

Sabie, O.M., Purdescu, F. and Niță, E.M. (2025). Exploring the Dynamics of Public Service Co-Production: Drivers, Opportunities, Challenges and Case Insights in Cultural Domain. *Applied Research in Administrative Sciences*, 6(1), 34-45.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24818/ARAS/2025/6/1.03>

EXPLORING THE DYNAMICS OF PUBLIC SERVICE CO-PRODUCTION: DRIVERS, OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES AND CASE INSIGHTS IN CULTURAL DOMAIN

Oana Matilda, SABIE

PhD Associate Professor, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania
oana.sabie@amp.ase.ro

Florentina, PURDESCU

Deputy Director (Public Relations), "Grigore Antipa" National Museum of Natural History, Bucharest, Romania
florentinap@antipa.ro

Elena Maia, NIȚĂ

Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania
nitaelena@stud.ase.ro

Abstract:

The concept of co-production, also known as citizen or beneficiaries' participation in the delivery of public services, is not a new one, and it has been an established practice for quite some time. As users and institutions from public administration, as well as other types of organisations, work together to improve public services, this concept is gaining more and more recognition. This study aims to determine the key factors influencing the co-production of public services, main opportunities and challenges starting with investigation of specialized literature and continuing with concrete examples of co-production in cultural services provided by museums. The case insights studies presented explores the role of co-production in museums, particularly how involving visitors in the creation and delivery of services enhances diversity and improves quality. Drawing on real-world examples, theoretical frameworks, and scholarly research, this study highlights the benefits and challenges of co-production in general, and in the museum sector in particular.

Keywords: co-production, public services, beneficiaries' satisfaction, main drivers, museums.

JEL: H11, L97, O38.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24818/ARAS/2025/6/1.03>

INTRODUCTION

The co-production of public services by citizens has emerged as a significant issue in public administration, particularly due to ongoing fiscal constraints and technology advancements. Relatively few empirical research has been conducted throughout the years on citizens' actual co-production behaviours and attitudes as recorded in surveys, despite increasing theoretical interest in the issue. Overall, limited research has examined individual experiences of co-production, such as health checks for disease prevention and water or electronic billing, with comprehensive empirical studies on this subject being notably rare. The majority of research has concentrated on case studies, such as those by Alford (1998), Joshi and Moore (2004), Bovaird (2007), that examine the organisation and experiences associated with co-production.

This research examines contemporary trends in co-production studies and users' satisfaction, while exploring various conceptual frameworks. The conceptual paper delves into research on public administration-related co-production and the primary drivers propelling it forward.

This research aims to identify the main drivers of public services' co-production and if it has, according to the literature, any influence on users' satisfaction. For this purpose, the concept of public services' co-production was investigated, as well as its' main drivers (factors), opportunities and challenges, in relation to beneficiaries' satisfaction. Starting from the research aim, we establish the next three research questions:

What are the main drivers of public services' co-production?

What are the main opportunities for public services' co-production?

What are the current and future challenges for public services' co-production?

1. CO-PRODUCTION OF PUBLIC SERVICES AND BENEFICIARIES'S SATISFCTION

Co-production or citizen engagement in the provision of public services is not a novel notion; it has been practiced for some time. This notion is becoming more and more appreciated as institutions from local administrations, but not only, and citizens collaborate to strengthen public services. Citizen participation in the provision of public services enhances efficiency, effectiveness, and quality by using multiple perspectives and insights into community needs and expectations (Khine, Mi and Shahid, 2021).

The term co-production in the public sector originated from the study of Elinor Ostrom and her colleagues at a political theory and policy analysis workshop at Indiana University in the late 1970s. Co-production was described as the process whereby the production factors engaged to create a good or service are supplied by individuals outside the same organisation, or that co-production delineates the array of activities in which both public administration personnel and citizens participate in delivering public services. The former engages as professionals or "ordinary producers," whereas "citizen production" relies on the voluntary contributions of individuals and groups to enhance the quality and quantity of the services they use and need (Bovaird et al., 2017; Ostrom, 1996). Since the 1980s, several scholars and practitioners have investigated the concept of co-production and suggested it as an innovative paradigm for the design and delivery of public services. Bovaird (2007) reinforces Alford's (1998) assessment that the interest in co-production diminished in favour of marketing during the greatest period of the new public management era, subsequently reemerging in the mid-1990s. This concept's scope is expanding to include not only citizens but also non-profit organisations and businesses as collaborators with public administration in delivering public services and in their planning, design, management, monitoring, and evaluation (Bovaird, 2007). According to Pestoff (2012), co-production in public services refers to the active involvement of citizens in the design, management, delivery, and evaluation of services. This concept challenges the traditional top-down model of public service provision, encouraging a participatory approach that leverages the skills, knowledge, and resources of citizens. In the cultural sector, and especially in museums, co-production has gained traction as institutions seek to become more responsive, inclusive, and community-oriented. However, the extent and effectiveness of co-production are shaped by a variety of organizational, contextual, and relational factors.

