

Independently of their level of experience, in some cases, the artists proposed ideas that were extensions of previous or ongoing work, while in other cases they tried to adapt to the tandem topics and designed tailored proposals. The focus of the SP project was on participation processes and work with specific communities. Even if conceptualized and understood in numerous ways, participation pro-

<sup>11</sup> The first tandem workshops served as a field experiment for the model, allowing us to test the design of the project at

cesses were always relevant, and clear both in artist statements as well as in the decision processes, namely at the final selection.

The final selection of artists was a culminating moment in each tandem workshop. From the five shortlisted artists, one was selected to have their work produced in the scope of SP.<sup>12</sup> Even if the pitch model is typical of selection processes, it was operationalized innovatively during the tandem workshops. The decision process was very collegial, with all partners involved in a long and participative debate (using fishbowl methodology). Each ended with a final decision from the tandem co-producers. However, the decision was clearly influenced by the group discussion, and was made either during or shortly after the workshop itself.

There were two exceptions during the final artist selection processes. With the agreement of the co-producers involved, the artist selection took place prior to the workshop in Tandems #11 and #6, due to specificities of local cultural milieus (in Slovenia and Romania). In these cases, the artists were already aware of the final decision when presenting during the workshop. On the one hand, it can be less stressful for the artists, but on the other hand, the people involved (artist and partners) did not have the opportunity to discuss their proposals together in person before the selection decision. This model instigated intense debate between the partners throughout the project, and although this practice was not repeated in the later tandems, this flexibility is still up for debate in future projects.

All workshops were monitored using two kinds of surveys. All artist participants from all workshops (that is, the 60 shortlisted artists in the 12 tandems) completed one survey, which provides important information on processual issues (the assessment of the workshop model and the opportunities that arose from participating in the project), as well as on the impacts of the project as regards empowering southern peripheries in contemporary art worlds. This information informed and helped to develop discussions between partners throughout the project.<sup>13</sup> Another survey was applied to all people involved in each workshop, assessing organizational, operational and logistical conditions, as well as the experiences and take-aways from a personal perspective. The same survey was applied to all project activities, and (even if people's responsiveness decreased when activities were underway) it served to continually fuel the debate on an organizational level and to seek continued improvement in all activities and processes.

12 In fact, in two tandems the co-producers involved opted to select more than one artist (Tandem #7 and Tandem #8—cf. Figure 2). This was made possible by splitting the budget available and managing synergies with other projects or funding mechanisms.

The SP participative approach varied depending on the choices made by selected artists, the communities they worked with, and the context of the co-producer partners in each tandem. The relationship with the community varied across tandems. This variety can be seen on three different levels. Firstly, both the local partners<sup>14</sup> and the selected artists varied in the creative process regarding their approach to the communities (cf. Chapter 7.1). Secondly, the territories and communities were naturally diverse (for instance, in their cultural, social or economic capital), factors which make the work take different shapes while being submitted to the same creative processes (e.g. Inês Jacques's work in Tandem #2 was shaped differently by the communities in Moita and Narbonne, respectively). Thirdly, political and social contexts vary across territories and communities, and the project revealed how clearly these can influence people's relationship with artistic processes, and performing and production conditions within a territory (e.g. contemporary sociopolitical conditions in Hungary and the way they influence artistic processes—cf. Chapter 4.9). The participatory processes undertaken throughout the project gradually influenced the practices and mindsets of the people involved (members of the hosting communities; partners' teams; artists, technicians and other creators participating in the research-creation process in those communities—including policymakers).

The participative work was held mostly with the communities,<sup>15</sup> in creative residencies, in the partners' territories. The role of connector (a mediator between the artist and a specific community) emerged as essential, if we consider that, at least, one of the territorial contexts was "new" to the artists/collectives, and the duration of the residencies were quite short. Connectors were not a mandatory element of the project design but the majority of artists used one (or more) and the support provided by these mediators was key to establishing connections, finding people in the communities, getting to know and exploring the places, etc. Connectors came in all shapes and sizes, the profiles of whom were defined by partner institutions and artists to respond to the needs of the different creative processes (e.g. an evangelical priest was fundamental in helping Tiago Cadete to connect with Latin migrants in Alcobaça/Pombal; a local actress, cinema director and coach, Mar Pawlowsky,

14 For instance, in some communities, partners opted to remunerate some of the participants involved in the creative process (especially the ones who ended up performing in the final productions), but this was operationalized differently in each case.

