

INSTITUTIONAL PRESSURES AND CONVENTIONS OF OPERATION

Challenges for Collaboration between Finnish Municipal Theatres and Independent Dance
Companies

Saara Moisio

Master's Thesis

Faculty of Arts

University of Helsinki

January 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Theoretical Framework and Research Questions	2
1.2 Research Method.....	4
1.3 The Outline of the Work.....	5
2 COLLABORATION AMONG FINNISH THEATRES	8
2.1 Previous Experiences On Collaboration: Forms and Challenges	9
2.2 Equally Beneficial Collaboration: Focus on Organizations' Local Knowledge	12
3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: DEFINING THE CONTEXT FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ART	15
3.1 Organizational Fields and Art Worlds: Constraining the Production of Art.....	16
3.2 Institutional Coercive, Mimetic and Normative Pressures.....	17
3.3 Conventions of Producing Art Works.....	19
4 CULTURAL POLICY AS AN AGENT IN THE PRODUCTION OF ART	22
4.1 Finnish Cultural Policy as an Arena of Interaction.....	23
4.2 Summary: Challenges for Collaboration in Theory.....	25
5 EMPIRICAL STUDY	27
5.1 Qualitative Research Interviewing.....	27
5.2 The Research Material and the Realization of the Study	29
5.3 The Method of Qualitative Analysis	33
5.4 The Evaluation of Qualitative Research: Reliability and Validity	36
6 THE CONTEXT OF OPERATIONS	38
6.1 The Context of Operations for Municipal Theatres.....	38
6.2 The Institutional Pressures of Municipal Theatres	41
6.3 The Context of Operations for Independent Dance Companies.....	46
6.4 The Institutional Pressures of Independent Dance Companies	51
7 THE CONVENTIONS DEFINING THE FUNCTION AND REPERTOIRE	58
7.1 Municipal Theatres: the Servants of Local Audiences.....	58
7.2 Municipal Theatre's Repertoire: the Reflector of Local Characteristics	62
7.3 Independent Dance Companies: the Enablers of Artistic Freedom.....	66
7.4 Independent Dance Company's Repertoire: Reflecting Limited Artistic Freedom	70
8 THE CONVENTIONS DEFINING THE RELATIONS AND COLLABORATION	76
8.1 Municipal Theatres: Emphasis on Local Relations and Formal Collaboration.....	76
8.2 Independent Dance Companies: Emphasis on Small-scale Relations and Informal Collaboration	82

9 CONCLUSION	87
9.1 Challenges for Collaboration.....	88
9.2 Implications for Practice and Future Research.....	93
9.3 The Evaluation of the Research Process	96
WORKS CITED	97
APPENDIXES.....	100
Appendix 1: Interview guide	100
Appendix 2: Original Finnish quotations from the interviews.....	103

1 INTRODUCTION

Collaboration between Finnish municipal theatres and independent companies has been under discussion for the past decade. Mostly the issue is addressed from quite general point of view. Collaboration is acknowledged as good and beneficial mode of action which is practiced time to time. In 2000 the Ministry of Education and Culture published a report on the “Development of collaboration between theatres” where it decided to provide government funding for collaborations between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies (Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000). Also a report about the future of Finnish theatre by the Foundation of Cultural Policy Research in 2006 acknowledges that collaboration is realized in different forms but better financial conditions are still needed for it (Kanerva and Ruusuvirta 33–35, 58–61). Yet in spring 2011 according to an article in Turun Sanomat theatre people yearn for more collaboration and better public support for it (Haapanen). It seems that although the issue has been researched, and there are aspirations to develop collaboration, it has not evolved into a more established way of operation between municipal theatres and independent companies.

Previous reports have rarely addressed challenges of collaboration which rise from the differences between municipal theatres and independent companies. Furthermore, collaboration between theatres and especially independent dance companies is not discussed in any of these reports. Additionally, previous academic study on the issue has not been done. Therefore, this thesis addresses the question of collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies. Instead of dealing with what kind of collaborations there has been realized between the two, the issue will be approached from the point of view why these two are not collaborating more and what in their contexts and ways of operation might challenge collaboration. In other words, the aim of this thesis is to provide theoretical understanding on what challenges collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies.

Municipal theatres and independent dance companies are quite different organizations which operate in different contexts. Theatres are institutions subsidized by the “Theatres and Orchestras Act” and municipalities. Additionally they have own building and permanent staff. Independent dance companies are so called “outlaws”; i.e.

small, freely formed organizations, which are supported by discretionary grants and subsidies for dance productions outside the scope of “Theatres and Orchestras Act”. They perform and rehearse where ever they find a place, and work with freelancer artists. Furthermore, theatre has a long history as part of Finnish cultural policy and building of society, whereas dance has not been granted an equivalent role. Finally, Finnish cultural policy influences the operations of municipal theatres and independent dance companies through different streams of public funding. Therefore, it can be considered that they deal with different issues in their operation which challenges the practice of collaboration. Throughout the work, when referring to municipal theatres and independent dance companies as organizations general terms of theatres and dance companies are used. Other art organizations are referred to as agents of the art world.

1.1 Theoretical Framework and Research Questions

The theoretical framework of the thesis is based on institutional theories on organizational fields, art worlds and collaborative planning. Key concepts within these theories are institutional coercive, mimetic and normative pressures and conventions of producing art works. Institutional theories on organizational fields and art worlds provide a framework for understanding how action is both structured and enabled within certain environments. The focus of attention is on institutional pressures and conventions of producing art works which define how to act and what to value in certain context. Main perception in institutional theory is that when considering the decisions and preferences of an individual, the culture, time period and historical context cannot be ignored (Powell 188). Similarly, theory of collaborative planning acknowledges that meanings, ways of thinking and acting are always connected to certain contexts (Healey 32). The framework of collaborative planning is used for understanding what needs to be considered when embarking upon collaboration and facing challenges.

When building collaboration, the fact that people come from different organizational environments cannot be ignored. Most commonly the problems on how to manage collaboration arise from the interaction between various different actors from different backgrounds. The institutional approach to collaborative planning suggests that to work through the problems and challenges of collaboration demands the

recognition of the differences between environments, ways of acting, thinking and valuing. (Healey 63–64)

Both theatres and dance companies can be considered to operate in Finnish art world and its organizational fields which are influenced and structured by cultural policy. In institutional theory on organizational fields it is assumed that organizations begin to resemble each other because of constraining and structuring pressures of the field. These pressures come both from outside and inside of the organizations in the field. (DiMaggio and Powell, 64–66). When considering the production of art works in art world from institutional point of view it is also argued that often art organizations operate according to established conventions, as it is faster and cheaper way to realize new art works. (Becker 29)

In this work I suggest that Finnish cultural policy through different funding streams creates certain conditions which structure the operations of theatres and dance companies. These conditions place different institutional pressures for both organizations which can further strengthen existing conventions of producing art works. Additionally, as institutional theory and approach to collaboration suggest, organizations and people in them do not live in a vacuum. Their values, purposes, goals and visions are created from and affected by the environments in which they reside. Therefore, both the conditions created by cultural policy and public funding as well as values and norms rising from surrounding environment are part of the context of operation for theatres and dance companies. Eventually, it can be assumed that this context with its institutional pressures invites to follow established conventions in the operations of the theatres and dance companies. Because of being subject to different institutional pressures the conventions of producing repertoire can be assumed to differ significantly in both organizations. With regard to collaboration, I consider that conventions which define theatre's and dance company's function, repertoire and relations to other organizations and agents in the art field influence how well collaboration between the two can be realized.

My main research question is: How do institutional pressures and conventions of operations challenge collaboration between Finnish municipal theatres and independent dance companies? This includes following sub questions: how do cultural policy and public funding define the context of operation and institutional pressures for theatres and dance companies? What kind of institutional pressures does the context of operation

place upon the two types of art organizations? What kind of conventions do institutional pressures maintain for defining the function, repertoire and relations of the two types of art organizations?

1.2 Research Method

This study is conducted as qualitative research. According to Uwe Flick qualitative research and its methods are especially suitable for studies which aim at finding out how knowledge is embedded in social relations and contexts (2). The aim of this study is to find out what kind of challenges rise from institutional pressures and conventions of operations. In other words, how the differences in theatres' and dance companies' contexts of operations are reflected in their ways of operations. Therefore, the theoretical framework and research questions introduced in previous paragraph support the selection of qualitative research over quantitative one.

In qualitative research the appropriateness of the methods and theories in relation to the object of the study is a central theme. Methods of qualitative research are only tools. Researcher's conceptual considerations on the subject of the study are the starting point for qualitative research. Additionally, according to Eskola and Suoranta, in qualitative methods it is acknowledged that social phenomena under study are in a constant process. Therefore, the diversity of perspectives, approaches and methods is acknowledged, as well as qualitative researcher's own position and its influence on the results of the study. In the end, the results of the qualitative research are attached to historical time and place of the study; they are not timeless depictions of certain situation. In qualitative research, as Flick argues, the interactions between subjective perspectives constitute a social field and its hidden practices. Here are emphasized same issues, which the theoretical framework and research questions suggest. In other words, individual perspectives on a certain issue are always based on the social context of the object of the study. (Flick 5–7; Eskola and Suoranta 15–16)

According to Eskola and Suoranta, the material of qualitative research is basically text. Similarly Flick states that text provides the medium for presenting and communicating the findings of the research. In the context of qualitative research “text” refers to diversity of material which can as well be recorded and transcribed interviews

as recorded and transcribed natural conversations and observations, personal diaries, biographies and letters. (Flick 29–30, 33, Eskola and Suoranta 15) In this study the form of data collection is qualitative semi-structured interview, and the text for interpretation and analysis is provided by transcribed interviews. The research sample is formed by four different municipal theatres and independent dance companies around Finland. The directors of these art organizations are the interviewees which provide the material for the analysis.

According to Steinar Kvale, the purpose of semi-structured interview is “to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena”. The aim is to obtain the local knowledge of the interviewees on the object of the study. (Kvale 6) In the context of my study, the aim is to obtain descriptions of the function of interviewees' art organizations, the ways of defining the repertoire and relations to other organizations and agents of the art field. I consider that the notions of how the interviewed directors of theatres and dance companies define their organization's function, repertoire and relations rise from the previous experiences and prevailing norms within their context of operations. On the basis of interviewees' descriptions I will interpret how and what kind of institutional pressures are reflected throughout the answers and what kind of existing conventions they suggest. In qualitative interviewing, and therefore in this work also, it is understood that culture affects the answers of the interviewees (Rubin & Rubin 19). In other words, qualitative semi-structured interview as a method acknowledges same issues as institutional theory on organizational fields, art worlds and collaborative planning and , therefore, serves as a relevant method for this study.

1.3 The Outline of the Work

This work consists of three main parts: introduction, theoretical framework and empirical study. As part of introduction in chapter 2, I first generally introduce how collaboration has been realized this far between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies and what kind of challenges there has been acknowledged. I include in this chapter also some of the theoretical considerations of collaborative planning on what needs to be considered when embarking upon collaboration. The

theoretical framework begins with chapter 3, in which I define, through the concepts of organizational fields and art worlds, how action and production of art works is both enabled and constrained. Essential part of this is, in chapter 4, the discussion on the role of cultural policy as an agent in the production of art in theatres and dance companies.

The empirical study of this work begins in chapter 5 with the introduction of the method of analysis and how the study is conducted. In chapters 6, 7 and 8 the material provided by the transcribed interviews is analyzed reflecting on the notions made in the theoretical framework. In chapter 6, I consider more closely what kind of context of operation cultural policy and public funding provide for theatres and dance companies. Reflecting this with the material provided by the interviews I discuss what kind of institutional pressures theatres and dance companies have. Eventually, in chapters 7 and 8 I will analyze what kind of conventions both types of art organizations have when defining their function, repertoire and relations to other organizations and agents of the art field. As a conclusion of the study, in chapter 9, I aim at presenting a synthesis on their institutional pressures and conventions of operation and what kind of challenges rises with regard to collaboration.

In this work cultural policy and public funding of arts is considered as the most important source of institutional constraining and structuring pressures. To limit the scope of the study I am only concentrating on discussing two streams of funding, which are Theatres and Orchestras Act for municipal theatres and operational subsidies of the National Council for Dance for independent dance companies. There are of course other possible sources for institutional pressures such as the influence of other funding streams, audience's decisions, competitors' and substitutes' actions. Their role is acknowledged, but because of concentrating mainly on how cultural policy defines the context of operation for art organizations, and what kind of institutional pressures and eventually conventions of operation it creates and maintains, the actual influence of other sources of institutional pressures is not discussed.