Brudney and England (1983) made a notable contribution to the widespread acceptance of the co-production concept in public administration by synthesising two separate theoretical perspectives: a political viewpoint and an economic perspective. The political viewpoint of public administration regards co-production as a means for individuals, particularly beneficiaries, to engage in the development and delivery of public services. Whereas, the economic side of co-production captures, in particular, aspects related to the collaboration between the usual production and the consumption of public services. Consequently, drawing from these two contexts, Brudney and England (1993) explained co-production as a complex concept, characterised by a consistent producer-consumer relationship, situated within the framework of various co-production types. In other words, co-production is defined by the degree of overlap between two sets of participants: on the one hand,

ordinary producers (eg: public administration institutions, public services agencies, NGOs) and, on the other hand, consumers (eg: citizens, other stakeholders as legal entities) (Moon, 2018).

Researchers Oliver, Kothari, and Mays (2019) highlight concerns in this field, asserting that bridging the gap between science and society requires an approach centred on interaction and public involvement in the production of public services. Partnerships in the co-production process can occur with individuals, the tertiary sector, or organised groups. Citizen involvement in the delivering of public services and policy making is generally defined as co-production (Moon, 2018; Khine et al., 2021). Definitions of co-production exhibit variability among researchers, lacking a singular concept. However, many scholars reference Ostrom's (1996) definition, which highlights the contributions of individuals from various organisations to the production of goods (products) or services. In the same spirit, Verschuere et al. (2012) provide a straightforward definition of the co-production concept. They say it refers to the active participation of individuals or groups of citizens in delivering public services.

Brandsen and Honingh (2016) developed upon the concept introduced by Verschuere (2012) and his associates, providing a more comprehensive definition of co-production. They characterised it as a relationship between an organization's paid employee and groups or individuals of citizens, necessitating their direct and active participation in the organization's activities (Fledderus, Brandsen and Honingh; 2015). Consequently, knowledge co-production necessitates the integration of information from diverse sources to address prevalent concerns and foster a shared comprehension of the deficiencies in local public services (Armitage et al, 2011). As a result, those engaged in the knowledge co-production processes are regarded as active contributors rather than passive recipients. In educational institutions, outcomes are influenced not just by the efficacy of the teaching methodology, but also by the attitudes and behaviours of the students towards the entire educational process. If young people lack motivation in listening or doing assignments, their learning will be significantly constrained. The collaborative conduct of service users may encompass the acquiescence to limitations or penalties; for instance, enhancing community safety necessitates that residents adhere to speed limits and parking regulations, in addition to bearing the costs incurred by rule violations. Adherence to the coercive authority of the state may be regarded as a minimal degree of citizen engagement; however, it still exemplifies a form of citizen contribution to the public interest objectives pursued by this sector (Bovaird and Loeffler, 2013).

The concepts of co-production and co-creation are mostly employed separately in the academic literature to emphasise the various degrees of citizen participation and input in the delivery and progress of public services. Osborne, Radnor and Strokosch (2016) define co-production as the engagement of beneficiaries in the service delivery process, despite their lack of direct contribution to the initial service creation. Citizens play a role in the implementation of services, while the design and planning are typically the responsibility of authorities or service providers. Conversely, co-creation represents a more advanced stage, wherein beneficiaries engage in the implementation process by actively participating in the initial design of the service. Co-production refers to a collaborative effort focused on enhancing the operational performance and efficiency of an existing service, whereas co-creation is orientated towards innovation and structural change of those services (Brandsen and Honingh, 2016).

Co-production and co-creation happen when individuals engage actively in the provision of services. Brandsen et al. (2018) contend that both concepts pertain to citizen participation in public service delivery and are frequently used interchangeably. Consequently, co-production serves as the catalyst for the value co-creation process aimed at fulfilling customer requirements. The first phase of service production is associated with co-creation, whereas the subsequent phase of the service cycle is linked to co-production. According to Brandsen and Helderma (2012), there are three methods to characterise the link between the two terms: co-creation occurs in the stages of design and planning, whereas co-production occurs throughout service delivery. In contrast, co-creation

concentrates on cooperative design and issue resolution, co-production stresses active involvement in service execution. Through user involvement, co-production seeks to increase the efficacy of services, while co-creation seeks to create services that better serve community needs.

