Pisco Med Publishing

Human Resources Management and Services 2026, 8(4), 6847
https://doi.org/10.18282/hrms6847

Conceptual Article

Human Capital in the Creative Industries and a Competency Model for Performing Arts Producers

Serhii Matiash*

* Department of Performing Arts and Culture, Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, Kyiv, Ukraine

***Corresponding author:** Serhii Matiash, svmatyash@gmail.com

CITATION

Matiash S. (2026). Human capital in the creative industries and a competency model for performing arts producers. Human Resources Management and Services. 8(4): 6847. https://doi.org/10.18282/hrms6847

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Human Resources Management and Services* is published by Piscomed Publishing Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Abstract: This article proposes a conceptual competency model for performing arts producers that explains their role in forming, coordinating, and developing the human capital of creative teams. The research problem concerns the limitations of individual lists of producer skills in explaining how diverse professional knowledge becomes a team's capacity to deliver a cultural project. The methodological framework combines research on human capital, project-based organizing, and team learning through theoretical synthesis. The article distinguishes individual human capital, team human capital resources, the social capital of professional networks, and the organizational conditions of collaboration. The model comprises six interconnected competency domains: industry-specific, managerial, creative, interpersonal and communication, digital, and adaptive competencies. Their relationships with team outcomes are explained through the selection of complementary team members, role alignment, knowledge sharing, psychological safety, and organizational reflection. The article formulates theoretical propositions for future empirical testing and proposes behavioral indicators and applications in education and creative team management. It also considers the ethical limits of a resource-based approach and the model's application under organizational instability. The contribution lies in linking producers' individual competencies, mechanisms of team interaction, and creative project outcomes. The model is a theoretical proposal; its structure, indicators, and anticipated relationships require further validation.

Keywords: project-based organizing; collective capability; knowledge sharing; team learning; role coordination; professional development.

1. Introduction

Producing performing arts combines artistic decision-making with the organization of collaborative work. A theatrical production, performance, or interdisciplinary event emerges through interaction among performers, directors, playwrights, designers, technical specialists, communications staff, and partner institutions. Recruiting qualified participants is insufficient to realize an artistic concept: their contributions must be aligned, information must be shared, and conditions must enable each person's professional capabilities to support the collective outcome. This requirement defines the problem addressed in the article. A list of producer skills describes individual potential but does not, by itself, explain how that potential affects a creative team's capacity. A producer may understand budgeting, maintain an extensive network, and grasp the artistic concept, yet the team may remain poorly coordinated if participants lack clear roles, timely feedback, or opportunities to report problems. It is therefore necessary to identify the intervening mechanisms linking individual competencies to team outcomes. Human capital provides a framework for examining knowledge, skills, and experience as foundations of productive

activity. Applying this concept to the arts nevertheless requires care. Artistic value, creative autonomy, and the right to decent working conditions cannot be reduced to economic returns. In this article, a resource-based approach explains the organization of professional collaboration, while outcome assessment encompasses artistic, organizational, learning, and social dimensions.

The study aims to develop a conceptual competency model for performing arts producers and explain the mechanisms connecting it to the formation and development of creative teams' human capital. The research question is: through which practices do producer competencies help transform participants' individual professional capabilities into a team's capacity to deliver a creative project? The study examines human capital in project-based activity within the creative industries, focusing on producer competencies and the mechanisms through which they are enacted in creative team management. The term performing arts refers here to practices in which live enactment and the event itself are central to the artistic outcome. The scope includes theatre, dance, staged musical work, and interdisciplinary projects, including digitally mediated formats. Extending the conclusions to other creative industries requires separate justification.

1.1. Theoretical foundations

1.1.1. Individual human capital and team human capital resources

In Becker's (1993) foundational work, human capital is associated with investment in education, learning, and professional training. For the study of producers, this directs attention to acquired experience, specialized knowledge, and the ability to apply them in practice. This perspective helps explain why learning and practice have lasting professional significance even when a particular creative project is temporary.