Furthermore, when speaking of collaboration this study does not concentrate on already realized and existing collaborations between municipal theatres and independent dance companies. Some forms of previous collaboration are acknowledged in the following chapter. However, more extensive discussion is excluded as the scope of this thesis is to find out what are the challenges which prevent collaboration evolving into more constant practice between theatres and dance companies.

In the following chapter I will introduce what should be considered when embarking upon collaboration, how collaboration is realized between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies and what kind of experiences there has been. I also discuss on what grounds the differences in the public funding can be considered to have an essential influence on possibilities of collaboration between theatres and dance companies.

2 COLLABORATION AMONG FINNISH THEATRES

As mentioned in the previous chapter, collaboration has happened and is happening between different art organizations, it is encouraged by public funding and general notion among artists is that it should be happening even more. This suggests that there are already some established ways of collaboration and relations between different agents of theatre and dance. Therefore, the most important issue to be considered is that in collaboration different art organizations and their cultures of operation are brought together. In addition, it needs to be acknowledged that the interaction between collaborating parties happens within the legal, social and mental boundaries of these organizations. In other words, collaboration always happens in “multi-cultural” context where the previous actions and relations of organizations influence their ways of doing things. In other words, the knowledge which every organization possesses is based on its relations to other organizations and agencies which are relevant to its operation. The intertwined reasoning processes, notions of ethics, values and emotional attachments of each organization, which are brought to the context of collaboration, are based on the previous relations. (Healey 247, 263–264)

This suggests that when developing collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies their previous interaction with other organizations, and what are their experiences on collaborations, can influence their interests on collaborating together. Therefore, for discussing the challenges in collaboration between especially municipal theatres and independent dance companies, it is essential to lay a foundation from previously published reports dealing with collaboration between theatres. Memorandums on the development of collaboration in Finnish theatres (Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000)¹ and on the future and conditions of dance (Tanssitaidepoliittisen työryhmän muistio 24:1999)² by the Ministry of Education and Culture (OKM³) and a report on Finnish theatres by Anna Kanerva and Minna Ruusuvirta (2006) published by the Foundation for Cultural Policy Research (Cupore⁴) provide a basis for this discussion.

¹ *Teattereiden yhteistyön kehittäminen* (2000)

² *Tanssin tila ja tulevaisuus* (1999)

³ Finnish abbreviation is used from now on when referring to the Ministry of Education and Culture. English abbreviation does not exist.

⁴ Abbreviation used from now on when referring to the Foundation for Cultural Policy Research.

In these documents, collaboration has been emphasized as a very important mode of action in theatres, both now and in the future. In the memorandum by OKM it is noted that there has been abundantly collaboration between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies but it has remained as one-time-realization (Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000,10). In theatres subsidized by law collaboration has been realized with schools and day-care centers, festivals and events, other legally subsidized theatres, institutions of art education, independent groups and other culture institutions. However, according to Cupore's report published in 2006, only fifth of the theatre institutions would especially like to develop collaboration with independent theatre groups. (Kanerva and Ruusuvirta 33–34)

Accordingly, independent companies have collaborated with theatres subsidized by law, both municipal and independent theatres, but it is stated that smaller theatres subsidized by law are more actively collaborating with independent companies than the institutions. (Kanerva and Ruusuvirta, 61) This already implies that there are some issues which challenge collaboration between municipal theatres and independent companies. In relation to the reports by OKM and Cupore it is worth mentioning that when speaking of independent companies there are no distinctions made between theatre and dance companies. Therefore, what is here presented about collaboration between municipal theatres and independent companies cannot be considered as fully compatible with collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies. In the following paragraphs I will describe generally what kind of forms of collaboration there mostly has been between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies; what kind of challenges there has been acknowledged, and what needs to be considered when embarking upon collaboration.

2.1 Previous Experiences On Collaboration: Forms and Challenges

According to the level of the engagement of the organizations, collaborations are either informal or formal. Generally the difference between informal and formal forms of collaboration is defined by how much the collaborating organizations have to change their usual ways of operating. For example, sharing information and office spaces through networking are considered as informal forms of collaborations as participating

organizations can still be operating quite separately. As a contrast, formal collaborations involve exchanging information and sharing organizations' resources for mutual benefits by changing the ways of operation. Such collaborations are, for example, called as alliances, joint programs or ventures and partnerships. (Acar and Guo 343; Roberts 26–27) Most common ways of collaboration between theatres have been joint productions, or independent group performing in a theatre subsidized by law as part of theatre's production or as visiting group with own production. These are formal forms of collaboration between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies. Collaboration is also realized as theatre loaning its properties such as costumes for independent groups. (Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000, 10) This refers to more informal forms of collaboration as it does not entail changes in the basic activities of the collaborating theatres.

Neither one of the two reports by OKM and Cupore, discussed this far, distinguishes whether collaboration has been realized with theatre or dance companies. Collaboration between municipal theatres and especially independent dance companies is briefly addressed within a memorandum discussing the conditions and future of dance (Tanssitaidepoliittisen työryhmän muistio 24:1999) published in 1999 by OKM. It suggests the sharing of performance spaces of municipal theatres as a form of collaboration with independent dance companies (Tanssitaidepoliittisen työryhmän muistio 24:1999, 37). Sharing of performance spaces would mean that the performances by independent dance companies are part of the repertoire of the municipal theater. This would entail changes in the basic activities of both the theatres and dance companies; therefore it is a formal form of collaboration. However, the memorandum does not report if this or any other kind of more formal form of collaboration has happened between the two types of arts organizations. Additionally, collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies has not been extensively researched after this report, which eventually suggests that collaboration is very rare.

This might be partly explained by the issues which are acknowledged as challenges in previous collaborations according to Cupore's report. In Cupore's report these challenges are mentioned to be adjusting timetables and artistic visions as well as dealing with copyright issues (Kanerva and Ruusuvirta 33–34). Additionally, in the memorandum by OKM it is mentioned that in some cases the independent companies collaborating with institutions have experienced that they have been left under the

artistic and financial rule of the theatre subsidized by law. This is especially the case with dance companies which have participated in theatres' own productions such as musicals. (Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000, 11) A quote by choreographer Katarina McAlester in the memorandum on the conditions and future of dance further supports the experience of inequality in collaboration. According to McAlester, often when choreographers and dancers are part of municipal theatre's own production they are not equally appreciated to directors and actors, although the work is the same. (Tanssitaidepoliittisen työryhmän muistio 24:1999, 37)

Such experiences on previous collaborations and their challenges imply that municipal theatres and independent dance companies might have different views on how to collaborate and produce performances, or what resources they have for building formal collaboration, which would equally benefit both. This is supported by the findings of Chao Guo and Muhittin Acar (2010) in an article discussing the forms of collaboration among nonprofit organizations. They present as their main finding that

An organization is more likely to develop formalized collaborations when it is older, has larger budget size, receives government funding but relies on fewer government funding streams, has more board linkages with other nonprofit organizations, and is not operating in the education and research or social service industry. (342)

Although Guo's and Acar's study is made with American non-profit organizations, in the context of municipal theatres and independent dance companies this suggests that theatres as older and more established organizations which rely on fewer government funding streams are accustomed to developing more formal forms of collaboration than dance companies, which are small organizations and have to rely on various streams of funding through government or private foundations. This also implies that because of having to rely on various streams of funding dance companies might not have possibilities to develop formal forms of collaboration.

With regard to public funding it is worth noting that since 2001 there has been available government funding also for collaborations between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies⁵. When speaking of public funding for collaboration, Guo and Acar emphasize that when collaboration is encouraged by government funding

⁵ According to an e-mail received from Katri Santtila on 13.1.2011

it may result into more formal types of collaborative activities. Additionally, they contend that the development of more intensive collaboration, which exceeds organizational boundaries, is prevented when government grants are compartmentalized. This is especially the case when nonprofit organizations have several funding streams. (Acar and Guo 347) This further suggests that the differences in the funding streams of theatres and dance companies challenge the development of collaboration between them.

This also makes one to consider the effectiveness of the funding for collaborations between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies, which is annually distributed by the Ministry of Education and Culture. For example, in 2010 all together 11 collaborative efforts between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies applied for the funding. Three of them received it. One of these was collaboration between a municipal theatre and an independent dance company. However, among the applicants, it was also the only one between a theatre institution and a dance company.⁶ This indicates that although government pursues to encourage the theatres subsidized by law and independent companies into collaboration through providing funding the scarcity of this funding might not encourage the development of more constant practice of collaboration. Eventually as government funding it also places certain conditions on collaboration. Therefore, it is essential that the interest to collaborate between theatres and dance companies comes first from the organizations themselves and not because there is public funding available. I end this chapter discussing what needs to be considered when developing collaboration between organizations from different backgrounds.

2.2 Equally Beneficial Collaboration: Focus on Organizations' Local Knowledge

According to Patsy Healey (2007), in collaboration the differences between what are considered as problems and solutions, and what people value and care about, emerge in various forms. To anticipate these differences one needs to keep in mind that the existing cultures and relations of collaborating organizations cannot be ignored.

⁶ According to documents received by e-mail from Helena Vilokinen, from the Registry of the Ministry of Education and Culture on 3.8.2010

Ultimately, collaboration has to be built on mutual trust which means that each participant's local culture and knowledge should be learned and respected. There needs to be considered how collaboration relates to the culture of each organization, which again raises questions about the consistency of core values, purpose, goals, and vision between the organizations. Although, organizations have similar goals they might have different ways of achieving them. (Healey 263–264; Phills 140–141) Consistency of artistic views, values and objectives are acknowledged as essential in collaboration between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies (Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000, 11, 12; Kanerva and Ruusuvirta 33, 35). This suggests that challenges for developing more constant practice of collaboration rise mainly from somewhere else than artistic values and objectives.

Therefore, as Healey emphasizes, when embarking upon collaboration and pursuing for common agreement on problems and how to do things attention should be actively paid on the breaks in the relations of the organizations. This includes focusing on the contexts of the organizations, how they speak of each other and who they either include or exclude in the situation. Additionally, to achieve common agreement includes reflection between the local knowledge of each participant and how understandings and valuings are developed between the collaborating parties. Finally, Healey argues that collaboration and the pursuit of common agreement is “a field of struggle, in which those who have power may easily control access, routines and style.” Therefore the arguments of the actors involved should be evaluated critically “in terms of their comprehensibility, integrity, legitimacy and truth”⁷. (Healey 264–265)

In terms of my work this suggests that one should focus on what is the context of operation for theatres and dance companies; how the context influences and is reflected in their operations and relations to other actors of the field. In addition, the findings by Guo and Acar suggest that the differences in public funding create different conditions for developing formal or informal forms of collaboration. Therefore, it is essential to consider how cultural policy and public funding define the context for producing art

⁷ Healey refers to communicative ethics by Jürgen Habermas (*The Theory of Communicative Action: Vol 1*, 1984). According to Healey, Habermas derives these principles from a notion of ideal speech situation. Habermas believes that in every communicative act speakers and hearers judge each other's sincerity from their own standing and point of view in relation to the issue. (Healey 266) Habermas' theory of communicative action is too extensive for the purposes of my study, but the part which Healey applies supports the notion that the context where individuals come from cannot be ignored in collaboration.

works in municipal theatres and independent dance companies. I will use the concepts of organizational field and art worlds for defining how influences coming both in and outside of the two types of art organizations enable and constrain the actions, relations and production of art works. I consider that with the help of these concepts it is possible to define what the context of operation for municipal theatres and independent dance companies is, what kind of institutional pressures it places upon them and what kind of conventions are maintained.

3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: DEFINING THE CONTEXT FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ART

Both the concepts of organizational field and art worlds acknowledge that organizations and people within them produce products, services and art works by being in interaction with other organizations and people, as well as with authorities and legitimating bodies. According to the definition of organizational field, it is characteristic that interacting organizations who manage with the same information load, and share the notion of working on a common ground, form hierarchies and coalitions. In other words, have relationships of different level. However, although, organizations acknowledge that they are working on a common ground, they are also competing with each other. Each organization has its aspirations for resources and customers as well as for political, institutional, social and economic status. As a result each agent in an organizational field has own views on how the field should be structured and, therefore, both creates, shapes and constrains possibilities for action through their own activities. Eventually, the notions on how to act within a field are influenced both by the organizations themselves and the authorities, cultural conceptions or political views of the field. (DiMaggio and Powell 64–65, 66; Scott 171–174)

Similarly the concept of art worlds by Howard S. Becker (2008) emphasizes that art worlds are formed by people who are in some way or another involved in the production of an art work. Characteristic for art world is the cooperative activity of its members. These members come from different art forms and are in interaction by either applying or producing resources for each other and competing for audiences and financial support. Therefore works of art are joint productions which are done according to particular notions on how to make and produce an art work in certain art world. As a quite extensive concept art worlds do not have boundaries but are varyingly independent in relation to the state and other organizations in society. (Becker 35–36, 38)

Therefore, in the context of Finnish art world and performing arts, all the art organizations and individuals, who in some way or another participate in the production of performances for audiences, form the field of performing arts of Finland. This entails that they have cooperative links through which works of art are produced. Finnish

municipal theatres and independent dance companies are part of this field by producing performances for which they want to get audiences. They also have to manage with the same information load created within the field by themselves and other agents of the field, which they are dependent on. In addition, they are aware of each other and time to time interact in different ways. However, the cooperative networks of the production of their performances do not seem to include involvement with each others as a practice. This implies that they have their own notions of how to produce performances and those do not include active interaction with each other.