The various methods of defining concepts highlight the distinct roles and degrees of involvement that citizens possess in the creation and provision of public services (Khine et al., 2021).

In Table 1 are some practical examples that illustrate how co-creation differs from co-production:

Table 1. Real life examples of co-production and co-creation

Type of process	Examples	Sources
Co-production	Volunteers who assist in the distribution of health information materials or those who participate in vaccination drives are examples of persons who engage in public health initiatives.	Parrado et al., 2013;
	Collaborating with law enforcement to monitor communities and report suspicious activities is known as community policing.	Brandsen and Honingh, 2015; Loeffler and Bovaird, 2016
	Support for education includes parents interacting with instructors, offering homework assistance, and registering their kids for learning-enhancing school activities.	Loeffler and Bovaird, 2016
Co-creation	Urban planning is the process by which people of the community collaborate with local government representatives to create parks and community centres that serve local needs.	Bovaird, 2007
	Healthcare innovation is the process by which patients and healthcare providers work together to create new treatment plans or apps that are suited to certain patient populations.	Loeffler and Bovaird, 2016

All these instances support the concept that co-production seeks to implement and sustain current services while co-creation emphasises jointly designing and producing innovative ways to address local needs.

There are a wide variety of activities that may be categorized under the umbrella of co-production's notion, and we are able to differentiate between them in the context of public services. Lindenmeier et al. (2019) analyzes the influence of co-production on the beneficiaries' satisfaction of public service organizations, within a case study in day care centers from Germany. The study, based on a parents' survey, examines the impact of economic, political and social participation, considering the role of mediating variables such as information level, value congruence between the individual and the organization, and perceived structural quality.

The mediation analysis results reveal significant positive indirect effects of political and social co-production on beneficiary satisfaction, whereas economic co-production does not show a significant impact on customer satisfaction. The authors highlight that co-production is a significant concept for both public service organisations and for-profit service companies (Alford, 2016). Nevertheless, the strategic ramifications of the prevailing service logic cannot be entirely implemented in the public sector, owing to sector-specific factors, including the presence of client categories who engage involuntarily or under compulsion (e.g., prisoners), the heterogeneity of stakeholders with potentially conflicting needs and objectives, and scenarios where a pronounced degree of client loyalty is viewed as an adverse outcome (e.g., the recurrent return of homeless individuals to communal shelters) (Osborne et al., 2016; Lindenmeier et al., 2019).

2. MAIN DRIVERS OF PUBLIC SERVICES CO-PRODUCTION

Voorberg et al. (2015) identified three influencing factors in the co-production process of public

services: factors affecting actors/stakeholders, factors impacting the process, and factors related to co-production. The key elements influencing the actors in co-production are predominantly the facilitating conditions that underpin this partnership. Among these factors we can observe: the level of compatibility between public organisations and citizens, the presence of explicit incentives to promote co-production, a receptive attitude towards citizen involvement in public service provision, the readiness of civil servants to delegate trust in participative management, and the inclination to mitigate risks by both the organisation and the citizens. Thus, citizens' participation in co-production depends on the existence of these favorable conditions. With the exception of risk aversion, most of the influencing factors target citizens, as the concept is based on a citizen-centric approach. However, studies examining the impact on service providers are limited, suggesting a future research direction focused on this aspect (Voorberg et. al., 2015; Khine et. al., 2021).

The co-production process is influenced by a number of factors, including awareness, beneficiaries' active participation, the mindset of political leaders and civil servants, public preferences, and conflicts between suppliers and consumers. The influences are primarily behavioural, yet institutional effects are frequently overlooked in co-production research. Relevant issues include the state of politics, how it affects consumer views, and whether co-production succeeds or fails based on user attributions (Khine et. al., 2021, pp.8-9).

In the cultural sector, particularly within museums, co-production has gained popularity as institutions strive to be more responsive, inclusive, and community-focused. The scope and efficacy of co-production are influenced by several organisational, contextual, and relational aspects. Among the main drivers influencing co-production in museums and other public services, we can find: institutional and organizational factors, motivational and relational dynamics of both service users and providers, but also contextual and external influences.