15 In some cases, however, participation occurred in other phases of the creative/artistic process, for instance, active spectatorship (e.g. Tandem #9—Moon Ribas and Quim Girón;



helped Hamdi Dridi in their liaisons with the fishing community in Catalonia). The role of connector in some cases was fulfilled by people hired specifically by each production team or in other cases by someone within the partner's team with experience of such processes (e.g. Francesca Giuliani in L'arboreto). Irrespective of the diversity of the role across the tandems, the role of the connector consistently helped artists to build bridges between the places and contexts (territories and people), as well as connect with the topics explored (for instance, connecting with researchers or people affected by or facing issues relating to specific themes—e.g. climate change and wildfires, for Vedrana Klepica; demeritias and floods for Kepler-452; or menopause for Eva Giannakopoulou).

The artist's relationship with a certain community or territory did not always originate from the same point of view. In some cases more conventional notions of "community" (as a group of people sharing some characteristics) were used in the research/creation process, or even as a target to be achieved, such as "building a community". In other cases, however, the link was established with a physically or symbolically defined territory. The diverse approaches to the concept of "community"—as well as creative participatory practices—enriched the project's creative outcomes, and contributed to ongoing dialogue among partners (and external invitees to the project's workshops and conferences), broadening the concepts and the perspectives for future projects and artistic interventions. It was the first encounter for most artists with these territories and communities. It takes time to establish new relationships, which was not always possible in view of the project design. Some artistic projects functioned well within these constraints, but others would need a longer-term connection with the community to achieve other types of outcomes, which is particularly relevant if the artist is not locally anchored.

Relationships between artists and co-producers, were equally heterogeneous. Artists differed in their level of independence, depending on their prior experience of collaborative work, mutual convergence of interests, thematic affinities, individual personality, etc. The balance between freedom/conditioning on the part of the producers/partners was formally and informally negotiated by each pairing throughout the process.

The separation between research and creative residencies defined in the project design was, in practice, often adopted flexibly, as research and creation naturally interrelate in participative artistic processes (and in particular in some of the types of participation followed by the selected artists). Funding constraints inherently shape the design of creative work, but in several cases, access to parallel funding or prior work helped to enable artists (and partners) to extend the duration and number of residencies and enhance their work. The experience from the residen-

The project design dictated that all productions would premiere in the co-producer countries (one and two), or even their venues specifically, and that then the productions could tour within and outside the project and the network. As can be seen in Section 3 of this book ("Stronger Peripheries Artistic Creations"), premieres took place essentially as planned, but touring outcomes varied, in some cases falling short of what was expected. Touring opportunities were easier for some productions to reach than others, which can be explained by several factors, including the aesthetic and production characteristics of the creation, the conditions and logistical capacities of partner venues/institutions, and cultural/political contexts.

In the specific case of L'arboreto, co-producer three in several tandems, performances were held solely during the creative process, during the residencies. Not being a "classic" performance venue, this partner has a strong relationship with locally anchored communities, and these performances play an important role in ensuring that those communities receive results in return for the process, demonstrating the importance of other types of outcomes in participatory processes.

Artistic quality is always hotly debated. This project was not an exception, with many debates on the aesthetic and cultural achievements of the productions developed within SP. However, because this was a participatory art project, the quality of the processes was scrutinized more closely than the creation itself. The diversity of processes, of artistic, social and political approaches to the themes, and of production conditions justify different positionings regarding the quality of the performances and of the participatory processes themselves (cf. Chapter 7.1—"A Quality of Participation Assessment Toolkit: a Co-Construction Process with Stronger Peripheries Partners").

### 3. Challenges to (Re)Organizing Participatory Practices in Southern Peripheries

A second level of our analysis is the identification of challenges inherent to participatory processes and that cultural agents will face when applying these processes in similar international collaborative projects in the future, drawing from our experience in Stronger Peripheries.

The challenges identified emerged from the multiple discussions held throughout the project, in particular during the workshops that looked to the future and in meetings during which applications to future calls for projects were discussed, along with spaces where the strategic and operative challenges were broadly and openly discussed among the partners (e.g. the workshops in Lisbon and Zagreb).