Individual qualifications and team capacity, however, belong to different levels of analysis. Ployhart et al. (2014) conceptualize human capital resources as individual or collective capacities grounded in people's knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics and available for the purposes of the relevant organizational unit. The proposed model relies on distinguishing a participant's potential from the capacity to draw on it in collaborative work.

For example, a lighting designer's expertise constitutes individual human capital. The team's capacity to draw on that expertise together with the knowledge of the director, performers, and technical staff is a team human capital resource. Realizing a particular staging decision is a possible outcome of using that resource. The producer's role is examined here through the practices that connect these levels.

Barney's (1991) resource-based theory provides a general framework for analyzing the strategic significance of organizational resources. In creative projects, it can be applied to distinctive combinations of experience, collaborative practices, and organizational decisions. Competition and commercial advantage cannot be the only criteria, however: a cultural institution's public mission or the experimental nature of an artistic work may imply different objectives.

Ray et al.'s (2023) review of 194 articles synthesizes research on types of human capital resources, their emergence, and their relationships with higher-level organizational outcomes. It helps situate the producer model within contemporary debates about collective capacity. The research question therefore concerns both the presence of competencies and the conditions under which they become available for shared tasks.

Zhang et al. (2023) identify problems in defining and measuring human capital resources: existing measures often capture only part of the construct or combine it with other characteristics. This caution informs the proposed model. Producer competencies, team psychological safety, and project outcomes should

be assessed separately. Combining them in an overall "human capital" score would blur the explanation and could create a misleading impression of an established relationship.

Ployhart (2021) argues for specifying the performance behaviors and outcomes that a resource-based approach seeks to explain. For performing arts projects, this means defining objectives in advance, such as artistic experimentation, access to cultural events, organizational reliability, or financial viability. The same competency profile may have different implications under different objectives. Accordingly, the proposed model does not establish a universal criterion of success.

1.1.2. Project-based organization of creative work

In their study of filmmaking, DeFillippi and Arthur (1998) highlight the importance of human and social capital embodied in participants' careers and mobilized through professional communities. Their work raises the question of where knowledge resides when an organization is established for a single project. This question also applies to temporary performing arts teams, although differences between film and stage practices preclude transferring all findings automatically.

Within the proposed model, project completion is both an organizational event and an opportunity for learning. Dissolving a team does not necessarily mean losing accumulated experience: it may persist in professional biographies, documentation, and subsequent collaborative practices. Knowledge retention nevertheless requires deliberate action. If discussions, technical solutions, and the causes of errors remain undocumented, a new team may have to repeat work already undertaken.

The producer's role therefore includes organizing the transfer of experience between projects. This may involve a debriefing, an archive of production materials, an agreed account of lessons learned, or mentoring for new participants. Access to these materials must respect authors' rights and agreements with the team. Retaining knowledge does not imply an institution's unconditional appropriation of individual creative work.

Proskurina and Nikitina (2023) examine producing in creative project management, including producers' responsibilities and professional competencies. Their sector-specific account helps identify artistic, organizational, and staffing tasks. The present framework adds an explicit explanatory link: it asks how competencies are enacted through role coordination, knowledge sharing, feedback, and learning so that participants' expertise becomes available for collective work. Its incremental contribution is therefore a proposed mechanism connecting a producer role description to team human capital resources and project outcomes. These mechanisms are theoretical expectations, not relationships already validated in performing arts teams.

1.1.3. Professional networks and conditions for team learning

Social capital must be distinguished from interpersonal and communication competencies. A competency denotes the ability to negotiate, listen, explain, and reconcile positions. Social capital concerns resources accessible through relationships among people and organizations. Granovetter (1973) demonstrates the importance of network structure in connecting different social settings. In producing, this raises questions about access to new partners and professional opportunities.

Having contacts guarantees neither fair team selection nor effective collaboration. A closed network may reproduce familiar team compositions and restrict newcomers' access. The proposed model therefore treats professional connections as a contextual resource, while transparent selection and the ability

to coordinate diverse participants belong to the producer's competencies.

Research on psychological safety provides another theoretical foundation. Edmondson (1999) examines a team's shared belief about taking interpersonal risks as a factor in team learning. Edmondson and Bransby's (2023) review connects this research field to task accomplishment, learning, employees' work experiences, and leadership. This article uses psychological safety as a possible condition for reporting errors and discussing difficult decisions within creative teams.