Institutional and organizational factors: museums operate within institutional frameworks that significantly shape their capacity for co-production. Governance structures, funding mechanisms, and bureaucratic traditions can either facilitate or hinder participatory practices. For instance, museums with rigid hierarchical structures and limited discretionary power may find it challenging to implement co-production initiatives (Brandsen & Honingh, 2016). In contrast, institutions with a strong orientation toward community engagement and decentralized decision-making are more conducive to participatory innovation (Osborne, 2018). Moreover, financial resources and staff capacity are crucial. Co-production often requires sustained investment in relationship-building, training, and evaluation. Underfunded museums may lack the means to support these processes, limiting the scope of citizen involvement (Jancovich, 2015). Organizational culture also plays a vital role; museums with inclusive, risk-tolerant cultures are more likely to embrace co-production, even when it challenges conventional practices.

Motivational and relational dynamics: the willingness of both service users and providers to engage in co-production is shaped by motivational factors, including perceived benefits, trust, and shared values. Museums must cultivate relationships with their communities based on mutual respect and recognition of diverse forms of expertise. Research shows that when citizens feel their contributions are valued and impactful, they are more likely to participate meaningfully (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012).

Trust is particularly important in museums that have historically excluded certain groups. Efforts to include marginalized voices must address past injustices and power imbalances. Co-production in this context becomes not only a method of service delivery but also a process of social justice and reconciliation (Jancovich, 2017).

Contextual and external influences: the broader social, political, and technological context also influences co-production. Political support for participatory governance, as well as policies promoting citizen engagement, can create enabling environments for co-production (Voorberg, Bekkers, & Tummers, 2015). Additionally, digital technologies have expanded opportunities for

engagement, allowing museums to collaborate with users online through crowdsourcing, digital storytelling, and virtual exhibitions.

However, contextual factors can also constrain participation. Social inequalities, language barriers, and lack of digital access may exclude some individuals from co-production opportunities (Simon, 2010). Thus, museums must adopt inclusive strategies that recognize and mitigate these structural barriers.

Co-production in museums and public services is a complex, multi-dimensional process influenced by organizational characteristics, motivational dynamics, and contextual factors. While the potential benefits of co-production—such as increased legitimacy, innovation, and social inclusion—are well-documented, realizing these outcomes requires sustained commitment and careful attention to the enabling conditions. Museums seeking to deepen public engagement through co-production must not only redesign their internal processes but also actively address the broader social and political forces that shape participation.

3. OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR CO-PRODUCTION AS A DRIVER OF BENEFICIARIES' SATISFACTION

Co-production involves collaboration between citizens and public administration authorities in the process of designing, providing and evaluating public services, having the potential to improve their quality, efficiency and performance. Still, this approach presents challenges as well as opportunities.

Popescu (2020) identifies the advantages of co-production as enhanced efficiency, superior service quality, transparency, accountability, and innovation. Citizen participation in the decision-making process, for instance, helps to provide priority to the genuine needs of the community and to raise users' satisfaction (Sandu, 2018). Active involvement also improves the responsibility and transparency of public administration institutions, hence fostering confidence in them (Dobrescu, 2021). In the cultural sector, especially museums, co-production presents a valuable opportunity to improve visitor satisfaction by engaging audiences more directly in the design and implementation of services (Boyle and Harris, 2009; Popescu, Corboș and Bunea, 2018). The ability to better match services to visitor expectations is one of the main advantages of co-production in museums. Museums may produce more individualised and relevant experiences by including audiences in artistic choices, educational programs, and exhibition design (Simon, 2010). Higher levels of satisfaction among museum visitors have been associated with this participatory approach's increased emotional engagement and sense of ownership (Holdgaard and Klasttrup, 2014).

Furthermore, co-production helps museums increase their societal significance. Museums may become more inclusive via collaborative efforts with various groups, attracting visitors who would otherwise feel excluded or disinterested. Jointly organised exhibitions with local communities, for example, frequently improve the displays' resonance and authenticity, which raises viewer pleasure via cultural representation (Bonet and Négrier, 2018).

Additionally, digital technologies provide up new co-production possibilities. Even outside of in-person visits, museums may maintain visitor engagement through the use of virtual co-curation, crowdsourced material, and interactive feedback systems (Russo et al., 2008; Bunea et al., 2024). Versatile services that prove more sensitive to the needs and expectations of visitors are supported by this constant dialogue.

Nonetheless, whereas the notion offers distinctive prospects for responsiveness and participation, it also poses obstacles concerning resource allocation, institutional resilience, and inclusion. A study by Ionescu (2022) revealed a notable set of challenges, such as: the absence of digital skills among authorities and citizens, limited financial resources, aversion to change, and coordination problems.