We present a schema of the challenges in Lisbon and Zagreb. A kind of project as identified by project partners in those debates, or-

### A) CHALLENGES RELATED TO HOW TO APPROACH PARTICIPATORY ARTISTIC PRACTICES

- To always remain open to exploring new content, formats and languages throughout the process and to innovate (challenging contemporary cultural production) (accepting the diversity of visions and approaches among partners and participants) (creating mechanisms to facilitate discussion on structural concepts and approaches/methods to be followed—e.g. discuss concepts such as “participation”, “community”, “periphery”, etc., and the need—or not—for consensus regarding these “structural concepts”)
- To be open to approaching diverse communities (which entails different interpretations of what a community is—physical, digital, metaphorical, etc.) and what their role should be in these kinds of artistic/cultural processes
- To think about who the processes and the results of participatory practices address (an audience, a community, an artistic field, to address a political/social challenge, etc.) (questioning: Which targets? Which impacts? What is relevant in the process?)

### B) CHALLENGES TO PARTICIPATORY ARTISTIC PROCESS IN SOUTHERN PERIPHERIES AND TO ADVOCATING “OTHER MODELS” FOR CULTURAL PARTICIPATION

- To reflect on our role as a southern cultural network (in terms of cultural, social, physical, economic and environmental contemporary challenges)
- To remain open-minded to other ways of thinking and working in southern context(s) (even if it may add new layers to the organizational challenges, it can facilitate/result in new ideas and perspectives)
- To seize the relevance of being together (partners, artists, communities) in challenging contemporary cultural production (empowering people and enhancing skills—artistic, technical, organizational—, in southern contexts)

### C) CHALLENGES IN RELATION TO ARTISTIC VALUE IN PARTICIPATORY PROCESSES

- To manage the balance between the “artistic results” and the “relevance of the process”, as well as the debates about artistic quality (Artistic quality in whose eyes? Partners, audiences, specific communities? The art world(s)? Gatekeeping mechanisms?) (does it make sense for a final performance to be a mandatory output, or may the process result in different kinds of outcomes?)
- To be aware of the discussions on the relevance of ethical mechanisms throughout the participative process vs potential aesthetic results of the artistic production/creation (these do not have to be necessarily opposite)
- To have the capacity to choose to take risks (or not) and to be open to new artistic topics/profiles (a familiarity with specific institutions/contexts/topics or forming part of specific creative milieus are often relevant/useful in gaining entry into these projects, which often reduces predisposition to take risks/innovate) (it also influences the will to address topics related to global challenges in southern cultural scenes)

### D) CHALLENGES TO CONSIDER WHEN REDESIGNING THE OVERALL PROJECT

- To give space (time) to the processes (to “be”) (gain/make time to create, to approach and to connect with the community, to get involved with the teams, to undertake in-depth research processes, to get involved in production processes, to get involved in impact assessments, etc.)
- To rethink the tandem organization model as the basis for the creative process (question the operationalization of the tandems and their structure: which relationship(s) between partners, producers, artists, communities, stakeholders, policymakers, etc.) (discuss if the tandems should all follow the same patterns/take the same structure or if they can be more flexible in their make-up—in terms of the number of partners involved, the number/type/length of the creations, operating procedures, main focus on processes/outcomes/touring, budget, etc.)

- To expand the agendas and topics set for the creation (enabling equal opportunities for cultural art worlds in the south and responding to the specific challenges they face) (linking—or not—to societal or funding body “agendas”: artistic, political, social, economic, environmental, etc.)
- To enable residencies to accomplish their dual role: develop artistic work/promote participatory processes (both types of residencies included in SP project design—research residencies and creative residencies—have this dual role; a continuous balance needs to be maintained between: working with specific communities and providing the time and space necessary to develop the artistic proposals.)
- To enable conditions that enhance touring prospects (and more presentations by each of the co-producers) (different types of conditions needed: reputational mechanisms, financial, technical, etc.) (to raise touring capacity, there must be a debate on the needs for harmonization or flexibility on matters that have shaped partner’s choices for their touring acquisitions, such as: degree of openness to formality/informality, use of usual/unusual venues/spaces and practices)
- To balance work and personal lives (this requires continuous (self-)vigilance, otherwise this kind of project will reproduce existing unsustainable and pervasive societal power dynamics in the cultural field)
- To place values such as pleasure and joy at the centre of project/network development (on the one hand, give space for sociability and encounter, making room for a fruitful relation between work and happiness to flourish, which is fundamental for these kinds of network to be sustainable; on the other hand, consider informality to be fundamental to these mechanisms, and that the imposition of activities oriented towards sociability may be counterproductive)
- To promote an innovative mechanism for knowledge creation and skills enhancement, questioning the standard role of “academic” and “artistic” partners in these kinds of projects (rethink how research and artistic creation interact and coordinate, as well as the way both things are represented by project partners) (discuss the objectives and formats of workshops, conferences and