Although, Becker speaks of art worlds and DiMaggio and Powell of organizational fields their concepts for defining what the context for art organization's operations is correlate to each other. Both suggest that interaction with other organizations and legitimating bodies influence the ways of operating and thinking. This interaction produces different kind of pressures which eventually both enable and constrain their operations. In the following paragraphs I discuss how production of art works is enabled and constrained according to the concepts of organizational field and art worlds.

3.1 Organizational Fields and Art Worlds: Constraining the Production of Art

Central theme in both of these concepts is that actions for producing either products, services or art works are guided and constrained by the culture, taken for granted beliefs and established conventions of the field. In addition, the demands by the state and central agents such as legitimating bodies and professions shape the ways to operate within the field. (DiMaggio and Powell 27; Becker 38) Therefore, here same issues are emphasized that already were stressed in relation to developing collaboration. That is, when considering the actions of an organization, the context where it operates cannot be ignored (Powell 188). This implies that the surrounding environment influences the operations and actions of organizations.

In Becker's definition of art worlds, works of art are produced by the members of art world by following conventions which are generally acknowledged as good. Producing art works according to established conventions influences how art organizations operate. (Becker 34) In the definition of organizational field by Paul J.

DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell (1991) operations of organizations are structured by institutional effects which result into homogenizing organizations in the field.

DiMaggio and Powell call this institutional isomorphism which “is a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions” (DiMaggio and Powell 66). Basically this means that when producing art works, art organizations and people in them are faced with institutional pressures which come both inside and outside of the organizations and their fields. Therefore, if art works are produced according to conventions, as Becker suggests, it can be assumed that these conventions are strengthened by institutional pressures. DiMaggio and Powell as well as Scott define these institutional pressures as coercive, mimetic and normative (DiMaggio & Powell 67; Scott, *Institutions and Organizations* 33–35). In the following paragraphs of this chapter I will clarify what these institutional pressures are, and what does it mean to produce art works according to certain conventions.

3.2 Institutional Coercive, Mimetic and Normative Pressures

When the possibilities to operate in a certain organizational field are considered from institutional point of view, it is argued that organizations aim for the support of other organizations and agencies in the field. In order to become legitimized and get an access to the resources of the society, the values which organizations present have to be consistent with the values of the surrounding society. Scott maintains that in institutional environments organizations are rewarded for establishing correct structures and processes, not for the quantity and quality of their outputs. However, when adjusting to the requirements of the field, organizations do not just passively accept what is given to them. They actively decide which relations, ways of operating, values and objectives they are going to pick and accommodate from the surrounding environment. (Scott, “Unpacking” 167–169, 170) Nevertheless, although organizations are relatively active and free to decide how to operate, the actions of other organizations and legitimating bodies affect their decisions. In situations of uncertainty and constraint organizations may feel forced, intrigued or guided to act in ways which lead to homogeneity in structure, culture and output (DiMaggio and Powell 64). This is encouraged by coercive, mimetic and normative pressures which every field contains.

Coercive pressures can be both formal and informal depending on the source. Government mandate and common legal circumstances, agencies and associations of which organizations are dependent, and interaction with other more hierarchical organizations place coercive pressures on organizations. Organizations which are affected by and dependent on the decisions and actions of previous mentioned agents begin to reflect their demands. For example, associations and agencies can have certain grounds for providing grants and subsidies for organizations, which then pursue for fulfilling them. In addition, when being dependent on interaction with more institutionalized actors of the field, organizations may feel obliged to follow certain ways of action in order to establish themselves as legitimate partners. (DiMaggio and Powell 67–68; Scott, “Unpacking” 177)

Mimetic pressures are placed on organizations especially in uncertain circumstances which encourage organizations to imitate other more successfully operating organizations. For example, ambiguous goals and poor understanding on organization's processes can result into uncertainty. Therefore, modeling one's operations after more legitimate actors of the field can provide a solution but eventually create homogenous organizations. DiMaggio and Powell also argue that much homogeneity in organizational structures results from the fact that there are only few alternative ways of doing things. When new organizations emerge in the field they follow the practices of more established ones for securing their possibilities for success. (DiMaggio and Powell 70)

Last but not least, normative pressures rise from shared conceptions, symbols and beliefs which are rooted in the cultural framework of the field and therefore influence organization's operations. In other words organization's operations have to support the cultural symbols, beliefs and values which are shared by the individuals in an organization. Scott states that “Cultural controls can substitute for structural controls”. This means that certain conceptions, procedures and beliefs are taken for granted when they do not need to be “formally encoded into the organizational structure”. (Scott, “Unpacking” 181) Therefore, it can be assumed that successful maintenance of organizations operations entails conforming to generally acknowledged rules, values and beliefs. Eventually, organizations operating in the same field begin to resemble each other.

In relation to this, professionalization has central role in maintaining long

established rules and defining the ways of acting and thinking, which should be followed in every situation. The norms, beliefs and values maintained by professions are usually generated in the institutions providing the education of the field. They are further reinforced in the work of professional associations and unions, as well as through the selection of personnel and board members of the central organizations of the field. Especially in the field of nonprofit organizations DiMaggio and Powell maintain that the directors of the organizations apply for and are given positions in the associations and councils which again structure the field through their activities. Finally, because of the normative pressures of the field, organizations are likely to become rewarded for realizing operations and structures which are regarded as good and correct and similar to other organizations in the field. (DiMaggio and Powell 71, 72–73)

To summarize, coercive, mimetic and normative pressures for municipal theatres and independent dance companies are generated by legal and cultural political decisions, government agencies and foundations, professions of both art forms, and uncertainties on both fields. Eventually, coercive, mimetic and normative pressures result into strengthening certain conventions in both theatres and dance companies. In the following paragraphs I will clarify how conventions of art worlds introduced by Becker constrain and enable the operations of art organizations.

3.3 Conventions of Producing Art Works

Becker argues that the involvement with and dependence on other agents of art world during the production of an art work places constraints on artistic work. In other words, in the production of art works one needs to deal with the conventions and standards of institutions. In simplistic terms this means that if artists want to get their works performed in existing institutions, they have to conform to the conventional boundaries of the institutions. If they do not want to conform to these conventions they need to find alternative ways to get their works to be performed to audiences, which again require extra time, energy and money. (Becker 27-28) In the context of municipal theatres and independent dance companies this would mean that if dance companies want to perform in municipal theatres they would need to be aware of the relevant conventions related to producing performances in institutions. Further this suggests, that

as independent dance companies have not performed in institutions, they might have different conventions to produce their performances, and performing in institutions might be even experienced too constraining.

Becker describes the conventions of the production of art works as standardized means of production, which enable easier and faster production of art works. According to him, conventions become standardized and taken for granted when everyone in the making of art work, from the artist to support personnel, knows what each one's task is and in which order. This can be almost described as automation of artistic production in which, instead of every time starting a fresh, people follow previous agreements and familiar ways of doing things. Conventions also include conceptions on what kind of art should be done in certain surroundings, in which way and to whom it is appropriate to present. Finally, one becomes familiar with the conventions of certain art form by becoming professional and engaging in the daily practices of that art form. (Becker 29, 55–56, 63)

Becker also notes that conventions can be flexible and give room to negotiation, if things want to be done differently. However, one small thing cannot be done differently in isolation from other activities to which it affects. Therefore, working according to conventions does not prevent unconventional work, but producing new kind of work becomes more difficult and costly in time and money, and can be only done when the required resources are found. Therefore, changing conventions might be experienced too challenging, which prevents operation differently than before. Eventually, established conventions also play a role in the production of unconventional work. In other words, often the communication in the production of an artwork happens by utilizing conventional expressions, which are familiar to everyone. (Becker 30–32, 57)

In the context of municipal theatres and independent dance companies this suggests that the production of performances is subject to conventions rising from their fields. Combined with the concepts of institutional coercive, mimetic and normative pressures, it can be considered that production conventions are products of these pressures. In institutional theory actions of state and professions are considered to be the main producers of institutional pressures which result into homogenizing organizations within a field (DiMaggio & Powell 64, Scott, *Institutions and Organizations* 93). In terms of this, it is worth acknowledging that homogeneity in the operations of

organizations within particular field eventually result into deteriorating the field. James A. Phillips (2007) considers that the decisions relating to funding and regulations of the field by government and private foundations are the main deteriorating forces, when the effects of the decisions are unintended and poorly understood. For example, funding decision which emphasizes particular trends can result into over capacity of organizations which follow these trends, and eventually weaken the diversity of the organizations in the field. (Phillips 144–145)

When speaking of Finnish municipal theatres and independent dance companies I consider cultural policy as the main producer of institutional pressures. By defining the main funding streams for both art institutions and organizations cultural policy influences their operations and eventually sustains the conventions of defining the function of theatres and dance companies and their ways of producing art works. Furthermore, following the results of the study by Guo and Acar, that public funding streams influence the form and content of collaboration in non-profit organizations, it is essential to regard cultural policy as part of the context of operation for theatres and dance companies. Cultural policy also combines together both the actions of state and professions which further create pressures and strengthen conventions. Therefore, in the following chapter I will discuss how cultural policy influences the context of art organization's operations.

4 CULTURAL POLICY AS AN AGENT IN THE PRODUCTION OF ART

Through its laws, regulations and government agencies, state participates in the operations of organizations in a field. Becker names state as one of the agencies in the networks of producing art works. State's participation in the production of artworks involves regulating art organization's operations through the work of government agencies and providing organizational forms and arenas for the settlement of disputes. Additionally, by defining property rights it controls the production and consumption of art works as well as secures part of artist's incomes, and supports his or her reputation. In the context of this work, state's involvement with the production of art works through providing financial support is the most important form of activity. By allocating public funding for artists and art organizations, state both enables and limits the possibilities to produce art works. Therefore, artists and art organizations are dependent on the state, and this is included in their work. (Becker 191)

With regard to art fields, state's participation becomes well illustrated in its cultural policy. State defines the streams of funding for art, artists and art organizations. Therefore, in the context of cultural policy, art, artists and art organizations are addressed from the point of view what governments, and other stakeholders, regard as best for the people of the nation and as a base for identity building (Duelund 13). This becomes well illustrated in Finnish cultural policy. According to Merja Heikkinen (2003), state support for artists in Finland has a long history as linked to the building of national identity (*The Nordic Model* 41). As a result, as Peter Duelund (2003) argues, decisions are based on what values dominant stakeholders consider as good and important for the society, and what they want to promote. Therefore, cultural political means, such as legislation statements, administration and financing forms and other direct or indirect tools for promoting and funding the arts, provide conditions for the production and consumption of art in certain context. (Duelund 13–14) Heikkinen (2007) also notes that because the terms of granting state support are defined in public policy, it also reflects what is generally valued as art (*Valtion taitelijatuki*, 225).

In addition to state and government agencies, there are various other stakeholders within the framework of cultural policy. Art institutions, the public, professional artists themselves, amateurs, the social and educational sector and international bodies, such as the EU and UNESCO, have their own interests towards art

and culture (Duelund 14–15). In the context of this work the relations between state agencies, art institutions and professional artists in Finnish cultural policy are of special interest. As Scott argues, the professionals of the field can affect the ways of operating by defining principles and guidelines for action and by defending their claims through participating in the decision-making bodies. This is enabled by the state agencies which ask for the recommendations of the professional associations and practitioners of the field. (*Institutions and Organizations* 95–96). Cultural policy provides an arena for this kind of interaction between the state and professional artists.