For example, the necessary investments in infrastructure and technology can put pressure on institutional budgets, and the coordination of different stakeholders can be complicated (Marin, 2019). Authorities must handle these challenges by developing explicit plans for public involvement, enhancing digital competencies, and fostering an organisational culture supporting innovation and cooperation (Popescu, 2020; Dobrescu, 2021).

Co-production in museums has challenges despite its benefits. Institutions' resistance to changes is a major obstacle. Participatory methods may be difficult to implement in traditional museum institutions, which are frequently defined by expert authority and hierarchical decision-making (Scott, 2013). Genuine co-productive results may be limited by staff members' lack of training or desire to share power with guests. Moreover, co-production procedures may need a lot of resources. Not all institutions, particularly smaller or underfunded museums, have the time, resources, and logistical preparation necessary to truly engage diverse audiences. Co-production projects have the potential to become superficial if improperly handled, which would erode trust and decrease rather than increase pleasure (Jancovich, 2017).

Another problem is making sure everyone feels welcome. Co-production is meant to give users more power, but it tends to attract people who are already involved in culture and society. This could make it harder for some people to access cultural activities (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012). Making sure that many people's views are heard and taken into account when decisions are being made is still a problem.

Co-production is a great way to make museum visitors happier by making things more personalised, open to everyone, and interactive. But for it to reach its full potential, big problems like organisational delay, limited resources, and issues of fair representation must be solved. Building institutions' co-production skills, creating frameworks for real involvement, and investing in ways to make things more accessible should be the main goals of future work. When done right, co-production not only makes visitors happier, but it also changes museums into 21st-century places where people work together and care about the community.

4. CASE INSIGHTS. CO-PRODUCTION IN MUSEUMS: ENHANCING SERVICE DIVERSITY AND QUALITY THROUGH VISITOR ENGAGEMENT

Museums have long been considered spaces of education, preservation, and cultural representation. However, traditional top-down approaches to museum management are increasingly being replaced or supplemented by participatory models that emphasize co-production. Co-production refers to the collaborative process where service providers and users (in this case, museums and visitors) work together to create value (Brandsen and Honingh, 2016). This model challenges the notion of the passive visitor and encourages active engagement, resulting in more inclusive, dynamic, and responsive institutions. This case study explores how visitor co-production enhances diversity and quality in museum services, focusing on strategies implemented by leading institutions, outcomes observed, and lessons learned.

The Concept of Co-Production in Museums. Co-production in the museum context can include a variety of practices, from collaborative exhibition planning to user-generated content and community-curated programs. It is rooted in theories of public service innovation and user-centered design, asserting that end-users possess unique knowledge and skills that can enrich institutional outputs (Voorberg, Bekkers and Tummers, 2015). When museums integrate visitors into the design and delivery of services, they not only democratize cultural production but also increase relevance to broader and more diverse audiences (Simon, 2010).

Case Study: The Museum of Liverpool. One prominent example of co-production in action is the Museum of Liverpool. Opened in 2011, the museum was conceived as a space for and by the

people of Liverpool. From the outset, it engaged local communities in curatorial decisions. This included consultation workshops with local heritage groups, co-curated galleries, and oral history projects that integrated personal narratives into exhibitions (Silverman, 2010). The gallery "The People's Republic," for example, features community-driven displays reflecting the multicultural and working-class history of the city.

The Museum of Liverpool's approach had several benefits. First, it ensured that the museum reflected the lived experiences of its diverse audiences, enhancing cultural representation. Second, it fostered a sense of ownership among visitors, increasing engagement and repeat visitation (Newman, McLean and Urquhart, 2005). The process also enhanced institutional learning, as museum professionals gained insight into new narratives and ways of interpretation.

Digital Co-Production: The Rijksmuseum's Rijksstudio. In the digital realm, the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam has become a global leader in visitor co-production. The launch of the Rijksstudio platform in 2012 allowed users to access, remix, and create artworks using high-resolution images from the museum's collection (Alexandrou, 2020). This platform exemplifies digital co-creation, enabling users to design their own products, share their creations, and engage with art in deeply personal ways.

This strategy democratized access to the museum's holdings and tapped into the creative potential of the public. The diversity of outputs—from fashion designs to educational materials—highlighted how co-production can foster both cultural innovation and inclusivity. Moreover, the museum's openness attracted new audiences, particularly younger and digitally savvy users (Russo et al., 2008).