## E) PRAGMATIC CHALLENGES TO THE CREATIVE PROCESS

- To question the artistic selection process (call requirements, dissemination mechanisms, workshop models) (debate which aspects we want to keep and change in the way artists are selected) (assuming the characteristics of the selection mechanisms clearly influence the type of artists selected and the results achieved in the artistic process) (discuss how the models influence the artistic profile of selected artists, and how they depend on the local creative milieu—e.g. level of previous experience, prior internationalization, disciplinary/linguistic skills, etc.) (keep time and interest to discuss the intended artistic profile, even if the open call model already predefines the type of candidate)
- To improve and strengthen coordination/collaboration between participants throughout the process, which can lead to alternative/innovative outcomes (enhancing the encounter between partners, artists and hosting communities involved and its unpredictable results/challenges). (avoiding prescriptive prior conditions and the imposition of conditions/limitations on artistic creation)
- To guarantee that mediators/connectors have suitable profiles and play a relevant role in the process (the role of mediators is structural to developing participatory work with specific communities—Should they all have similar profiles? Should they be part of the community or not? Should they be the artists themselves? Should they be someone from the art world?)
- To safeguard informality (and conflict) as it is crucial to creative/production processes in southern realities (adopting alternative/specific modes of production and creation, open to listening to different voices and to other “ways of doing”)

## F) CHALLENGES TO TERRITORIAL EMBEDDEDNESS AND RELATIONSHIP WITH COMMUNITIES

- To ensure sustainability of the processes with the territories and communities (ensuring continuity of participation practices, audience development policies, etc.)

(to deliver something to the community must be considered a central objective of participatory processes, be it specific outcomes or the process itself; to have return, at a multidimensional level, even if not easily quantifiable)  
(Which impacts should be considered/sought? At which levels/dimensions? What should be measured and how? etc.)

- To guarantee that artistic projects are territorially embedded and that these projects combine local anchorage with global dynamics (root-based processes vs global challenges)
- To ensure (economic, artistic, social, etc.) practical sustainability for the people/institutions (partners, artists, mediators, venues, etc.) involved during the processes  
(precarity, flexibility, remuneration policy, etc., for artists, community participants, partner's teams, etc.)

#### G) CHALLENGES RELATING TO NETWORK COLLABORATION/GOVERNANCE

- To guarantee horizontal logics and fair articulation between structures/partners (and artists, scholars, etc.), that underlies mutual development and capacity building (autonomy, responsibility, trust)
- To encourage all the parties involved to commit to project values (during the project and in the long term)  
("care", "empathy", "responsibility" within partner teams, municipal structures, technical structures, etc.)
- To avoid intimidating potential participants/partners with the level of bureaucracy and linguistic barriers involved in this kind of project (particularly relevant in certain territorial and social contexts)  
(e.g. entropy in the processes, obstacles to communication—artists/partners, cultural institutions/scholars, etc.)
- To consider expanding the network to other "southern" contexts  
(discussing the involvement of new partners, remaining open to expanding to other "southern geographies", even if specificities in terms of their institutional or political contexts (e.g., compatibility in terms of organizational issues or bureaucratic procedures, visa requirements, etc.) challenge production processes (or productivist perspectives)

#### H) CHALLENGES REGARDING POLICYMAKING AND GOVERNANCE

- To enhance the capacity of these processes and stakeholders (and this kind of project) to inform and influence public policies, at different levels (national, regional/local, European)  
(contribute to challenging and changing conventional practices in cultural policies and other areas of public policy, including territory-based integrated policies and education systems)
- To ensure that stakeholders involved in the project who have policymaking competences commit to delivering results from the project in their regular activities  
(e.g. city councils within partner networks)  
(e.g. letters of commitment, involving different levels of action: politicians, technical structures, operational technicians)
- To guarantee a safe space for these (participative, alternative, independent) kinds of creations and processes in the radicalization and polarization context of contemporary societies  
(EU projects as a refuge at national/regional level, for alternative and socially oriented artistic practices, particularly in contexts of artistic/financial asphyxia contemporary independent arts scenes are experiencing in some EU countries).
- To ensure that EU investment in this kind of project essentially targets its end users and does not just feed intermediate structures and parallel services  
(that it is effectively spent on cultural activity and not on external services, e.g., expensive meals, travel and accommodation)  
(that negative externalities—e.g. carbon footprint—are managed/kept to a minimum)
- Continue promoting and advocating for the (multidimensional) value of culture as a fundamental component of sustainable development (acknowledging culture as a priority and a driver for territorial development, and promoting its visibility).  
(accepting the multidimensional value of these processes, in cultural, economic, social, environmental, and civic participation domains)