Applying this perspective to rehearsals remains a theoretical assumption. The model proposes that opportunities to express doubt without humiliation help reveal organizational and creative problems earlier. Psychological safety does not remove expectations concerning performance quality and accountability. Producers should support discussion while maintaining clear decision-making procedures.

Abi Saad and Agogué's (2023) review integrates research on team creativity and virtual work, highlighting processes and contextual conditions. It brings hybrid creative project organization into focus: participants may develop a concept remotely but perform together at a venue. The proposed model assumes that producers need to coordinate these modes, considering the nature of the knowledge involved, the need for direct interaction, and access to technology.

2. Materials and methods

This conceptual article uses theoretical synthesis with elements of model development. Jaakkola (2020) emphasizes the need for a clear design and an explanation of the roles assigned to selected theories in conceptual research. Accordingly, human capital theory identifies the resource of professional capabilities; research on project-based organizing explains team temporariness and experience transfer; and the team learning perspective helps identify mechanisms for putting knowledge into collective practice.

The study draws on a purposively selected body of foundational works and research and reviews published in 2021–2026 on human capital, teamwork, creative industries, and technological change. The sector publication on the INSPIRE project serves as a practical source concerning performing arts production needs; its status differs from that of peer-reviewed research. Inclusion criteria are direct relevance to the research question, the capacity to distinguish individual and team levels, and usefulness in explaining the organization of creative collaboration. The study is not a systematic review, does not claim exhaustive coverage, and includes no empirical testing. Bibliographic information has been checked against accessible publishers' pages; the argument does not rely on inaccessible findings or unverified quantitative estimates.

The analytical procedure first distinguished individual professional capabilities from collective resources and outcomes, drawing on Ployhart et al. (2014), Ray et al. (2023), and Zhang et al. (2023). It then related producers' functional tasks, discussed by Proskurina and Nikitina (2023), to problems of organizing temporary creative work (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1998). Tasks were grouped according to the principal decision they require: identifying production requirements; organizing interdependent work; developing artistic possibilities; enabling mutual understanding; organizing technology-mediated information; and responding when established arrangements no longer fit conditions. These groups became the industry-specific, managerial, creative, interpersonal and communication, digital, and adaptive domains, respectively.

The six-domain classification is the author's functional synthesis, not a taxonomy reproduced from one source or derived through systematic coding. Team learning research (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson and Bransby, 2023)

informed the interpersonal and communication domain and the proposed feedback mechanisms; research on virtual teamwork and technological change informed attention to digital work (Abi Saad and Agogué, 2023; Ortiz-Ospino et al., 2025). Adaptive competencies were distinguished to address the revision of arrangements in temporary projects under disruption. Dooley et al. (2024) and the practical INSPIRE publication (Culture Action Europe, 2025) provide contextual support for considering collaboration, digital capabilities, and resilience. They do not establish this particular six-domain structure. The grouping was retained as a way to connect recurring producer decisions to mechanisms of collective knowledge use, without claiming that it is exhaustive.

The unit of analysis is a performing arts project with an identifiable producer or producing team and interdependent participants. The model assumes substantive influence over team selection, work organization, or resource allocation. Where these powers belong to another role or institution, the relevant function rather than the job title determines application. When producing is shared, analysis should identify who contributes each capability, who makes the associated decisions, and how those contributions are coordinated. The resulting profile describes complementary coverage of project requirements, not a requirement that every person attain the same level in all six domains.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. A competency model for producers

The model comprises six domains representing interconnected groups of capabilities rather than six autonomous forms of capital. Professional experience supports their development, while project requirements determine the combination needed within the producer or producing team. The behavioral examples in the following subsections are illustrative indicators for professional development and future research; they are not validated measures or scoring criteria. Ethical responsibility informs the use of every domain, including respect for artistic autonomy, participants' rights, and acceptable working conditions.