Case Insights: The "Grigore Antipa" National Museum of Natural History in Bucharest. The Antipa Museum, renowned for its extensive natural history collections, has embraced co-production to enhance visitor satisfaction and accessibility. Some of the more known co-production initiatives at the Grigore Antipa Museum are:

Interactive Exhibits: "Touch My Hair" AR App. Recognizing the natural inclination of visitors to engage physically with exhibits, the museum introduced the "Touch My Hair" augmented reality (AR) application. Developed in collaboration with the Augmented Space Agency, this app allows visitors to interact with replicas of museum items through AR technology, providing a tactile experience without compromising the preservation of original artifacts (Fodor, 2023). This initiative exemplifies co-production by integrating visitor feedback into exhibit design, enhancing engagement and satisfaction.

Inclusive Programs: "Descoperă/ Discover" Workshops and "Orele Liniștite/ Quiet Hours". The museum has implemented programs aimed at inclusivity, such as the "Descoperă" (Discover) workshops tailored for children and young people with special educational needs. In 2023, these workshops saw participation from 445 individuals, doubling the attendance from the previous year. Additionally, the "Orele Liniștite" (Quiet Hours) initiative provided a sensory-friendly environment for 1139 visitors with disabilities to explore the permanent exhibition of the Antipa Museum and the live exotic butterflies exhibition, demonstrating the museum's commitment to accessible and co-produced experiences (Muzeul Antipa, 2023).

Community Engagement: "MyAntipa" Project. The "MyAntipa" project represents a collaborative effort between the museum, cultural figures, and the public to create interdisciplinary educational experiences. Activities include guided tours led by cultural personalities, reading incubators for children, and public debates with museum scientists. This project fosters a sense of ownership and personal connection among visitors, aligning with co-production principles (Rador, 2019).

These co-production initiatives have contributed to increased visitor satisfaction by creating more personalized, engaging, and accessible experiences. Interactive technologies like the AR app cater

to diverse learning styles, while inclusive programs ensure that a broader audience can participate in museum offerings. Community engagement projects like "MyAntipa" deepen the relationship between the museum and its visitors, fostering a collaborative cultural environment. The Antipa Museum's adoption of co-production practices illustrates the potential of collaborative approaches to enhance visitor satisfaction and inclusivity. By integrating interactive technologies, inclusive programming, and community engagement, the museum has created a more dynamic and responsive cultural institution. Continued investment in co-production strategies, along with addressing associated challenges, can further strengthen the museum's role as a participatory public service.

Benefits of co-production for the case insights. Co-production offers numerous benefits to museums. First, it enhances **diversity** by allowing underrepresented groups to voice their perspectives and shape narratives. This is particularly important in decolonizing museum spaces and addressing historical imbalances in representation (Lynch, 2011). Second, it contributes to **service quality**, as services are more closely aligned with the actual needs and preferences of users (Osborne, Radnor and Strokosch, 2016).

Furthermore, co-production fosters **social inclusion**, enabling marginalized communities to participate in cultural discourse. It also improves **sustainability** by building stronger community ties and shared responsibility for institutional success.

Challenges and considerations for the case insights. Despite its benefits, co-production is not without challenges. It requires a cultural shift within institutions, which may resist relinquishing control. It also demands resources—time, staff training, and funding—to support meaningful participation (Bovaird and Loeffler, 2012). Moreover, inclusivity must be actively managed to avoid reinforcing existing power structures through tokenistic engagement.

Clear frameworks, transparency in decision-making, and ongoing dialogue are essential to ensure that co-production efforts are equitable and impactful.

In the end it can be said that co-production of museum services by visitors represents a transformative approach to cultural engagement. As shown by the Museum of Liverpool, the Antipa Museum and the Rijksmuseum, such practices enhance the diversity and quality of museum offerings by integrating community knowledge and creativity. While challenges remain, the potential benefits in terms of inclusivity, innovation, and relevance are substantial. Museums willing to embrace this collaborative model can become more responsive, resilient, and representative institutions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study adds to the knowledge of the co-production complexity in the public sector by offering an insightful image of the elements affecting beneficiary satisfaction and by highlighting basic distinctions between the public and private sectors in terms of applying service logic.

Our literature review indicates that the principal factors influencing co-production include (1) the establishment of reliable or long-term relationships among stakeholders, (2) the engagement of active users, (3) the availability of contributions and resources, (4) the introduction of new settings, (5) the implementation of new technologies, (6) the dissemination of knowledge, and (7) the facilitation of information flow.