4.1 Finnish Cultural Policy as an Arena of Interaction

In the context of Finnish cultural policy this becomes well illustrated. The main decision-making bodies responsible for distributing state support for artists and art organizations, such as independent dance companies, are the National Art Councils and the Arts Council of Finland, in which the members of each art field serve as experts. (Heikkinen, *The Nordic Model* 42). The state support for art institutions, such as municipal theatres, is distributed by the decisions of the Ministry of Education and Culture and according to the Theatres and Orchestras Act⁸. Heikkinen notes that the National Arts Councils are in close relations to the Ministry of Education and Culture. The interests of different stakeholders of cultural policy are represented through the members of the arts councils, who are experts proposed by the major cultural and art organizations and institutions in each field. They are nominated by the Government for three year periods. (Heikkinen, *The Nordic Model* 42, 49)

The National Arts Councils represent the expertise of their art fields and allocate the support according to artistic quality and peer evaluation (Heikkinen, *Valtion taiteilijatuki* 225–226). Heikkinen notes that this creates the most institutionalized interaction between the artistic fields and cultural policy by generating administrative definitions for art and artists, according to which the support is allocated. Eventually, the definitions of publicly supported art also reflect the professional definitions of the art fields. Therefore, the art field can influence the decision making bodies, but eventually these bodies have an impact on the art fields. (Heikkinen, *Valtion*

⁸ Teatteri- ja orkesterilaki 3.8.1992/730

taiteilijatuki 229–230) The allocation of state support for municipal theatres according to the Theatres and Orchestras Act differs so that, instead of peer evaluation, the amount of the state subsidy is defined according to the unit price of person years in the theatres. (Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä 2003:13, 17)

Basically this suggests that the differences in the streams of state support and on what terms it is allocated produces different institutional pressures for municipal theatres and independent dance companies. This is supported by Scott's argument that, although organizations are facing institutional pressures their environments are not congruent. This results into more complex ways of acting in environments which are more fragmented. (Scott, *Institutions and Organizations* 116) Therefore, if the field of independent dance companies is more fragmented in terms of authorities and funding streams then it can be assumed that their ways of acting differ from those of municipal theatres'. Becker also acknowledges that sometimes art worlds can be so fragmented that they become divided into subgroups which have their own and different conventions (61).

This is something which I consider that defines the situation of Finnish field of performing arts. The differences in public funding for different art organizations divides the field of performing arts in Finland into theatres and dance companies which get the statutory support and theatres and dance companies which have to rely on discretionary support by the National Arts Councils. In other words, Finnish cultural policy, through different funding streams, creates contexts of operations which include different institutional pressures for municipal theatres and independent dance companies.

Additionally, Scott states that strategies are institutionally shaped. Organizations' responses to institutional pressures become included in their ways of acting, which eventually become generally acknowledged as appropriate ways of acting, and thus conventions in certain field. (Scott, *Institutions and Organizations* 124–125) Therefore, it can be assumed that, the context which cultural policy and public funding provide for municipal theatres and independent dance companies maintains certain conventions which are followed in order to keep the operations viable. In other words, the artistic work within municipal theatres and independent dance companies is constrained by coercive, mimetic and normative pressures, which sustain established production conventions. Eventually this places challenges on developing collaboration with these art organizations who are subject to different kind of coercive, mimetic and normative

pressures, and have different conventions.

4.2 Summary: Challenges for Collaboration in Theory

In the theoretical framework of the thesis I have discussed how production of art works is defined according to the concepts of organizational fields and art worlds, and how cultural policy and public funding influence the context of operations. On the basis of this discussion, it can be summarized that the operations of theatres and dance companies are structured by cultural policy and public funding, which create uncertainties and strengthen the taken for granted norms and conventions. When the two types of art organizations are funded through different financing streams, they have developed different ways to deal with institutional pressures. Therefore they also differ as organizations. Eventually municipal theatres and independent dance companies operate quite separately and have own context of operation within the field of performing arts of Finland.

On the basis of this, both organizations have different institutional pressures which homogenize their operations by maintaining existing conventions. As mentioned earlier, homogeneity in operations can result into deteriorating the field by creating over capacity of similar kind of art organizations. According to Phills, the deterioration of the field can be prevented through collaboration where the agents of the field aim at collectively changing their conditions to operate in the field. (Phills 142–143) Similarly Healey argues that power relations can be changed through collaboration. This, however, cannot happen if there is lack of trust and confidence in the relations between the agents who come from different cultural contexts, have different identities and systems of meaning. (Healey 263) In order to succeed in developing collaboration which would change the conditions of the field, and prevent it from deteriorating, there should be shared interest among the participants. Also conflicting or competitive interests should be solved for obtaining the support of all the members and the external legitimating and funding bodies of the field. (Phills 148). Finally, the creation of more formal ways of collaboration between theatres and dance companies would entail changes in the production conventions of both organizations.

Changing production conventions to include more formal collaboration might be

experienced as expensive in time and money. Therefore, theatres and dance companies might find it challenging and time consuming to collaborate together. As a result they mostly do things as before within their own context, and in collaboration with those organizations with who they are used to. Although there might be will and future plans to collaborate more it is difficult and expensive as it would involve changes in many other conventions of doing things.

Although, institutional theories on organizational fields and art worlds do not provide any practical suggestions for collaboration, they help to define what is the context where theatres and dance companies operate. When the context influences how different organizations function, it cannot be ignored when developing collaboration. Therefore, the theoretical discussion of this work suggests that the development of constant practice of collaboration between theatres and dance companies is challenged by the differences in the context of operations, and thus also by institutional pressures and conventions of operations. The differences are maintained by different funding streams, which result into producing institutional pressures and maintaining different production conventions. With regard to collaboration this implies that there might be some contradictions in the relations and ways of operating between the theatres and dance companies. In the empirical part of this work I aim to illustrate what kind of institutional pressures the context of operations places upon the two art organizations, and what this implies for their ways of operating and eventually for collaboration. Furthermore, I will analyze how these pressures are reflected throughout the interviews and in interviewees' ways of defining their art organization's function, repertoire and relations to other organizations.

5 EMPIRICAL STUDY

As the method for answering the research questions of this study I have chosen qualitative research interview. In this chapter I will shortly introduce this method, the material of the study and how the study was realized. Additionally, I will discuss the validity and reliability of the study. I base this discussion on methodological literature by Steinar Kvale (1996), Jari Eskola and Juha Suoranta (2001), Uwe Flick (2002) and Sirkka Hirsjärvi and Helena Hurme (2008).

5.1 Qualitative Research Interviewing

The subject of this study, theoretical framework and research questions guided the decision to conduct qualitative research. The theoretical framework suggests that the context of operations places institutional pressures upon municipal theatres and independent dance companies. These pressures are assumed to further strengthen existing conventions of defining the function, building of repertoire and having relations to other organizations. By strengthening existing conventions institutional pressures tend to homogenize organizations which are subject to the same kind of context of operation. For analyzing whether this kind of situation challenges collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies qualitative research method is most relevant. Therefore, semi-structured interviews on what is the current situation of municipal theatres and independent dance companies provide the material for this study. From the material I analyze how institutional pressures influence on and are reflected in the operations of interviewed art organizations. I will also define what kind of conventions both organizations have.

Within the scope of this study I will only concentrate on defining the conventions of defining the function, repertoire and relations of the two types of art organizations. Thorough analysis of the existing conventions and how they reflect institutional pressures entails deep descriptions on these operations. As Kvale argues, the interview conversation has the ability to capture various views on the subject of the study from interviewees own point of view. Kvale also introduces different aspects of qualitative research interview which further provide a premise for my decision to

conduct the study as qualitative research. In qualitative interview the object of interest is interviewee's own experiences about the central themes of the study, and what meanings are given to them. In other words, the objective is to gain qualitative knowledge through obtaining descriptions on how the interviewees experience the themes of the study in their life. With regard to this it is acknowledged that the answers are subjective and cannot be generalized. In addition, the interviewee statements can sometimes be ambiguous, reflecting contradictions in the world the subject lives in. (Kvale 27, 30–31)

All these notions are essential in terms of my study. In the interviews I have concentrated on themes of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, values and purposes, artistic visions, repertoire decisions, relations and collaboration. In other words, what is the function of municipal theatre or independent dance company, how it is realized in terms of the artistic work, and what kind of relations they have to other agents of the art field. For interpreting the existing conventions of these operations and how institutional pressures are reflected, I am interested in the qualitative descriptions provided by the directors of the art organizations. Conclusions of the study provide some direction for defining what kind of issues should be considered when either the cultural policy makers or theatres and dance companies themselves aim for creating collaboration and face challenges in it.

However, with regard to the conclusions, it is worth mentioning, that qualitative research does not pursue for statistical generalizations. Instead, qualitative research aims for describing and understanding certain events and actions or providing theoretically reasonable interpretation on certain phenomenon. (Eskola and Suoranta 61) In the context of this study, firstly I aim for describing and understanding three central issues: what kind of context of operations theatres and dance companies have; what kind of institutional pressures they have; what kind of conventions there are in defining the function, repertoire and relations of these art organizations. Secondly, I provide with the help of institutional theories an interpretation on how these issues challenge collaboration between the two art organizations. Therefore, when speaking of the material of the study, the issue that matters is the quality and not the quantity of it. In the following paragraph I will introduce the material and realization of the study.

5.2 The Research Material and the Realization of the Study

In qualitative research, material helps the researcher to form an insight about the phenomenon under study. The aim is to construct theoretically strong point of views out of the material. Eskola and Suoranta, as well as Kvale, state that the amount of the material, in other words, how many interviewees there should be depends always on the subject and purpose of the study. Additionally, it is characteristic for qualitative research that theoretical grounds guide the decisions regarding the amount of the material. The study can be based on fairly small number of interviews as long as they are thoroughly analyzed. In qualitative research it is possible to have a sample group that is formed of as little as one interviewee up to as many as are required to reach the point of saturation. Reaching the point of saturation means that conducting more interviews will not provide any new information regarding the subject of the study. (Eskola and Suoranta 18, 61–62; Kvale 102)

As the sample for the study I chose four different theatres and dance companies around Finland. For gaining an insight into the institutional pressures and existing conventions I chose to interview the directors of these art organizations. By interviewing directors, I aim to explore how their ways of defining the function, repertoire and relations to other organizations reflect institutional pressures and existing conventions. Therefore, I chose not to conduct this study as a case study of already realized collaboration between certain theatre and dance company. Furthermore, I considered important that the sample of the study represents the reality of Finnish art world, when speaking of theatre institutions and independent dance companies.

Therefore, I included in the sample theatres who vary in size and governance form. With regard to the independent dance companies, I selected interviewees among the ones whose companies are well-established and receive the discretionary operational subsidy by the National Council for Dance. Additionally, I selected interviewees in various parts of Finland as I wanted to take into account regional differences between the theatres and dance companies. Eventually, this provides for analysis on how the context of operation defined by cultural policy and public funding places same institutional pressures upon the organizations, in spite of where they are located.

As interviewees I selected the directors of municipal theatres and artistic directors of independent dance companies. Being responsible for defining what the

functions, repertoires and relations of their organizations are, I consider that these directors are equivalent to each other as representatives of their organizations. One of the theatres has two directors of whom I interviewed both. One of the dance companies also has two artistic directors, but due to time constraints I was able to interview only one of them. In one of the dance companies I also interviewed the managing director for gaining some additional information to the answers of the artistic director. However, later I decided not to use the interview because it did not provide any essential additional information and, within the scope of this study, I decided to concentrate on the views of the artistic director.

All together I made ten interviews during November and December 2010 and January 2011 of which I used nine. Next I will shortly describe the theatres and dance companies whose directors I interviewed. I have decided not to mention the names of the theatres and dance companies or the names of the interviewees for the sake of confidentiality and anonymity. Therefore, I will only mention the governance form and size of the theatres. At the moment municipal theatres differ from one another with regard to the governance form. Some are operating as non-profit limited companies and some are still fully owned by their municipalities. However, they all have a background as fully owned by the municipality in some point of their operations. When selecting the dance companies I regarded the ones who had received the operational subsidy during 2009 and 2010. Later I also looked whether the selected dance companies had received the subsidy earlier. Therefore, I will mention since when the dance companies have been receiving the operational subsidy. (“Tanssitaide”)⁹ For clarifying how their operations differ I will also mention if the dance companies are presenting only the choreographies by their artistic directors or also choreographies from other dance artists. For distinguishing interviewees' statements in the text, this information is also included in parenthesis after each quotation.