An activity may draw on several domains. The grouping identifies the principal problem addressed by a decision, not mutually exclusive categories of behavior. For a shared rehearsal platform, managerial competencies concern responsibility and deadlines, interpersonal and communication competencies concern mutual understanding, and digital competencies concern access, versions, and the suitability of the information system. If a venue becomes unavailable, adaptive competencies concern reconsidering assumptions and selecting an alternative, while the other domains help implement it. Thus, digital competencies foreground technology-mediated information, and adaptive competencies foreground changed conditions. The same episode may illustrate several domains; it should not be counted as several independent competencies or converted into an aggregate score merely because it has several functions.

3.1.1. Industry-specific competencies

This domain encompasses understanding the production cycle, the distinctive requirements of stage and performance formats, budgeting procedures, contracts, copyright, and technical requirements. Its function is to identify the professional activities and resources needed to realize an artistic concept. Producers need not perform every specialist's work, but they should understand task dependencies and recognize when specialist advice is necessary.

The distinction from the managerial domain concerns the object of the decision. Industry-specific competence explains what a particular production requires; managerial competence concerns how people organize the fulfillment of those requirements. For example, understanding stage installation requirements belongs to the first category, while coordinating the installation crew's schedule

with rehearsals belongs to the second.

Illustrative behavioral indicators include explaining production requirements, identifying a missing specialist, anticipating technical dependencies, and engaging experts promptly. Plans, budgets, technical briefs, and accounts of decisions can provide evidence. The existence of a document is insufficient: its relevance to the project's needs matters.

3.1.2. Managerial competencies

The managerial domain includes goal setting, team formation, role allocation, coordination, resource management, and monitoring commitments. Its central task is to establish a structure for collaborative work. Producers specify who is responsible for an outcome, how tasks are handed over, when approvals are required, and the limits of each participant's autonomy.

Formal responsibilities in a creative team should allow room for interdisciplinary interaction. Excessive rigidity can inhibit experimentation, whereas ambiguity can produce duplicated work and hidden conflicts. Competence therefore involves the ability to change the organization of work without sacrificing role clarity.

Illustrative behavioral indicators include agreeing goals with the team, allocating responsibilities transparently, explaining procedures for changing tasks, and making decisions traceable. Participants' accounts can help establish whether a management plan guides practice and whether authority matches assigned responsibility.

3.1.3. Creative competencies

The creative domain denotes the ability to evaluate and develop concepts, recognize the potential of interdisciplinary combinations, and relate artistic decisions to production conditions. A producer may co-create the concept, but the proposed model also includes establishing conditions for others' creative work. This involves asking productive questions, supporting trials of alternatives, and allowing time to evaluate them.

A creative decision differs from an organizational change. The former concerns an artistic proposal; the latter concerns how it is implemented. They nevertheless interact. A budget reduction may require a new scenographic concept, but adopting it should take account of the artistic leads' positions as well as financial feasibility.

Illustrative behavioral indicators include explaining concept selection, organizing trials, and discussing trade-offs between artistic possibilities and available resources. The number of ideas proposed is insufficient, since some may be irrelevant to project objectives. Developmental discussion should consider how the team is enabled to examine and develop artistic possibilities.

3.1.4. Interpersonal and communication competencies

This domain includes negotiation, listening, facilitation, feedback, conflict management, and intercultural interaction. Its function is to make positions and agreements understandable among participants using different professional vocabularies. A director, technical crew, and financial partner may interpret the same requirement differently; producers help translate these differences into a mutually understood decision.

Communication should not be reduced to personal persuasiveness. Access to information, documentation of agreements, and opportunities to disagree matter. Regular discussion of risks and constructive responses to reported errors are proposed as practices supporting team learning.

Illustrative behavioral indicators include explaining decisions, checking mutual understanding, providing accessible channels for reporting problems, and

using agreed conflict resolution procedures. An absence of visible disagreement may reflect silence or fear. Confidential participant feedback can help interpret these behaviors.

3.1.5. Digital competencies

The digital domain encompasses tools for planning, collaboration, archiving, communication, and presenting cultural outputs. It concerns the ability to organize information flows and assess whether a technology fits a task. Producers should understand who can access materials, how current versions are identified, and how the team will work during a technical failure.