#### 4. Impacts on Participants and in Territories

The third level in our assessment of the operationalization of SP and its impacts is the level of the territories. This level is concerned with the

tion) that the project brought to the communities involved. The analysis is based essentially on the self-assessment of the perceived impacts, by the different partners, of the activities undertaken during their artistic tandems, in the multiple dimensions included in the assessment.

Impact assessment in participatory projects is often based on a quantitative approach. Although this approach is recognized as extremely reductionist, it continues to be applied and this project will be no exception—the compilation of basic quantitative data with some outputs and outcomes of the project is available in the final report delivered to the funding institution.

We also systematize some of these data here. As can be seen in Section 3 of this book, the project brought 14 new artistic creations, resulting from the calls launched for each of the 12 tandems. The 14 artists/artist collectives selected, in the nine different countries, had the opportunity to develop their creations. Moreover, 60 artists/collectives (five in each tandem) were shortlisted in these same countries, and had the opportunity to participate in the respective tandem workshop, which gave them the opportunity to show their work, to network, and to internationalize their work and their careers. As result of these interactions, to now just a few collaboration/programming opportunities have arisen, but it is expected that this number will grow in the medium to long-term, as programming teams and artists know each other's work and are in direct contact for any future potential collaborations.

There were 28 premiere performances, which consisted of 14 premieres in “co-producer one” countries, followed by 14 “mirror” premieres in “co-producer two” countries. However, most of the performances were held on other occasions. To date, 131 performances have been held or are planned (at various stages of completion), and it is expected that the number will increase, inside and outside the network. Irrespective of the numbers, the touring aspect is one of the (few) areas in which most agree that the project didn't fully meet expectations.

The diversity of artistic projects, venues and conditions under which the productions were to take place meant that the possible and envisaged audiences varied greatly in size and type—cf. Chapter 7.2. We estimate that 8,980 people have attended the total of the performance activities accounted for to date.

As part of the development of these creative processes, a total of 48 research and creative residencies were carried out. Each tandem chose their own approach to identifying and working with the communities and communities varied in number and size. In broad terms, we can assume that at least 1,338 people were involved in the hosting communities that were considered part of SP activities, across the different countries.

SP project activities covered a plethora of participants

and 14 artist/collectives were finally selected for co-production). In addition to all the artists and collectives involved in the project activities and the communities and audiences involved in the artistic activities, many other people were involved in other SP project activities. Among these we highlight the 170 people from the 14 partner institutions (and their associates, in the case of the three municipality/institutional networks) who were involved in capacity-building activities, which formed part of one of the main objectives of the project. The project produced many other quantifiable outcomes, including the holding of 26 events (workshop/conferences/seminars), with 2,168 participants, across 10 countries. The involvement of (and mutual exchange between) academics, policymakers and local/national artistic communities in all these events is thus the main outcome of all those activities. The sharing of know-how, collective learning, networking effects, and personal/institutional skills improvement resulting from those three events is certainly more relevant than the participation numbers. The same can be said for the other kind of outputs from the project (e.g. the publication of the two project books, targeted at academic and artistic audiences, as well as the multiple presentations at academic and artistic events, as well as the multiple presentations at academic and artistic research teams involved in the project). The effects of these outputs can be much more intangible and long-term than figures could make us presume. In particular, the two toolkits developed within the project (for audiences analysis and for assessing the quality of participation) could be considered mere quantitative outputs from the project; however, they are intended to have a powerful outreach, and are considered important vehicles in enhancing skills within teams from partner institutions involved in the project as well as artistic communities of Southern Europe and the Balkan region in general.

In addition to these direct impacts, many others, indirect and induced, could be accounted for, both positive and negative. These include the thousands of kilometres that teams, artists and audiences travelled (and the ecological footprint attributable to such travel), as well as the inevitable positive indirect effects on the territories where the project's activities were carried out (at least in economic terms—e.g. accommodation, local transport, food—which, in the overall calculation of the project, amounted to more than 557 thousand euros).