First one of the interviewed theatre directors works in a medium-sized municipal theatre which operates at the moment as non-profit limited company. Second interviewed theatre director shares the directorship of a medium-sized theatre which operates as regional theatre. This theatre is administered by an association formed by the municipalities of the region. Third interviewed theatre director works for a big

⁹ According to documents downloaded from the web page of the National Council for Dance <<http://www.taiteenkeskustoimikunta.fi>>, date of access 28.9.2010.

municipal theatre which is fully owned by the municipality. Fourth interviewed theatre director is the other one of the directors working for medium-sized regional theatre. Finally, the fifth theatre director works also in a big municipal theatre which is fully owned by the municipality. In spite of the form of the ownership or governance of the theatre, each of them has municipal administrators in their boards. They also have theatre buildings, two to three stages and permanent artistic, production and administrative staff.

First one of the interviewed artistic directors works for an independent dance company which has been receiving the operational subsidy since 2008 and presents only the choreographies of its director. Second interviewed artistic director works for a dance company, which has been receiving the operational subsidy since 2008, but presents performances also from other choreographers than its director. Third interviewed artistic director works in a dance company which has been receiving operational subsidy since 2003. The dance company has in its repertoire also performances from other choreographers than its artistic director. Finally, the fourth interviewed artistic director shares the directorship with other choreographer of their dance company. The dance company has been receiving operational subsidy since 2003 and presents only choreographies by both of its artistic directors. As mentioned earlier, I was able to interview only one of the artistic directors of this dance company.

With regard to dance companies' facilities, only one has own performance space and three others have to rent performance spaces. Each of the dance companies is employing the artistic director, producer and technical manager, either full- or part-time. Other artistic and production staff is mostly employed for each production. Each of the dance companies has an association as supporting organizations. The boards of these associations include mainly artistic directors as chairman and from two to five other members. Only the second one of interviewed artistic directors whose company produces performances also from other choreographers is not a member in the supporting association, but is employed by the board.

Both the directors of theatres and artistic directors of dance companies were interviewed at their theatres and offices or working rooms. Only the other one of the two theatre directors of the same regional theatre was interviewed in university's premises because the interviewee was at that time working in Helsinki. Before interviewing I read the plan of operations and strategies of the art organizations in order

to familiarize myself with their operations. The interviews were conducted as semi-structured interviews. Following Kvale's introduction to qualitative research I conducted the interviews according to an interview guide. Each of the interviews was also recorded and transcribed. (Kvale 27) Before beginning the actual interviews I also tested the questions of the interview guide with two different managing directors of dance companies, one independent and one subsidized by law. I was also prepared to do more interviews if needed. However, after the ten preliminary agreed interviews it was clear that the point of saturation was reached with regard to the themes of this study.

The interview guide included suggested questions relating to the themes of the study (appendix 1). Questions ranged from defining the organization's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to describing values and purposes, artistic visions, repertoire decisions and the organizational field of the organizations. Interview guide was made when the theoretical framework and the formulation of the research questions were still under process. Due to this the interview guide also included questions on competitors, audiences and other services of the art organizations. At the later point of the analysis these questions proved to be outside the scope of the final research questions of the study. Questions regarding the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the organizations were first included as an opening for the conversation, and for gaining background information. With these questions the aim was also to define how interviewees regard the current situation and future of their organizations. During the analysis the answers to these questions proved to be very useful for defining how institutional pressures are reflected in theatres' and dance companies' current situation. They also provided preliminary themes for analyzing how institutional pressures influence the conventions of defining the function, repertoire and relations of the art organizations.

Questions dealing with the values and purposes of the art organizations aimed for gaining descriptions on why theatres and dance companies exist, and what is important in their work. Answers to these questions provided material for analyzing the existing conventions of how the directors define the function of their organizations, and how institutional pressures are reflected in this function. Accordingly, questions on artistic visions and repertoire decisions, and what influences them, provided material for the analysis of the prevailing conventions in repertoire decisions. Finally, questions

concerning the organizational field of theatres and dance companies aimed for gaining information on interviewees' relations to other organizations of the Finnish art world.

Due to the incompleteness of the theoretical framework during the interviews were made, this part of the interview guide was bit problematic. As an interviewer I had problems formulating questions firmly and clearly. Some of the interviewees had also problems understanding what is meant by the term “field”. Therefore, additional clarifying questions had to be made. In spite of these difficulties interviewees were able to provide useful material for analyzing what kind of conventions they have in their relations to other organizations. Therefore, during the interviews the scope of this part of the study became clearer. Final question in each interview concerned the future of the art organization. With this question the aim was to conclude the interview and gain possible additional material on the overall future ambitions of the interviewees. Answers to this question proved to be useful when analyzing the institutional pressures of the art organizations.

During each interview the atmosphere was relaxed and interviewees answered freely from their own point of view, and as they considered best. Questions followed certain order but there was enough freedom to change the order of the questions or place additional questions if needed. During the process of interviewing and analysis the preliminary research questions were revised and the scope of the study further limited. This is one of the characteristics of qualitative research. As Eskola and Suoranta remark, in qualitative research different stages of the research intertwine. In other words, the process does not follow beforehand defined steps, but the research plan and questions need to be revised during the collection and the analysis of the material. (16) The analysis and interpretation of institutional pressures and existing conventions is based on the transcriptions of the recorded interviews. In the following paragraph I will introduce the method of analysis.

5.3 The Method of Qualitative Analysis

In the analysis of qualitative material the objective is to produce new information on the subject of the study by clarifying the content of the material. On the one hand, the aim is to reveal, uncover or contextualize the statements in the text. This

increases the material of interpretation. On the other hand, the aim is to reduce the text by paraphrasing, summarizing or categorizing. (Eskola and Suoranta, 137; Flick 176) Kvale discerns three different parts through which the interpretation of the material is gained: the structuring of the material, the clarification of the material and the analysis of the material. According to Kvale the analysis of the material “involves developing the meanings of the interviews, bringing the subjects' own understandings into the light, as well as providing new perspectives from the researcher on the phenomena.” (190)

There are various methods and approaches to qualitative analysis of which Kvale introduces meaning condensation, categorization, narrative structuring, meaning interpretation and ad hoc methods (192–193). Eskola and Suoranta distinguish methods for qualitative analysis such as quantitative techniques, thematizing, typifying and discourse analysis (160). It is clear that there is no one right way to analyze qualitative texts. In relation to this Kvale states that ad hoc meaning generation is the most frequent form of interview analysis. In other words, the interview material is analyzed through the use of several different approaches and methods. Kvale, as well as Hirsjärvi and Hurme, refers to Miles and Huberman¹⁰ who introduce all together 13 different tactics for analyzing qualitative texts. Such methods are among others noting patterns and themes, seeing plausibility and clustering and making contrasts and comparisons. (Kvale 203–204; Hirsjärvi and Hurme 171–179). In this study the meaning of transcribed interview texts is generated by using this kind of ad hoc methods.

Suggested by Kvale, as well as Hirsjärvi and Hurme, tactics of thematizing and clustering as well as noting relations between variables and finding intervening variables are applied in the analysis of the material of this study (Kvale 204; Hirsjärvi and Hurme 173–174). In thematizing the interview material researcher pursues to find out issues which each of the interviewee shares in one way or another. Additionally, these issues or recurring themes relate to the preliminary themes set in the interview guide but also enlighten the topic of the study in new way. Successful thematizing entails interaction between the theoretical and empirical material of the study. In other words, the theory and empirical material should intertwine in the analysis and interpretation of the material. (Eskola and Suoranta 174–175; Hirsjärvi and Hurme 173) However, if the analysis of the material is only done by thematizing, the results of the

¹⁰ Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman, A. M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London: Sage.

study might end up being too superficial. Therefore, clustering, noting relations between variables and finding intervening variables are essential methods for achieving deep interpretation of the material. Clustering involves grouping the recurring themes under a common headline which represents certain issue relevant for the study. Finally, for reaching coherent interpretation the relations and connections between different clusters are considered. (Eskola and Suoranta 181; Hirsjärvi and Hurme, 149, 174)

In order to analyze how institutional pressures and existing conventions challenge collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies I looked for recurring themes throughout the interviews. In other words, what kind of similar issues each of the directors of theatres and dance companies emphasized with regard to strengths and weaknesses, threats and opportunities, values and purposes, ways of building repertoire and having relations to other agents of Finnish art world. I looked for recurring patterns and themes both expected and unexpected ones. Among the themes I chose few central ones which were present in every interview. I consider that these themes reflect how different institutional pressures influence the operations of the two types of art organizations.

As Hirsjärvi and Hurme state, noting and regarding what are the relations of the recurring themes to each other is the most essential part of the analysis (174). Therefore, I also consider in my analysis how the recurring themes both in terms of insitutional pressures and conventions relate to each other. In other words, I analyze what kind of recurring themes with regard to the conventions of defining the function of both art organizations reflect coercive, mimetic and normative pressure. Furthermore I analyze, what are the relations of these themes to conventions in defining the repertoire. Finally, the conventions of having relations to other actors, and how institutional pressures influence on it, are analyzed. On the basis of these connections I draw a conclusion on how institutional pressures and existing conventions challenge collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies. As already mentioned, the results of this study cannot be generalized to be characteristic of all collaborations between municipal theatres and independent dance companies. However, they provide implications for what kind of issues can challenge collaboration between the two and what should be considered when embarking upon collaboration.

5.4 The Evaluation of Qualitative Research: Reliability and Validity

In qualitative research the evaluation of the process and its results involves considering the reliability and validity of them. The interpretation of the material is reliable when there are no incongruous statements. In other words, the results of the research are consistent and the research is made as transparent as possible in terms of interviewees' and researcher's statements. In addition, the process of the research needs to be made explicit for comparison with other similar kind of studies. (Eskola and Suoranta 213; Kvale 235; Flick 220-221) With regard to this study, the process and results are made explicit by openly describing what are the preliminary assumptions based on theoretical concepts, and which of the interviewee statements are equivalent to these notions. The presentation of the analysis and results of the study are made in such a way that reader is able to separate writer's interpretations from interviewee's statements. Throughout the presentation of the analysis of the material it is described and noted if there were some inconsistencies in terms of how interviewees understood the questions and how this affects the interpretation of the material.

Accordingly, validity of a qualitative research is assessed by paying attention to the relations made by the researcher between the material and its interpretation, whether the interpretation made is correct in relation to what is said by the interviewee (Flick 222). In terms of this, Eskola and Suoranta distinguish two different ways of defining the validity of a qualitative research: internal validity and external validity. Internal validity refers to the consistency of the theoretical and conceptual definitions. In other words, the theoretical basis and methodological decisions must be in logical relation to each other. This relation I have discussed in previous paragraphs of this chapter. External validity refers to the ability of researcher's interpretation to describe the object of the study exactly as it is in reality. (Eskola and Suoranta 213) In this study the external validity is supported by describing the interviewees and interviewing process and including original quotations for illustrating the interpretations. However, in terms of this it is worth mentioning that interviews were made in Finnish whereas in this study I have translated quotations into English. I have pursued to maintain the original content of the quotations in the translations and original Finnish quotations are included in an appendix (appendix 2).

In the following chapters I will present the analysis and interpretation of the

material provided by interviews with the directors of theatres and dance companies. In this discussion theoretical concepts of institutional coercive, mimetic and normative pressures and conventions of producing art works are intertwined with the recurring themes of the interviews. As mentioned earlier in relation to collaborative planning, embarking upon collaboration demands paying attention to the relations, context and local knowledge of the collaborating actors (Healey 264-265). Therefore, I aim at interpreting from the interviews how the context of operation and institutional pressures are reflected, what kind of existing conventions they maintain when defining the function, repertoire and relations of interviewed organizations.

Firstly, I will clarify this by discussing more closely the context of operations for both municipal theatres and independent dance companies in terms of the cultural political background and public funding. I will analyze what kind of institutional pressures municipal theatres and independent dance companies deal with and how these are illustrated through the interviews. Secondly, I will analyze what kind of local knowledge both organizations have with regard to the conventions of defining the function and repertoire decisions. I will also discuss how the institutional pressures are reflected in these conventions. Thirdly, I will analyze what kind of conventions municipal theatres and independent dance companies have in their relations to other agents of Finnish art world. I will conclude this work by considering how institutional pressures and existing conventions challenge collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies.

6 THE CONTEXT OF OPERATIONS

In this chapter I will define the context of operations for municipal theatres and independent dance companies. I will discuss more closely the cultural political background of both organizations and how it influences their operations. Furthermore, I will introduce how the distribution of public funding for both organizations is realized and what kind of characteristics this suggests for the context of operations. The discussion is based on previous documents and research dealing with Finnish cultural policy. This provides a framework for interpreting what kind of institutional coercive, mimetic and normative pressures the context of operations places upon both organizations. Therefore, I include also in this chapter the discussion on institutional pressures of municipal theatres and independent dance companies. In other words, I first consider what kind of issues, in the context of operations, produce institutional pressures. Then I analyze how these pressures are reflected in the interviews of the directors of municipal theatres and independent dance companies. Throughout the interviews I aim at finding recurring themes that emphasize the exposure to the same pressures. By maintaining the existing production conventions, these pressures can result in the homogenization of theatres' and dance companies' operations.