Technological novelty is not an independent criterion of quality. An additional platform may improve coordination but also create unnecessary learning demands. In the proposed model, digital competence includes deciding against a complex tool when it does not fit the team's capabilities. Similarly, generative tools require human review, attention to authorship, and agreed handling of participants' materials.

Illustrative behavioral indicators include establishing clear file structures, version control, access rules, usable instructions, and backup work procedures. The number of software applications listed on a résumé does not establish digital competence. Evidence of professional action includes explaining access decisions and helping participants locate and exchange the information they need.

Ortiz-Ospino et al. (2025) synthesize technological trends in cultural and creative industries, including changes in digital content creation and production organization. Their review supports understanding digital competence as the ability to assess technological change and the organizational consequences of implementation. It covers a broader range of industries, however, and does not directly validate theatre producer competencies.

Heigl's (2026) review of generative AI in creative contexts identifies directions for research on long-term effects, socioeconomic consequences, and ethical use. Anantrasirichai et al. (2026) additionally examine contemporary AI applications across creative production and emphasize human oversight. Producers therefore need to assess preparation speed alongside consistency with the artistic concept, reliability, and conditions of use. Within the model, recognizing a tool's limitations is part of professional judgment.

3.1.6. Adaptive competencies

The adaptive domain includes assessing changes, scenario planning, renegotiating roles, and restoring work after established arrangements are disrupted. It differs from general management by addressing situations in which initial assumptions no longer match conditions. Producers must identify which project elements can change and which are essential to artistic objectives, safety, and agreements with participants.

Adaptability does not mean expecting the team to compensate indefinitely for inadequate resources. Changes to deadlines or formats should involve reassessing workloads, remuneration, and responsibilities. Otherwise, apparent organizational flexibility may conceal exhaustion. The model therefore includes the producer's ability to recognize feasibility limits and justify postponing or stopping work.

Illustrative behavioral indicators include developing alternative scenarios, identifying critical deviations early, communicating changes, and agreeing revised working conditions. Reflection after disruption can examine whether procedures changed or whether work continued to depend on improvised individual efforts.

3.2. Mechanisms connecting competencies to team capacity

The first group of mechanisms concerns selecting complementary participants. Producers identify the project's professional requirements and

compare them with candidates' capabilities. Reputation and recommendations may help but do not replace analysis of a specific role. The model assumes that effective selection depends on the fit between tasks and the team's combination of competencies, rather than maximizing every participant's individual qualifications.

The second group involves aligning roles and task dependencies. A shared objective must be translated into clear tasks and coordination rules. If a scenographic change affects lighting, performers' movements, and installation, the team needs an approval procedure. Industry knowledge helps producers recognize dependencies, while managerial and communication competencies help organize a joint decision.

The third group concerns knowledge sharing. Professional experience must become available at the right moment and in an understandable form. Demonstrations, joint reviews, production discussions, and mentoring may support this process. Digital documentation helps but cannot replace interaction where knowledge is practical and embodied in performance.

The fourth group encompasses psychological safety, feedback, and reflection. The proposed model assumes that openness to reporting problems reduces the risk of concealment. Debriefing helps distinguish organizational causes from individual errors. Its purpose is to improve practice rather than merely assign blame.

The fifth group concerns retaining experience and maintaining professional continuity. After project completion, the team may leave documentation, revised procedures, and agreements for future collaboration. Human capital remains primarily embodied in people. Organizational archives and contact networks are separate resources that help remobilize experience but do not replace those who possess it.

The explanation links four levels. First, producer competencies are individual capabilities, which may be distributed across a producing team. Second, these capabilities are enacted through interaction practices such as role alignment, knowledge sharing, feedback, and debriefing; psychological safety is a team condition that may support those practices. Third, these practices can make participants' professional knowledge available for coordinated use, constituting a team human capital resource. In this article, team capacity refers to that available collective capability. Fourth, using this resource may contribute to artistic, organizational, learning, and social outcomes. Capacity is therefore distinct from the outcomes of its use: a team may be able to mobilize expertise yet face funding or venue constraints that prevent delivery. The links are conditional on authority, time, resources, and project objectives.