Many other more qualitative and intangible effects were also seen at this level, associated with the consolidation of the institutional structures of the partners involved (including the creation/maintenance of 93 jobs<sup>16</sup>), or the impacts resulting from the multiple exchanges in terms of know-how between the people involved in the project, mutual learning, the transmission of tacit and formal knowl-

edge between teams, for instance. Intangible effects at symbolic level (for instance, for the artists shortlisted or selected in the diverse tandems, or for the partner institutions themselves) related to their involvement in this European project are not negligible at the local/national level, and should be valued. The same can be said for the communities and individuals directly involved in participatory practices, whose lives have been altered (to a lesser or greater extent) by their involvement in that experience.

It is for all these reasons that we believe that the project impact assessment should go beyond the more quantitative aspects, and take a more qualitative approach. Naturally, this more qualitative evaluation must take context and relativity into account—that is, that effects and impacts must be read and problematized in light of the specific and particular contexts of each individual, institution, community or territory (Tomaz et al., 2020; Costa et al., 2022; Costa, 2022).

Considering the SP framework, and the practical conditions available for the project evaluation, the qualitative evaluation can be operationalized at two different levels with the information collected by the team throughout the course of the project. On the one hand, we can assess the impacts for the different types of stakeholders involved in the project (artists, partner institutions, hosting communities), based on the information collected regarding the quality of participation in the project activities. On the other hand, we can work with project partners to assess their perceptions in relation to the impacts that the project's activities have had on the respective territories and communities, trying to make this assessment as multidimensional as possible.

Regarding the first strand, the quality of the participatory process for the different types of actors involved was assessed using the respective toolkit, developed during the project by the partners themselves. It gives interesting results. The information collected through this toolkit (with interviews with the artists and the project's partner institutions, focus groups with the hosting communities, and systematic observation of the activities developed) was used to draw the main conclusions in relation to the participatory art-practice creations developed in each of the tandems. These conclusions are compiled in the respective Project Assessment Frames, one for each of the 12 tandems. They systematize the main conclusions, based on the perceptions of the interviewees and the observation made, for a set of topics: (i) impacts on participants; (ii) impacts on cultural organizations and their relations with audiences/communities; (iii) impacts on artists, creative processes and production; and (iv) impacts on cultural policies and social transformation. A global synthesis of these impacts, that cuts through all tandems, can be consulted in Chapter 7.1 of this book ("A Quality of Participation Assessment Toolkit: a

In relation to the second strand, associated with the impacts of the project's activities on the territories and communities where they were developed, an innovative methodology was also applied, seeking a multidimensional evaluation of these impacts performed through self-assessment by the partners involved. The self-assessment perspective, despite being limited in comparative terms, allows for a more realistic and contextualized assessment of the actual impacts (individual and collective) for a divergent mix of people, institutions and territories (but who are also faced with diverse experiences and expectations).<sup>17</sup> In addition to being a self-evaluation, the qualitative evaluation must also be performed from a multidimensional perspective, defining five major "pillars" for the development of territories/communities, and that, therefore, the impacts of the activities developed must be analysed in light of each of these five dimensions: (i) cultural; (ii) economic; (iii) social; (iv) environmental; and (v) citizenship and participation.

The assessment is made using a conceptual framework which has been developed by DINÂMIA'CET-iscite's research team over the past few years throughout the course of several research projects (this can be consulted in Costa, 2022; Tomaz et al., 2020; Costa et al., 2022). To develop the conceptual framework, we had to design a practical analytical grid to enhance awareness about the multidimensionality of value creation by cultural and creative activities. The grid had to allow each specific agent to apply the measurement of value flexibly in accordance with their requirements. This grid was tested and applied to various empirical situations that arose through the parallel research projects. Testing adopted a knowledge co-creation perspective with the cultural and creative agents. The toolkit developed with this process (Culture.Impacts.DIY, available here: <https://diy.cultureimpact.com>) can be used autonomously by cultural agents and policymakers to perceive the diversity of factors underlying value creation and the multiplicity of impacts of cultural and creative activity on society and on their specific communities.

From this process, a grid with 15 subdimensions which concretize the five dimensions mentioned above was conceived (cf. Figure 4).