6.1 The Context of Operations for Municipal Theatres

For municipal theatres cultural political decisions and public funding are a source of coercive, mimetic and normative pressures. Therefore, cultural policy has a central role in creating the context of operations for municipal theatres. For defining what kind of context this is I will mainly use a study by Minna Sallanen (2009) on the development of the network of municipal art institutions in Finland, and reports regarding the changes of the public funding of theatres.

Municipal theatres have always been considered as an essential part of providing art experiences for the citizens of Finnish municipalities. The creation of this network was originally part of the building of Finnish society. The main cultural political motive behind the founding of municipal theatres was that cities and municipalities have “cultural responsibilities” towards their citizens. In addition to this, having your own

theatre building in a city or municipality was a status symbol. (Sallanen 59–60, 61) Therefore theatres were from the beginning integrated into municipal administration. Due to this they were obliged to represent the values of their respective municipalities. Values such as equality, impartiality, artistic high quality, and theatre for the citizens were to be reflected in all operations of the theatre and thus also in the repertoire. (Sallanen 78–80)

Such a historical and cultural political context can be assumed to create both coercive and normative pressures. Sallanen argues that municipal theatres have been developed according to certain boundaries dictated by the municipal administrations that again had to follow state's cultural policy. Eventually the objectives for a theatre's operation came from three different directions: municipalities, the institutions themselves, and national labor unions. They all can be considered as sources of normative pressure. Municipalities were keen to ensure that their “cultural responsibility” was fulfilled and the status of the city maintained. The institutions themselves desired to secure their continued operation and artistic freedom by means of a new premises and increased public support. Finally the national labor unions were in line with the institutions but emphasized also the equality of the conditions for work and salary. (Sallanen 326–330)

This brief account on the cultural political background of municipal theatres illustrates that from the very beginning theatres were developed in tight relationship to their municipalities and regions. The framework and environment provided by municipalities and regions is an essential part of the context of operations of the theatres, which places institutional pressures upon them. Therefore, this notion of municipalities and theatres as being culturally responsible to their community is still reflected in the behavior of theatre professionals today. In addition, the changes in public funding of municipal theatres have a great influence on the context of operations of theatres. Most important and influential of these changes was the decision to ensure the public support for theatres by law.

The Theatres and Orchestras Act (Teatteri ja orkesterilaki 3.8.1992/730) which came into force in 1993 has had a significant meaning in defining how public support is distributed for municipal theatres. Before municipal theatres were financed according to discretionary statutory support by the state and municipalities (Kurkela 16). The main purpose of the Theatres and Orchestras Act is to provide theatres better conditions for

long-span artistic work and planning of the operations (Kurkela 16; Kanerva & Ruusuvirta 9). The Act is a good example of legal circumstances which create coercive and mimetic pressures for municipal theatres.

According to the present decree¹¹ of the conditions for getting the support the theatre should be owned by a municipality, municipal consortium, private community or foundation which statutory duties include practicing of theatre operations. Performance activities should be practiced as permanently and professionally. There should be at least one permanent staff member and the person responsible for artistic activities should have professional education or be sufficiently acquainted with the artistic activities. Additionally, theatre's operations should have financial conditions, but it should not be operating for profit. Finally the theatre should have strategy and economic plan and the operations should be stated as necessary. ("Teatteri- ja orkesterilaki 3.8.1992/730")¹² This illustrates how legal circumstances mandate what kind of organizations theatres subsidized by law should be. This can influence also the operations of municipal theatres. In 2010 the Theatres and Orchestras Act included all together 47 theatres, 26 of which are municipal theatres either owned by the municipality or operating as independent theatres. The Act includes also 10 dance companies. (*Finnish theatre statistics 2010*, 5; 10).

When the Act came into force it changed the financing schemes of municipal theatres. The act decreased the role of state and gave more responsibility to municipalities in financing the culture. Although, theatres' statutory support was increased, municipalities reduced their support for them, which increased insecurity with regard to finances. Eventually, when municipalities act as the main financiers of the theatres they also demand something in return. This has resulted into negotiations between municipalities and theatre institutions, which eventually must conform to profit principles. Nowadays, municipalities demand that theatres provide one third of their incomes themselves. (Kurkela 12) In 2010 the state support for theatres subsidized by law accounted for 38%¹³, the local council's support for 36% and theatres' own incomes for 26% (*Finnish Theatre Statistics 2010*, 7).

¹¹ Tavoitteet ja valtiosuus, 2§ (23.11.2007/1066)

¹² Up to date legislation on Theatres and Orchestras Act is accessible at <<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1992/19920730>>

¹³ 53 997 332 euros, *Finnish Theatre Statistics 2010*, 12.

The coercive and mimetic pressures which the Act can be considered to produce are well illustrated in the notion made by Tiia Kurkela (2000) that the Act has been criticized for strengthening existing structures. Additionally, theatre professionals do not consider the act to promote new, creative, flexible and easier forms of production. (Kurkela 16) Eventually, although the act has secured public support for theatres, it has also resulted partly to more insecure finances. This is mainly because theatres are obliged to provide own finances through ticket incomes. (Kurkela 112-114)

On the basis of this account there can be defined certain characteristics for the context of operations of municipal theatres. First of all, the cultural politically defined relationship to municipality and region can be considered to place normative and mimetic pressures through the notion of “cultural responsibilities”. Second, being funded according to the theatres and orchestras act and therefore obliged to secure finances from the state, municipality and through ticket incomes places coercive pressures. Third, when the whole network of municipal theatres is founded on cultural political decision, the existence of theatres is dependent on changes in cultural policy. Therefore, theatres are also cultural political agents and strive for maintaining their role as such. This places mimetic pressures upon municipal theatres. In the following chapter I will illustrate more closely how these pressures are reflected throughout the interviews with the directors of municipal theatres.

6.2 The Institutional Pressures of Municipal Theatres

When analyzing, how institutional pressures are reflected in the interviews, I will concentrate on those themes and issues which were repeated in each interview. The mimetic and normative pressures, placed by both the cultural political relationship to municipality and the notion of municipal theatre's “cultural responsibilities”, were present in each interview. Most clearly this was reflected in the answers when asked about the strengths and values of the theatres. Accordingly, throughout the interviews, arguments about how finances constrain possibilities to operate reflected coercive pressures placed by the division of the funding between the state, municipality and own incomes. Answers to questions on the weaknesses and what affects repertoire decisions emphasized this reality. Finally, the uncertainty about the future of public funding, and

how it produces mimetic pressure to maintain the role of the theatre as cultural political agent, was present in the answers dealing with the threats and future of the theatre. I consider that these pressures maintain certain conventions for the operation of the theatre. Eventually, they have an effect on how well collaboration with independent dance companies can be realized.

The issue which recurred mostly throughout the interviews was the importance of maintaining the operations of the theatre local and regional. This is illustrated in how the interviewed directors defined where their theatres physically operate. Each director considered that their theatre mainly operates in the municipality, nearby region and county. Depending on the geographical location of the theatre also Europe and neighboring countries were considered as areas of operation. However, in each interview directors emphasized firstly nearby regions, secondly whole Finland and lastly foreign countries as regions of operation. The emphasis on local operations was also reflected in what the interviewed directors appreciated in their theatres.

Each of the interviewed directors emphasized the importance of close relations to their regions both in practice and in theory. Directors considered their theatres as important providers of artistic experiences for the people of the region. Additionally, theatres were mentioned to be developers of Finnish theatre from musical theatre to drama and newer forms of contemporary theatre. Therefore, in each interview municipal theatres were regarded as central cultural actors in their regions. The emphasis on regional factors in every operation was considered to differentiate theatres from each other and, therefore, also as an important basis for repertoire decisions.

In addition, the theatre building, good facilities and state's support were regarded as an important strength for Finnish theatre. Public support was considered to guarantee the non-commerciality of theatre productions, that each of the directors appreciated highly. Eventually, also the appreciation of strong traditions and the professionalism of the staff were repeated throughout the interviews. Each of these issues reflects the cultural political role and status of theatre in municipality, given at the beginning of the development of the network. The notion of theatres realizing the “cultural responsibilities” of the municipality and the awareness of their long tradition are deeply rooted in these institutions:

In my opinion theatre is above all an institution which has to be able to locally justify its existence, meaning in this county and municipality. In

other words, first of all, we have to fulfill our basic function by serving the people of this region with good repertoire policy and, second of all, we have to react on how the world and theatre as art form is changing. (Theatre director working in a medium-sized municipal theatre that operates as non-profit limited company)

This quote, as well as the emphasis on the regionality and locality of the operations, reflects normative and mimetic pressures, placed by cultural political relationship to municipality. All the interviewed directors regarded that local and regional characteristics are strength for their operation and must be considered in every action. In other words, the normative pressures of the cultural political relationship to municipality support locality as a norm among municipal theatres. Additionally, the emphasis on the importance of public support reflects the mimetic pressures related to this relationship. In short, theatre directors are keen to stay dependent on public support and connect the theatres to their regions. Although, each of the directors considered that regional characteristics differentiate them from each other, it can be still asked how much public funding and existing facilities enable the realization of these differences. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, public funding homogenizes the operations of organizations which are dependent on it. Therefore, when the relation between the theatre and municipality was strengthened in the Theatres and Orchestras Act, theatre became subject to certain coercive pressures.

The coercive pressures for the operation of the theatre were in each interview linked to money and theatre's dependence on municipality's support. The administrative link to the municipality, and how it partly defines the work of the theatre, was mentioned throughout the interviews. Depending on the ownership of the theatre, there were some differences with regard to the form of the relationship between the theatre and municipality. Two of the theatres are fully owned by the municipality, one by an association formed of the municipalities of the region, whereas one theatre is operating as non-profit limited company. However every theatre has municipal administrators as board members. Participation in the administration of the municipality and dependence on its financing decisions was mentioned to challenge the programming and long term planning of the repertoire:

. . . when municipalities operate according to calendar year and art institutions need for the planning of repertoire, hiring and visions three to

four years, the possibilities to think and make future engagements are quite difficult . . . (Theatre director working for a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

The quote reflects the coercive pressures resulting from the close relationship to municipality. This implies that theatres must organize their administrative operations and planning of repertoire according to the timetables of municipal administration. In other words, the operations of the theatres are constrained by the administrative links to the municipality, which influences the ways of acting and thinking. Still, it was mentioned that theatres can freely make the repertoire decision for coming years. However, being forced to wait the financing decisions of the municipality until the end of the present year was considered to constrain artistic work. The planning of the repertoire for two to three years ahead was said to be difficult when the director cannot be sure about the public support for coming years. Therefore, the relationship to municipality with regard to finances also creates uncertainty. This can encourage to follow previously defined ways of operation. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, uncertainty produces especially mimetic pressures. Organizations dealing with the same uncertainty might not see any other ways for operation than the established ones and end up producing art works in similar ways.

When speaking of the future of public funding and cultural policy, the interviewed directors repeated that they are constantly dealing with uncertainty. Each of the interviewees mentioned that they feel threatened by how cultural policy and public funding will in the future define their operations:

The decrease in public funding is certainly a threat because it has an effect on the planning of the repertoire, which of course affects on own incomes . . . for now we have been able to have fairly high standards in terms of premiers on the main stage and more experimental works on the smaller stage but possibilities are probably tightening . . . (Theatre director working in a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

The quote also brings out the concern of own incomes and being able to keep the quality of art high. In each interview, cutting down the public support for theatres by municipalities and the state was considered to result into dependence on ticket incomes and commercial money. All the interviewed directors were critical about making theatre

for financial profits as it was considered to have an effect on the quality and diversity of a theatre. However, it was acknowledged, that the ever increasing costs of the repertoire and the maintenance of the facilities also constrain the artistic freedom of the theatres, and weakens their possibilities to operate freely. Therefore, each of the interviewed theatre directors considered that they must attract new audiences in order to be able to fulfill the function of publicly supported theatre. This reflects that the directors have pressure to maintain the role of the theatre as the main provider of cultural experiences for every citizen. This would also justify the receiving of public funding.