Junker et al. (2025) distinguish access to resources from their mobilization at team level. Their review of agile teams proposes a model of sustained effectiveness that considers internal and external resources, work demands, and members' well-being. This provides a contemporary theoretical foundation: talented people or partnership opportunities do not necessarily mean that a team can use them in a given situation. Applying this perspective to arts projects requires testing because creative production conditions may differ from the contexts covered by the review.

3.3. Theoretical propositions and directions for testing

Proposition 1: alignment between the producer's competency profile and project requirements is associated with better coordination of roles and task dependencies. Testing requires separate measurement of the profile, requirements, and coordination quality. Producer assessments should be compared with team assessments and production documents to avoid drawing conclusions solely from self-reports.

Proposition 2: the relationship between interpersonal and communication competencies and team learning is mediated by opportunities to discuss problems openly and receive constructive feedback. Testing should establish temporal order, since successful projects may themselves improve perceptions of communication. A single end-of-project survey cannot reliably distinguish these explanations.

Proposition 3: in projects with comparable production demands and resources, explicitly connecting industry-specific judgments to managerial decisions is expected to support clearer task dependencies and more workable coordination than leaving those judgments disconnected from work allocation. For example, a recognized installation requirement must inform the rehearsal schedule and assignment of responsibility. This exploratory proposition concerns complementarity in the enactment of the two domains, whether within one person or across a producing team. It does not rank their separate importance, assume equal weights, or specify an additive or multiplicative relationship. Testing would examine the connection between production judgments and coordination decisions alongside the availability of each capability.

Proposition 4: under highly changeable conditions, adaptive competencies support team capacity through timely renegotiation of work and maintenance of acceptable workloads. Analysis should include the severity of external disruptions, institutional resources, and available alternatives. Completing a project does not demonstrate effective adaptation if completion comes at the cost of exhaustion.

Proposition 5: documentation and debriefing practices are associated with the use of experience in subsequent projects. Testing requires observation across at least two production cycles. Researchers should establish whether materials were used, by whom, and with what organizational consequences; an archive's existence is not equivalent to knowledge transfer.

The propositions define a research agenda. Interviews and analysis of production situations could refine the proposed mechanisms and indicators before multisource surveys. Comparisons across performing arts projects should consider scale, budget, duration, prior collaborative experience, and the distribution of producing responsibilities.

3.4. Practical applications

In performing arts education, the model can align learning outcomes with professional actions. Industry-specific competencies can be explored through production tasks, managerial competencies through organizing teamwork, and interpersonal and communication competencies through negotiation and feedback. Students should explain decisions and analyze their consequences rather than merely submit documentation. Application to other creative industries would require task analysis and attention to differences in production arrangements.

A learning project can be organized as a sequence of interdependent situations. For example, a change of venue requires reconsidering the technical concept, schedule, and communication. This makes competency integration observable. Assessment should nevertheless distinguish learning tasks from actual safety and legal responsibilities that require authorized specialists.

For team management, the model offers a developmental framework. Supported task performance, independent work, coordination of others' work, and transfer of experience are possible prompts for discussing responsibility and learning needs. They do not form an established proficiency scale, a mandatory sequence, or equivalent levels across domains. A person may coordinate one task while needing support in another; an opportunity to teach does not by itself demonstrate higher competence. The illustrative indicators should be interpreted through specific tasks and multiple sources of evidence, without assigning standardized scores or using an unvalidated aggregate ranking.

A shared producing arrangement illustrates how the methodological unit can inform practice. The producer may agree the artistic priorities, partnerships, and overall resource commitments; the production manager may translate technical requirements into schedules, task handovers, and day-to-day coordination; a specialist adviser may provide technical or rights-related expertise. These are illustrative allocations, to be adapted to actual authority and project needs. The framework asks whether required capabilities are covered, who is responsible for each decision, and how specialist judgments reach those who organize work. A gap may call for learning, advice, or delegation rather than an expectation that every individual demonstrate equally advanced capability in all six domains.