In general, studies indicate that greater satisfaction is linked to citizen and other beneficiaries' participation in the co-production of public utility services. Direct involvement lets people believe they have a voice in how services are provided, hence influencing more favourable views and more

confidence in the suppliers of such services (Thomas, 2017; Agger and Lund, 2017; Nabatchi, Sancino and Sicilia, 2017).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The paper has been prepared under the institutional research project with the title: “*Studiu privind percepția stakeholderilor asupra calității și performanței serviciilor publice*” (“*Study on stakeholders' perception of public services' quality and performance*”), 2024, financed by the Bucharest University of Economic Studies, and is part of the research strategy of the HRM METAVERSE CENTER.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

The author/authors listed have made a substantial, direct and intellectual contribution to the work, and approved it for publication.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Agger, A. & Lund, D. H. (2017). Collaborative innovation in the public sector: New perspectives on the role of citizens?. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 21(3), 17-37.
- Alexandrou, E. (2020). Digital Strategy in Museums: A case study of The Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Accessed online on November 22, 2024 at <https://core.ac.uk/reader/328007050>
- Alford, J. (1998). A public management road less travelled: Clients as co-producers of public services. *Australian journal of public administration*, 57(4), 128-137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.1998.tb01568.x>
- Alford, J. (2016). Co-production, interdependence and publicness: Extending public service-dominant logic. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 673-691. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111659>
- Armitage, D., Berkes, F., Dale, A., Kocho-Schellenberg, E. & Patton, E. (2011). Co-management and the co-production of knowledge: Learning to adapt in Canada's Arctic. *Global environmental change*, 21(3), 995-1004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.04.006>
- Bonet, L. & Négrier, E. (2018). The participative turn in cultural policy: Paradigms, models, contexts. *Poetics*, 66, 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2017.12.004>
- Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community coproduction of public services. *Public administration review*, 67(5), 846-860. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00773.x>
- Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (2012). From engagement to co-production: The contribution of users and communities to outcomes and public value. *Voluntas: international journal of voluntary and nonprofit organizations*, 23, 1119-1138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9309-6>
- Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (2013). We're all in this together: harnessing user and community co-production of public outcomes. *Birmingham: Institute of Local Government Studies: University of Birmingham*, 1(2013), 15. Accessed online <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/government-society/inlogov/publications/2013/chapter-4-bovaird-loeffler.pdf>, on October 20, 2024
- Bovaird, T., Flemig, S., Loeffler, E., & Osborne, S. P. (2017). Debate: Co-production of public services and outcomes. *Public Money & Management*, 37(5), 363-364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2017.1294866>
- Boyle, D. & Harris, M. (2009). The Challenge of Co-production: How equal partnerships between professionals and the public are crucial to improving public services. *London: new economics foundation*, 56(18). NESTA
- Brandsen, T. & Honingh, M. (2016). Distinguishing different types of coproduction: A conceptual analysis based on the classical definitions. *Public administration review*, 76(3), 427-435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12465>
- Brandsen, T. & Honingh, M. (2018). Definitions of co-production and co-creation. In *Co-production and co-creation. Engaging Citizens in Public Services* (pp. 9-17). Routledge Critical Studies in Public Management, edited by Taco Brandsen, Trui Steen and Bram Verschuere, Taylor & Francis Group, New York, accessed online at <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/25001/%209781138%20700116text.pdf;jsessionid=%20A931599BAD8961%20D9729E2E9F560C%2088B5?sequence=1#page=23>, October 20, 2024
- Brudney, J. L. & England, R. E. (1983). Toward a definition of the coproduction concept. *Public administration review*, 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/975300>