Uncertainty about the future of cultural policy and public funding combined with the pressure of reaching new audiences was present in every interview. It was acknowledged that the social climate has changed significantly during the years. Additionally, directors were concerned that the current municipal administrators only compare their operations to what is happening in the theatres in Helsinki. Each of these issues create mimetic pressures concerning how to reach new audiences, and both maintain the role of the theatre as publicly funded and central cultural agent in the region.

Finally, the uncertainty about the future focus of cultural policy adds the pressure to maintain the meaning of the theatre in municipality as important:

. . . generally, how the financing of culture is considered, as well as the question of, how the whole field is in the future defined; is the map of Finnish theatres the same after couple of years as now, creates threats . . . how much society will steer culture institutions towards raising own funds, so I see here a great question of principle on which institutions are considered significant by their owners and the state, so that they get the support . . . (Director working in municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

This quote reflects the pressures placed by the agents which municipal theatres are dependent on. The uncertainty about the changes in finances and cultural policy place both mimetic and coercive pressures upon the theatres. The mimetic pressures placed by the uncertainty and, on the other hand, the coercive pressures placed by public funding, both support also normative pressures. By emphasizing theatre's close relations to the region and its people, theatre directors pursue to strengthen the meaning of the theatre in the municipality. In order to maintain their role as a central cultural agent in the region,

they have to consider how their activities relate to the lives of the people for who they mainly provide cultural services.

Eventually, the common concerns about the role of the theatre in the municipality, and about the demands placed by the municipalities and state, illustrate that theatres are subject to same institutional pressures. Roughly speaking, in every interview were reflected the pressures placed by the cultural political relationship to municipality, the notion of realizing “cultural responsibilities”, the dependence on funding from three directions, and the uncertainty about the future of both public funding and cultural policy. Therefore, dealing with these pressures influences the decision making when it comes to repertoire, visiting performances and with whom the theatres have relations and collaboration. As suggested in the theoretical framework, being subject to same institutional pressures homogenizes organizations operations. This implies that municipal theatres are similar in their operations. Therefore, I will more closely consider what kind of conventions municipal theatres have in building the repertoire and having relations and collaboration. However, before that I will discuss how cultural policy defines the context of operation for independent dance companies and what kind of institutional pressures they have.

6.3 The Context of Operations for Independent Dance Companies

When considering how cultural policy defines the context of operations for independent dance companies, it is worth mentioning that dance companies do not have as well defined role in municipal cultural policy as municipal theatres. This becomes illustrated with regard to the development of the legitimacy of dance in cultural policy. Furthermore, the decisions and terms of the National Council for Dance in providing funding are an important source of institutional pressures. However, before discussing more closely what the context of operations for dance companies is and how cultural policy influences it, it is necessary to point out that there has not yet been done any extensive study on how dance has been dealt with in Finnish cultural policy. Therefore I will base this discussion on a study by Riitta Repo made in 1989 on the legitimacy of Finnish dance and the establishment of the education of dance. Additionally, I will use a study made on the conditions of the public support for dance productions by Paula

Karhunen (2008) and reports on the conditions of independent dance companies as well as the web pages of the National Council for Dance.

According to Riitta Repo it was not until the 1960's when the distinction between amateur and professional dancers began gradually to unfold in Finland (69). The slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance until 1980's was due to the lack of financial support and state supported education system. Additionally, dance professionals had little possibilities to influence on cultural policy. During 1980's the position of dance in the decision making bodies of the state became more established when dance got its National Council in 1983. Until that, dance art had one representative in the National Council for Theatre. (Repo 91, 105)

Repo states that the legitimacy and independence of dance was generally acknowledged during 1980's, which have also been referred to, by the professionals of the field, as "the decade of the dance". The lack of acknowledgement for the legitimacy and independence of dance prior to the 1980's was due, in large part, to insufficient representation for dance within cultural administration, and the fact that dance was generally viewed as subordinate to theatre, music and the visual arts. Additionally, practitioners of dance in Finland had their own disputes and disagreements about the positions and professionalism of different dance styles. Until 1980's, apart from classical ballet, dance artists in Finland were lacking support systems for developing production and education of dance. Therefore, models of small-scale entrepreneurship provided financial basis for the production of dance. (Repo 155–156)

However, Repo points out that state is the most significant supporter for dance. The legitimacy of art is traditionally defined by participation in cultural policy. Therefore, it was important for the agents of dance to get involved with state's support systems. The founding of the National Council for Dance has resulted into more organized dance field. (Repo 157) Although Repo's study is already over 20 years old and partly dated, it still suggests that before own National Council, dance did not have as clear and central role in Finnish cultural policy as theatre had. This kind of cultural political background can be considered to still generate certain notions about the role of dance in society. Therefore, the work of the National Council for Dance has a significant meaning both for the development of the dance field and the maintenance of the appreciation of dance as art form.

As the main provider of grants and subsidies for dance productions in Finland,

the National Council for Dance influences the operations of independent dance companies. Its task is also to work for improving the conditions for dance in Finland by supporting dance groups and dance professionals. (Karhunen 19) Additionally, according to Paula Karhunen's study on the grants for dance productions, the support by the Finnish National Council for Dance does not cover all the production and maintenance costs (66). Eventually, although the basis for dance companies' finances is provided by the support of the National Council for Dance, they are also dependent on grants distributed by private foundations. This creates uncertainty in dance companies' operations as they are dependent on waiting for grant decisions. In the end, as Karhunen states, this uncertainty partly dictates what kind of performances dance companies can produce and for how long ahead they can plan their future. (Karhunen 68) Although independent dance companies apply and receive funding from various other sources, I will only consider the effects of the operational subsidy as it has the most significant meaning for dance companies' operations.

In order to get the operational subsidy from the National Council for Dance for either 1, 3 or 5 years¹⁴, dance companies applying for it must fulfill certain artistic, financial and production criteria, as well as prove to have permanent and professional performance activity. In addition, it is stated that the subsidy is discretionary and granted each year, for one year at a time. Although dance groups and communities can apply for the subsidy for 3 or 5 years, granting the subsidy for more than one year depends upon the budget of the National Council for Dance. Additionally, those companies who apply for funding for more than one year have to provide a strategy for their operations spanning 3 to 5 years. Those who apply for 5 years of funding must also receive funding from their municipality. Although, the council has committed to provide funding for 3 or 5 years, it will annually evaluate the operations of the dance company. In fall 2011 it is stated in the criteria for granting the operational subsidy that "The community's artistic resources and the quality and significance of its activities will be evaluated through peer evaluation of the dance group's repertoire". In addition, the council evaluates the regional and national significance of the company, and pay attention to the number of spectators and performances. With regard to this, it is

¹⁴ Since 2011 independent dance companies have had the possibility to apply for an option for funding for 3 or 5 years. The National Council for Dance has been granting discretionary operational subsidy for one year since the year 2000. (According to an e-mail received from Mari Karikoski, the secretary of the National Council for Dance on 19.12.2011)

mentioned that realized or planned collaborations with other art organizations and international contacts and activities may positively influence the evaluation.

("Tanssitaide")¹⁵

Although it is not stated that dance companies should include certain function in their strategy, peer evaluation suggests that one is tempted to compare their operations to those of others in the field, in order to evaluate their possibility of receiving a subsidy. This might generate mimetic pressures when one is encouraged to follow what others, possibly more successfully operating dance companies, do. In addition, when collaboration and international activities are emphasized as positively influencing the evaluation of the significance of the group, it can be assumed that dance companies aim to include these activities in their operations in order to get the subsidy. This means that the National Council for Dance sets out certain criteria for independent dance companies, outlining the minimum requirements for activities in an organization. When comparing the criteria set out for theatres subsidized by law with those of independent dance companies, it is clear that the National Council for Dance evaluates a broader scope of activities, such as collaboration and international networking, than is required by the Theatres and Orchestras Act. Additionally, the Act does not define any criteria for the evaluation of the activities of theatres which are included in it. This implies that independent dance companies' operations are constantly under scrutiny. Over time, the emphasis on certain activities set out in the criteria used to evaluate applicants for the subsidy, can result in similarities between dance companies' operations.

When the funding is discretionary dance companies cannot also know for sure if they annually receive the funding, and if they do, whether it is going to be the same next year. Therefore, public funding does not support making attachments and plans for two to three years ahead. Although, dance companies have the possibility to apply the subsidy for 3 or 5 years, the constant evaluation of their activities creates pressures for operations. Being granted the subsidy for 5 years demands also funding from the municipality, which further can encourage aiming for the support of the municipality. However, when municipalities do not have any obligations, by the law, to support independent dance companies, similarly as municipal theatres, the funding is scarce. This implies that the context of operations for independent dance companies is mainly

¹⁵ See the full version of the grounds of admitting the subsidy the web page of the National Council for Dance: <<http://www.taiteenkeskustoimikunta.fi/>>, Date of access 23.9.2011.

defined by uncertainty about future finances. This again suggests that being dependent on applying the operational subsidy of National Council for Dance creates some coercive and mimetic pressures for independent dance companies' operations.

This is illustrated through some main characteristics of the independent dance field. Already in the 1980's the field of dance was defined by Helsinki region as the base for dance artists, the female majority of the dance artists and short careers (Repo 76). Still today, more than half of the independent dance companies operate at the Helsinki region. Furthermore, there is none big or mid-sized employers compared to Finnish municipal theatres which would offer permanent or temporary employment for dance artists. As a result, working in independent field is only option for most of the Finnish dance artists. Furthermore, according to Koskela and Rekola, scarcity in permanent employment possibilities has made dance artist accustomed to working simultaneously in different groups and productions (6, 9). Most common dance production is contemporary dance which has been prepared for half a year and rehearsed for approximately three months. There are mostly four to five performers and the productions employ all together ten persons. Productions are performed on average for five to ten times. Additionally, most of the performances are performed in small venues which do not enable big audiences for a successful dance performance. Eventually, dance artists find themselves carrying out several different production-related tasks which are outside the scope of their profession. (Karhunen 70)

This description of the characteristics of independent dance companies illustrates that they are operating within a certain context which places institutional pressures upon them. It also suggests that there is homogeneity in dance companies' operations, because of being dependent on discretionary funding and having to deal with uncertainty. Finally, the position of dance in Finnish cultural policy has not been as thoroughly defined with regard to values and function as municipal theatres have. This has evidently produced many small dance companies who operate according to the principles of small entrepreneurs; therefore, it can be assumed that dance companies do not have any pressures to present certain mutual values with the municipalities or serve certain audiences. In other words they are not obliged by the notion of realizing the "cultural responsibilities" of the municipalities where they reside.

On the basis of this, I consider that the context of operations for independent dance companies is mainly defined by three factors: the slow development of the

cultural political legitimacy of dance, the politically undefined relationship to municipality, and the dependence on the discretionary operational subsidy from the National Council for Dance along with other grants from various different sources. This kind of context produces coercive, mimetic and normative pressures which mostly can be assumed to keep the operations as small scale. Eventually, the context of operation forces them to operate in certain way. In the following chapter I will more closely consider what kind of institutional pressures independent dance companies are dealing with. I base this discussion on the interviews with the artistic directors of the dance companies.

6.4 The Institutional Pressures of Independent Dance Companies

I consider that each of the three issues which define the context of operations for independent dance companies produces different institutional pressures. First, the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance produces both mimetic and normative pressures by maintaining the status of independent dance companies as uninstitutionalized. Second, by not defining any obligations for dance companies, the politically undefined relationship to municipality can be considered to produce mainly normative pressures. Third, the dependence on the discretionary operational subsidy from the National Council for Dance creates coercive pressures by defining terms and conditions which at least should be fulfilled by independent dance companies. Finally, each of these issues can be considered to generate a feeling of uncertainty with regard to finances and future plans, as the state is still the main supporter of independent dance companies. The amount of public funding which the National Council for Dance distributes depends on the annual budget given by the state.

A recurring theme in each interview with artistic directors of independent dance companies was a constant feeling of uncertainty. This uncertainty was primarily linked to waiting for funding decisions; making future plans without knowledge of a budget or financing; hiring performers with temporary contracts; struggling with maintaining operations viable within the municipality, and not having permanent performance and rehearsing space. Throughout the interviews, the dependence on the discretionary operational subsidy was considered to create uncertainty for long term planning. This

was exemplified by arguments about the difficulties of planning the future productions. When uncertain about future funding, the only possibility is to employ freelance dancers with temporary contracts. In other words, being uncertain of future finances prevents companies from building lasting employment relationships, which would enable more systematic planning of future productions. Therefore, employing freelance artists eventually challenges scheduling and artistic planning of the independent dance companies. This further complicates any long term planning:

The discretionary funding by the National Council for Dance has to be applied every year, and there isn't any continuum, so of course it places pressures in terms of how I can ask any choreographer here to work if I can earliest in December promise that you can start your work in February, because then we have the funding. So you can't really say that this is long-span work, in other words you have to be all the time a little bit on the alert, which is exhausting. (Artistic director whose dance company produces performances also by other choreographers and has been receiving the subsidy since 2008)

As this quote illustrates, and other interviewees emphasized, randomness and leaving many issues to chance makes organizations vulnerable and increases the work load for individuals eventually leading to burn out. The Previous quote also reflects the coercive pressures resulting from being dependent on discretionary public funding. Additionally, the constant feeling of uncertainty and randomness in the operations, present in each interview, reflects mimetic pressures. In other words, the pressures placed upon dance companies' operations by the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance. When dance companies have enjoyed state support only from 1980's onward there has not been sufficient infrastructure built for them in order to employ dancers more permanently and develop more stable finances.