Project outcomes should be examined separately from competencies and available team capacity. Organizational outcomes include delivery against the agreed plan; learning outcomes concern knowledge acquired and transferred; social outcomes include participation experiences, procedural fairness, and workloads; artistic outcomes concern concept realization as assessed by relevant participants and experts. Coordination quality can be examined as an interaction process, while subsequent delivery is an outcome. Financial measures may supplement these dimensions according to project objectives.

Dooley et al. (2024), reviewing 63 texts on gaps between graduate preparation and creative industry needs, identify communication and collaboration among the most frequently reported interpersonal skills, with digital and related skills prominent among professional requirements. These findings support including the corresponding domains in an educational model but do not establish the proficiency level required specifically of performing arts producers. That level should be determined through task analysis.

Culture Action Europe's (2025) publication on INSPIRE directly addresses the performing arts sector. It describes production professionals' needs in digital, entrepreneurial, interpersonal, resilience, and environmental competencies. This practical source complements peer-reviewed research without replacing it. Within the proposed framework, environmental responsibility informs choices about resources, logistics, and technology across domains rather than establishing a separately validated competency category.

3.5. Instability and applications in Ukraine

The following Ukrainian examples illustrate possible uses of the framework in performing arts projects under wartime disruption. They are hypothetical applications, not empirical observations or evidence of sector-wide conditions. Situations might include venue unavailability, changes in team composition, communication interruptions, or postponement of an event.

In such circumstances, adaptive competence involves identifying alternatives and acceptable risk limits in advance. Managerial competence concerns agreed notification and task revision procedures; digital competence concerns backup access to work information; and interpersonal and communication competence concerns participants' differing capacities. Safety decisions should follow current requirements and the expertise of responsible services rather than producer improvisation.

International collaboration may require renegotiating professional roles, expectations, and communication practices. The model allows these needs to be analyzed without assuming that all teams work alike. Its application in Ukraine should recognize differences among independent projects, public institutions, educational productions, and collaborative productions.

4. Discussion

The contribution is a proposed explanation of how producer competencies are enacted through coordination, knowledge sharing, and learning. Relative to

producer role and competency descriptions, including Proskurina and Nikitina (2023), the framework specifies the intervening practices through which expertise may become a team human capital resource and then contribute to project outcomes. It separates individual competencies, network resources, interaction practices, team conditions, collective capacity, and outcomes, allowing their relationships to be examined rather than assumed. This account concerns performing arts production; its extension to other creative industries needs a separate functional justification.

The six domains constitute an author-developed functional synthesis, not an established factor structure. Theoretical plausibility and practical examples do not establish their completeness, measurement validity, or causal effects. Interviews and analysis of production tasks should examine whether the grouping is useful, whether boundaries need revision, and how indicators operate when responsibilities are distributed. Any assessment instrument would require its own development and validation. Overlap between domains is expected and should be interpreted through the purpose of a decision rather than treated as evidence of independent factors.

A second limitation concerns source selection. The theoretical corpus supports framework development but does not constitute a comprehensive review of contemporary research on artistic work. Future studies should extend the sector-specific evidence on employment, producer roles, and learning within particular performing arts industries. This would clarify the limits of applying general organizational theories.

A third limitation concerns alternative explanations. Funding, institutional reputation, artistic expertise, prior collaboration, and audience characteristics may affect outcomes independently of producer competencies. Causality may also be reciprocal: competent producers support learning, while strong teams develop producers' capabilities. Future research should therefore examine interaction dynamics.

Finally, a resource-based approach has ethical limits. Participants retain autonomy, copyright, and the right to determine their working conditions. Competency assessment should not justify unpaid work or exclusion through opaque criteria. Developing human capital also means expanding participants' own professional opportunities.

Contemporary theory supports these human-centered limits. Wright (2021) highlights free will, identity, meaning, community, and people's intrinsic value in strategic human capital research. For the producer model, this means that participants' professional capabilities cannot be explained solely through expected project returns. Motivation to participate in an artistic concept, belonging within the team, and opportunities to influence collaboration conditions should be examined separately.

5. Conclusion

Producer human capital and creative team human capital resources should be examined at different levels. Individual knowledge and experience become available to a collective project through selection, coordination, knowledge sharing, and learning. Producers help organize these mechanisms within the scope of their actual authority.