- Bunea O.I., Popescu, R.I., Sabie, O.M. & Corboș, R.A. (2024). Digital Engagement and Its Impact on Museum Visitation: An Analysis of Social Media and Online Presence. *Journal of Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies and Research*, 58(4), 91-108.
- Dobrescu, M. (2021). *Transparență și responsabilitate în sectorul public*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară.
- Fledderus, J., Brandsen, T. & Honingh, M. E. (2015). User co-production of public service delivery: An uncertainty approach. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30(2), 145-164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076715572362>
- Fodor, S. (2023, November 23). Natural History Museum in Bucharest: AR app allows interactive visiting experience. *Romania Insider*. Accessed online on October 26, 2024 at <https://www.romania-insider.com/antipa-museum-ar-app-nov-2023>
- Holdgaard, N. & Klasturp, L. (2014). Between control and creativity: Challenging co-creation and social media use in a museum context. *Digital Creativity*, 25(3), 190-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14626268.2014.904364>
- Ionescu, A. (2022). *Provocările digitale în administrația publică*, Timișoara: Editura Eurostampa
- Jancovich, L. (2015). *Breaking down the fourth wall in arts management: The implications of co-creation for arts organizations*. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 17(3), 33-45.
- Jancovich, L. (2017). The participation myth. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(1), 107-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1027698>
- Joshi, A., & Moore, M. (2004). Institutionalised co-production: unorthodox public service delivery in challenging environments. *Journal of development studies*, 40(4), 31-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220380410001673184>
- Lindenmeier, J., Seemann, A. K., Potluka, O. & von Schnurbein, G. (2021). Co-production as a driver of client satisfaction with public service organizations: an analysis of German day-care centres. *Public management review*, 23(2), 210-232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1674366>
- Loeffler, E. & Bovaird, T. (2016). User and community co-production of public services: What does the evidence tell us?. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(13), 1006-1019. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1250559>
- Lynch, B. (2011). *Whose Cake is it Anyway?: A Collaborative Investigation Into Engagement and Participation in 12 Museums and Galleries in the UK*. Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- Khine, P. K., Mi, J. & Shahid, R. (2021). A comparative analysis of co-production in public services. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6730. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126730>
- Marin, D. (2019). *Managementul parteneriatelor public-private*, Constanța: Editura Lumen.
- Moon, M. J. (2018). Evolution of co-production in the information age: Crowdsourcing as a model of web-based co-production in Korea. *Policy and Society*, 37(3), 294-309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2017.1376475>
- Muzeul Antipa. (2023). Muzeul Antipa în anul 2023. Accessed online on October 26, 2024 at <https://antipa.ro/product/muzeul-antipa-in-anul-2023/>
- Nabatchi, T., Sancino, A. & Sicilia, M. (2017). Varieties of participation in public services: The who, when, and what of coproduction. *Public administration review*, 77(5), 766-776. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12765>
- Newman, A., McLean, F. & Urquhart, G. (2005). Museums and the active citizen: Tackling the problems of social exclusion. *Citizenship Studies*, 9(1), 41-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102042000325351>
- Oliver, K., Kothari, A. & Mays, N. (2019). The dark side of coproduction: do the costs outweigh the benefits for health research?. *Health research policy and systems*, 17, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-019-0432-3>
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z. & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-production and the co-creation of value in public services: a suitable case for treatment?. *Public management review*, 18(5), 639-653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111927>
- Osborne, S. P. (2018). From public service-dominant logic to public service logic: are public service organizations capable of co-production and value co-creation?. *Public management review*, 20(2), 225-231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1350461>
- Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: Coproduction, synergy, and development. *World development*, 24(6), 1073-1087. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(96\)00023-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(96)00023-X)
- Parrado, S., Van Ryzin, G. G., Bovaird, T. & Löffler, E. (2013). Correlates of co-production: Evidence from a five-nation survey of citizens. *International Public Management Journal*, 16(1), 85-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2013.796260>
- Pestoff, V. (2013). Co-production and third sector social services in Europe: some crucial conceptual issues. In *New public governance, the third sector, and co-production* (pp. 13-34). Routledge.
- Popescu, A. I. (2020). Long-term city innovation trajectories and quality of urban life. *Sustainability*, 12(24), 10587. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410587>
- Popescu, R.I., Corboș, R.A. & Bunea, O.I. (2018). Selling cultural organizations – a case study on client's perception of the cultural activity of Calea Victoriei Foundation. *Administration and Public Management Review*, 31, 81-96.
- Rador. (2019, June 27). Muzeul Național de Istorie Naturală „Grigore Antipa” lansează proiectul “MyAntipa”. *Agenția de presă Rador*. Accessed online on October 26, 2024 at <https://www.rador.ro/2019/06/27/muzeul-national-de-istorie-naturala-grigore-antipa-lanseaza-proiectul-myantipa/>

- Russo, A., Watkins, J., Kelly, L. & Chan, S. (2008). Participatory communication with social media. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 51(1), 21-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2008.tb00292.x>
- Sandu, C. (2018). *Participarea cetățenilor în procesul decizional*, Iași: Polirom.
- Scott, C. A. (Ed.). (2016). *Museums and public value: creating sustainable futures*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York.
- Silverman, L. H. (2010). *The social work of museums*. Routledge, New York.
- Simon, N. (2010). *The participatory museum*. Published by Museum 2.0. Santa Cruz, California, USA
- Thomas, J. C. (2017). *Citizen, customer, partner: Engaging the public in public management*. Routledge, New York.
- Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T. & Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production: The state of the art in research and the future agenda. *Voluntas: international journal of voluntary and nonprofit organizations*, 23, 1083-1101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9307-8>
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public management review*, 17(9), 1333-1357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.930505>