The environment in which artists, musicians, authors, and film-makers live and the type of relationships they act in make us think about this cluster of enterprises as an ecosystem: in particular, within the abundant entrepreneurial and institutional reality in Bologna that constitutes an ecosystem, we can also speak about a sub ecosystem for cultural enterprises.

It is interesting to apply the concept of sub-ecosystem to this enterprises' structure due to the relational dynamics that characterise them, and to reexamine how this concept is considered in the literature is useful for understanding its application.

The ecosystem approach to entrepreneurship combines insights from economics, strategic management, entrepreneurship studies, and economic geography, highlighting synergies between entrepreneurship and territory (Acs et al., 2017; Mack & Mayer, 2016; Mason & Brown, 2014; Porter, 2000; Spigel, 2017).

The concept of ecosystem applied to entrepreneurship has been introduced by Moore (1993) who, first, in an essential article in the Harvard Business Review, presented his idea based on the analogy between business ecosystem and biological ecosystem (Galateanu et al.,2013 ) starting from Bateson's (1972) definition of co-evolution: in both ecosystems, there is a community that works and survives in specific environmental conditions, the components of which have a mutual connection among one another (Galateanu et al.,2013); the members of the community are connected and collaborate as part of an extended system of organisations whose components support one another (Erina et al., 2013). Within an ecosystem, organisations co-develop and co-evolve their resources innovatively, co-creating value (Khotinskaya et al., 2019); It is consequently the presence of bi-unique relationships that turn these ecosystems into the base of future strategies (Erina et al., 2013) and that make them superior than organisational clusters à la Porter (2005).

Alcune definizioni possono aiutarci a collocare queste strutture organizzative: Stam and Spigel (2017) define EE as a "set of interdependent actors and factors coordinated in such a way, they enable productive entrepreneurship within a particular territory"(p. 1). Mason and Brown (2014) define EE in a more detailed manner as "a set of interconnected entrepreneurial actors, organizations, institutions and entrepreneurial processes which formally and informally coalesce to connect, mediate and govern the performance within the local entrepreneurial environment" (p. 5).

Qian et al. (2013) define ES as ‘those economic, social, institutional and all other important factors that interactively influence the creation, discovery and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities’ (p. 561). The creation of new opportunities is essential to ES.

The persistence of the relations between the members of the ecosystem makes it healthy, robust and enduring: healthy relations between the various components contribute to the success and development of businesses (Galateanu et al.,2013); therefore, as in natural ecosystems, a healthy business ecosystem provides longevity and propensity for development (Den Hartigh et al., 2006). Through the concept of 'health', the performance of business ecosystems can be evaluated (Iansiti et al., 2002).

There are three critical success factors (Erina et al., 2013):

1) Robustness: the ability of an ecosystem to be able to handle 'disruptions' (Den Hartigh et al., 2006), as well as to survive in stressful situations, both caused by internal and external forces, which might threaten to demolish the ecosystem (Peltoniemi et al., 2004a). A robust business ecosystem can also be described as sustainable, as it can quickly adapt to environmental changes (Galateanu et al., 2013); 2) Productivity: the level of efficiency of the system (Den Hartigh et al., 2006) and the benefits that the components derive from remaining in it (Iansiti et al., 2004); 3) Creation of "niches": i.e. presenting a positive but not high level of variety and diversity (not too low to avoid innovation, but not too high to encourage competition and not cooperative behaviour) and possibilities for new ventures through a non-protectionist but a cooperative attitude (Peltoniemi et al., 2004a)

Further elements that reflect the well-being of the network are the partners' health, their ability to obtain the maximum return from the opportunities within the ecosystem (Den Hartigh et al., 2006), and the health of the network in itself as measured by the level of member inclusion, by the impact of each individual and by the presence of solid relationships. In a healthy ecosystem, there are 'main actors' who influence the conduct of others and define the currents (Den Hartigh et al., 2006).
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