For each of these 15 subdimensions of development, five key indicators were defined, and for each of them a 1–7 Likert-scale question is used to understand to what extent the respondent considers the activity in question to have allowed or contributed to each of the aspects in terms of the development of the community/territory.<sup>18</sup> Therefore 75 indicators are collected (five for each subdimension; that

17 In this regard, see Costa (2022).

Figure 4: Dimensions and subdimensions for impacts assessment

Dimension	Subdimension
1. Cultural	1. Artistic/cultural relevance
	2. Cultural richness
	3. Creative embeddedness in the community/territory
2. Economic	4. Economic viability
	5. Economic growth and local prosperity
	6. Structural change
3. Social	7. Social cohesion and equity
	8. Participants fulfillment
	9. Engagement with social fabric
4. Environmental	10. Valorization and protection of the physical environment
	11. Responsible use of resources
	12. Environmental quality and biodiversity
5. Citizenship and Participation	13. Identity expression
	14. Civic participation
	15. Governance and quality of processes and policies

Source: <https://diycultureimpact.com>; Costa, 2022

is, 15 for each dimension). For some specific criteria, the indicators can be compared, but primarily they can be used to sustain self-reflexivity processes within user institutions, as regards the effort they make and the impacts they have on each of the dimensions/subdimensions presented (for more information, see Costa, 2022; Costa et al., 2022).

The impact assessment toolkit was used twice in SP. Firstly (while still under development and open to improvements), it was applied (in paper format) to the partners' teams present at one of the project's initial workshops (Zagreb, 2021). This exercise was important to enhance the self-reflexivity of each partner team, but also to contribute to the final tuning in the co-construction of the tool, the final version of which was then made available on the current online platform. Then at the end of the project, partner teams were again in-

The time restrictions for writing the book and concluding this text were incompatible with providing the final results of the evaluation and its analysis—activities are still underway in several tandem— and we opted instead to make them available through this link, which we invite the reader to follow.



## 5. Concluding Note

This chapter aimed to bring a panoramic reflection on the global impacts of the Stronger Peripheries project. As a starting point, we assumed that the assessment of the impacts of such a project would demand a time frame and a distance that are not easily compatible with the scope of a four-year project. However, the complexity and multidimensionality required by such a process could be grasped in several ways and this text sought to contribute to this kind of assessment in a less conventional and innovative way. Three complementary layers were used in this exercise: (i) a processual evaluation, centred on the implementation of SP activities, setting the analytical observations of the research team throughout the project against the factual data collected; (ii) a systematization of identifying the main challenges that participatory processes entail and that cultural agents will face when applying these processes in the future in similar international collaborative projects; and (iii) a multidimensional exploratory synthesis of the impacts of the project on the communities involved, through the lens of the diverse partners by means of self-assessment of the activities undertaken in their artistic tandems.

The reflection held at each of these levels is self-explanatory and it is not our objective to summarize the main results again here. We just wish to highlight its relevance for the formulation of public policies. A reflection on its potential to influence public policies and the action of policymakers (including those directly or indirectly connected to this project) is the subject of another text included in this book (Chapter 6.3—“Cultural Policies in the South: Implications for Territorial Policies”) and relates to one of the parallel objectives of the project. By the same token, this reflection on the project's impacts can also help to rethink participative processes from the southern peripheries, and to feed into an ongoing reflexivity of participant cultural institutions on their role in these processes and on their positionality as part of those “southern” cultural milieus and their specific challenges. Finally, it provides us with indications on how to rethink European cooperation projects on culture and on participatory practices, and in the ways different and specific practices and solutions can be woven to

## References

- Costa, P. (2022). Valuing culture and creativity impacts in a global technological era: reshaping the analytical framework. *European Planning Studies*, 30(9). pp.1656–1675. DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2021.2023109
- Costa, P., Tomaz, E., Perestrelo, M., Lopes, R. V. (2022). Acknowledging the multidimensionality of value creation in cultural activities: an impact self-assessment toolkit in Gato, M. A. e Guibentif, P. (coords). *Entre Transições: Retrospectivas—Transversalidades- Perspetivas*. Lisboa: DINÂMIA'CET-iscte. pp.148–163.
- Tomaz, E., Costa, P., Gato, M. A., Cruz, A. R., Perestrelo, M. (2020). Discussing impact assessment on creative tourism: A theoretical and analytical model. *DINÂMIA'CET Working Papers*. WP no. 2020/05.