The proposed model encompasses industry-specific, managerial, creative, interpersonal and communication, digital, and adaptive competencies. Their contributions depend on alignment with project tasks and complementarity within the producing team. Assessment should consider individual characteristics alongside the practices through which they affect the team.

The model can structure performing arts education, professional development,

and reflection on creative collaboration by relating task requirements to complementary capabilities and shared responsibilities. The propositions provide a basis for investigating the links between professional judgment, interaction practices, available collective capability, and project outcomes.

Further research should examine these links through interviews, project analysis, and multisource observation across production cycles. Artistic autonomy, participants' rights, and the quality of their professional experience remain criteria for interpreting both organizational practices and their outcomes.

Acknowledgment: The author used ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist with English-language drafting, substantive text revision, and manuscript formatting. The author reviewed and approved the revised text and is responsible for the content of the article.

Conflict of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Abi Saad E, Agogué M (2023). Creativity in virtual teams: Systematic review, synthesis and research agenda. Creativity and Innovation Management. 32(1): 117–140. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12540

[2] Anantrasirichai N, Zhang F, Bull D (2026). Advances in artificial intelligence: A review for the creative industries. Artificial Intelligence Review. 59: 89. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-026-11494-w

[3] Barney J (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management. 17(1): 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

[4] Becker GS (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education, 3rd ed. University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/H/bo3684031.html

[5] Culture Action Europe (2025). INSPIRE: Labour market needs analysis report. Available online: https://cultureactioneurope.org/knowledge/inspire-labour-market-needs-analysis-report/

[6] DeFillippi RJ, Arthur MB (1998). Paradox in project-based enterprise: The case of film making. California Management Review. 40(2): 125–139. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165936

[7] Dooley K, Peng F, Neville S, McKibbin J (2024). Mind the gap: A scoping review of skills gaps for graduates in the creative industries. Arts and Humanities in Higher Education. 23(4): 330–349. https://doi.org/10.1177/14740222241276166

[8] Edmondson A (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly. 44(2): 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

[9] Edmondson AC, Bransby DP (2023). Psychological safety comes of age: Observed themes in an established literature. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior. 10: 55–78. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-055217

[10] Granovetter MS (1973). The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology. 78(6): 1360–1380. https://doi.org/10.1086/225469

[11] Heigl R (2026). Generative artificial intelligence in creative contexts: A systematic review and future research agenda. Management Review Quarterly. 76: 955–992. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00494-9

[12] Jaakkola E (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. AMS Review. 10: 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0

[13] Junker TL, Bakker AB, Derks D (2025). Toward a theory of team resource mobilization: A systematic review and model of sustained agile team effectiveness. Human Resource Management Review. 35(1): 101043. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2024.101043

[14] Ortiz-Ospino L, González-Sarmiento E, Roa-Perez J (2025). Technology trends in the creative and cultural industries sector: A systematic literature review. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship. 14: 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00497-6

[15] Ployhart RE (2021). Resources for what? Understanding performance in the resource-based view and strategic human capital resource literatures. Journal of Management. 47(7): 1771–1786. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211003137

[16] Ployhart RE, Nyberg AJ, Reilly G, Maltarich MA (2014). Human capital is dead; long live human capital resources! Journal of Management. 40(2): 371–398. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313512152

[17] Proskurina M, Nikitina V (2023). Production activity essence and producer's role in the field of project management in the creative industries. Socio-Cultural Management Journal. 6(2): 31–51. https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2023.291246

[18] Ray C, Essman S, Nyberg AJ, Ployhart RE, Hale D (2023). Human capital resources: Reviewing the first decade and establishing a foundation for future research. Journal of Management. 49(1): 280–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221085912

[19] Wright PM (2021). Rediscovering the "human"in strategic human capital. Human Resource Management Review. 31(4): 100781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100781

[20] Zhang L, Van Iddekinge CH, Ployhart RE, Arnold JD, Jordan SL (2023). The definition and measurement of human capital resources: A content and meta-analytic review. Journal of Applied Psychology. 108(9): 1486–1514. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001088