Throughout the interviews, the descriptions on the level of infrastructure and bureaucracy in independent dance companies reflected the small-scale of operations. This is illustrated also in the organizational structures of the independent dance companies. Each of the independent dance companies have as their background organizations supporting associations¹⁶. The board members of these associations are in

¹⁶ Rekisteröity yhdistys in Finnish

most cases the founding members of the dance company. Therefore, the level of infrastructure and bureaucracy is very low or almost minimal. I consider that this demonstrates the result of the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance. Therefore, when compared to municipal theatres which are all institutions, for dance there are only two as big institutions, the National Ballet in the National Opera and Helsinki Dance Company as part of Helsinki City Theatre. Both are subsidized by law and also funded through their hosting institutions (Koskela and Rekola 5). In other words, dance as art form has not been regarded as essential for the support of Finnish culture that there would be buildings for it around the country. This also refers to the notion, made by Repo, that dance was able to gain its independence from other art forms as late as 1980's. Therefore the cultural political role of dance as part of theatre, but outside of theatre institutions, creates normative pressures for independent dance companies. I consider that this also becomes reflected both in relation to the infrastructure of the dance companies and to the politically undefined relationship to municipality.

In each interview the freedom of artistic work was connected to freedom from constraining infrastructure such as the size of existing stage or number of employed performers. According to one of the interviewees, the low level of infrastructure and lack of bureaucracy enables both artistic work dealing with current issues and reactivity to sudden changes. Additionally, it was stated that dance companies do not have any pressures coming from outside which would define what they have to do. Three of the four interviewees also emphasized that they do not have any interest to move towards gigantic or spectacular productions, and operations which would entail more bureaucracy. Each of the artistic directors mentioned that, when speaking of the resources which they have now, they are already over-employed, and do not wish more complicated structures. Although this is clearly a matter of resources, it also reflects the norm of small-scale operations that are not constrained by structural demands of cultural policy and municipalities. Eventually, the directors of independent dance companies seem keen to maintain their freedom in artistic work.

The fact that independent dance companies do not have cultural political relationship to their municipalities was present in every interview. On either artistic or administrative level none of the interviewees mentioned any obligations from the municipality's side. The loose relationship to municipality was also conveyed in how the

interviewees defined where they physically operate. The artistic directors of the independent dance companies considered that their practical operations are in the municipality where they have the office. However, through visits to other regions in Finland and abroad, and employing freelance dancers and other artists around Finland, most of the interviewees considered that they are broadly operating both in Finland and internationally.

When compared to municipal theatres, on the basis of the interviews, independent dance companies do not seem to be as engaged to the municipalities and regions where they reside. This varies in some amount according to whether the dance company is the only professional dance agent in the municipality and region. If the dance company is the main professional dance agent in the region, it can have the municipality's support through different collaborations. Generally, the interviewees did not mention any as strong obligations to operate locally as the directors of municipal theatres. This illustrates the fact that dance companies' relationships to their municipalities are not defined by the law or long traditions in cultural policy.

However, the effect of this is that the financial support provided by the municipality to dance companies is either very low or nonexistent¹⁷. This strengthens the dependence on the discretionary funding from the National Council for Dance and eventually the coercive pressures which it produces. When dance companies' own incomes do not cover the costs of production and administration they are forced to apply funding and support from the National Council for Dance and other foundations. Therefore their operations are constrained by the rules and timetables of granting various subsidies and grants. Additionally, as dance has not been traditionally regarded as part of municipal theatre institutions, independent dance companies suffer from scarcity of rehearsing and performance spaces. This affects the possibilities to perform and reach audiences, which further places coercive pressures upon independent dance companies, when they are forced to perform where it is possible. Yet the public support seems to be too low to enable steady growth for the dance companies and their operations stay small scale.

¹⁷ According to the Finnish Theatre Statistic 2010, among the theatres subsidized by law municipalities' funding for big and mid-sized theatres was in 2010 36%. For dance companies subsidized by law the municipalities' support in 2010 accounted for 15%. According to an e-mail received from Minna Luukko, the publicist of the Finnish Dance Information Centre on 3rd of October 2011, any statistics on municipalities' support for independent dance companies have not been collected.

To illustrate the differences in the context of operations between municipal theatres and independent dance companies, I will now consider what kind of relations dance companies have to their municipalities. In each interview the pressure of applying funding and aiming for the support of the municipal administrators were present. On the basis of the interviews, municipality's support varies according to how important municipal administrators consider the work of the dance company. As stated earlier, those dance companies who are the main professional dance agents in their municipality and region do have much more collaboration with municipal administrators than the dance company residing in municipality with larger pool of dance and theatre companies. It also seems that if the dance company is producing performances for children and young, or employing applied practices in its operations, municipalities have considered them as important actors for their citizens and are willing to collaborate and provide support:

I have the feeling that the city might consider our work quite beneficial for them. We have a cultural collaboration with the city which means that the city will support financially the visits from schools to our performances and we also organize workshops for schools. (Artistic director whose dance company produces only own choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2003)

The nature of the relationship between municipality and independent dance company varies also according to how long the dance company has been operating in the municipality and how established its operations are. Therefore, it seems that, although municipalities place fewer obligations upon independent dance companies than on municipal theatres they can still have some influence upon dance companies' operations through different collaborations and programs. However, this works only if the operations of independent dance companies are considered valuable to the municipality in question. In other words, municipalities do not place any demands upon independent dance companies to provide a repertoire equally for every citizen. If and independent dance company provides performances, for example, for children on its own will and from its own point of view, it can be considered as a beneficial activity in a municipality, and therefore be supported, and encourage the dance company to continue provide said repertoire. Therefore, a given municipality may place some coercive pressures on independent dance companies to perform certain activities, as

dance companies need and aim for municipal support.

The coercive pressures placed by municipality are again linked to funding and the uncertainty on finances. Not having cultural political relationship with, and steady financial support from, the municipality directs for applying the discretionary operational subsidy. Further, when granting the subsidy for more than 3 years demands for receiving funding also from municipality it places coercive pressures to aim for that support. This creates more uncertainty for dance companies operations:

. . . struggle over own existence in relation to the funding of the city is a constant threat. Every year we have the same fights and we don't know about the funding for next year until it is decided in the meeting of the city council in December. (Artistic director whose dance company produces also performances by other choreographers and has been receiving the subsidy since 2008)

Dance companies cannot take municipality's support for granted, and therefore they are also dependent on various other financing streams. As mentioned earlier, being dependent on waiting for grant decisions forces dance companies to modify their operations and decision making according to the funding decisions of the financiers. When the discretionary operational subsidy by the National Council for Dance is the main public funding stream for independent dance companies, I consider that the coercive pressures which it places, eventually lead to dependence on the support of the municipality. However, none of the interviewees mentioned that, for pursuing the support of the municipality, they would be obliged to do certain activities. Therefore, I consider that, being dependent on the discretionary operational subsidy produces stronger coercive pressures than loose relationship to municipality. When it comes to the relationship to municipality, I consider that the normative pressure to maintain freedom from bureaucracy and sense of small entrepreneurship has stronger effect on independent dance companies.

Being dependent on funding from the National Council for Dance and various other sources also reflects the coercive pressures placed by cultural policy and uncertainty related to it. In the end, each of the interviewees mentioned that the future of their dance companies is also dependent on how long they have strength to continue the struggle with uncertainty. In the experience of one particular interviewee the current situation in cultural policy is defined by randomness and a lack of long term planning,

which increases the feeling of being on alert all the time. When each of the interviewees emphasized the difficulty of making long term planning, because of uncertainty and randomness, it seems that they are subject to similar institutional pressures. Uncertainty enables only short term planning which challenges the development of operations into more established form. On the other hand, small-scale of operations and lack of bureaucracy was also appreciated by the interviewees. This suggests that they have common notions on what is good way for an independent dance company to operate in Finland, in current situation. Additionally, because dance companies are competing for the same operational subsidy by the National Council for Dance, it can be assumed that their operations do not differ much. This can result in deteriorating the dance field because of over capacity in small dance companies. Eventually, this influences how dance companies operate and what kind of relations and collaborations they have. In the following chapters, I will analyze what kind of conventions of operations both municipal theatres and independent dance companies have in defining their function, repertoire and relations. I will also discuss, how institutional pressures are reflected in their conventions of operations.

7 THE CONVENTIONS DEFINING THE FUNCTION AND REPERTOIRE

As mentioned in the theoretical framework of this thesis, institutional pressures placed upon both municipal theatres and independent dance companies strengthen their conventions of operation. Roughly, for municipal theatres, coercive pressures arise from the relationship with the municipality and the dependence on ensuring the funding from the state, municipality and ticket incomes. Normative pressures, again, come from the cultural political role given to the theatres. Finally, the concern about the future of cultural policy and the role of municipal theatre in it, as well as the maintenance of that role as an important cultural actor in the municipality, produce mimetic pressures.

For independent dance companies, coercive pressures arise from being dependent on both the discretionary operational subsidy by the National Council for Dance and the pursuit of support from municipalities. Normative pressures are related to both the politically undefined role in the municipality and the slow development of the legitimacy of dance. Becoming legitimized as late as 1980's has resulted in low degree of infrastructure which, eventually, produces constant feeling of uncertainty about finances and, therefore, mimetic pressures. Dealing with constant uncertainty and randomness seems to define every operation in the dance companies.

In this chapter, I analyze what kinds of conventions define operations in both organizations and how the context and institutional pressures can be conveyed in them. I consider only the conventions defining the function and repertoire of both organizations. I regard these as the two most important issues which influence the decisions of embarking upon collaboration and with whom it is possible to realize.

7.1 Municipal Theatres: the Servants of Local Audiences

In this chapter, I will analyze how previously mentioned institutional pressures are reflected in interviewees' ways of defining what the function of municipal theatre is. Although, in terms of public funding, administration, and engagement to municipality, there has been significant change since the beginning of the development of municipal theatres, it can be assumed that the original statements about the function of the theatres

still prevail. Throughout the interviews the coercive and normative pressures related to the relationship with municipality, and the need to secure financial support from three different directions, were strongly present.

It was emphasized that municipal theatres as publicly subsidized art institutions belong to every citizen and therefore the differing points of view must be equally represented. Each of the theatre directors also mentioned that their operations, mainly the repertoire, require addressing issues relevant to the people living in the municipality and its surrounding region. Interviewed directors felt that theatre as an art form has the ability to deal with relevant local issues, thereby enhancing the well-being of the citizens. This was also strongly connected to how interviewees considered the meaning of art generally for human's life. With regard to this, it was emphasized that the value of art and, therefore, also theatre is in its ability to produce information and experiences on issues which any other field of work is unable to produce. Theatre was considered to bring people together. At the same time, the task of municipal theatre was said to bring theatre and art closer to people's lives:

. . . we must think that this art institution has to meet with diverse groups of people, diverse audiences and age groups, and we must try to reach the whole basis of experience of the society. We can't delimit too much our target audiences and that is, in my opinion, the societal function of this kind of theatre institution. (Theatre director working for a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

In one way or another, such a track of thought was repeated in each interview. It reflects the coercive and normative pressures rising both from the cultural political role given to the theatres, and the relationship with their municipalities. By justifying the existence of theatre as a necessity for human life, each of the theatre directors emphasized the importance of the theatre institution in the municipality and region. Eventually, this also reflects the mimetic pressures produced by the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy.

The existence of municipal theatre was also justified by arguing that its task is to bring forward new ways of watching, experiencing and producing theatre. It was considered important that art produced by municipal theatres deal with current issues, employing both the most traditional forms of theatre, as well as the most contemporary and cutting edge possibilities of performance and technology. One of the theatre

directors emphasized that, because of the facilities that publicly supported theatre institutions have, there should always be a readiness to take risks in producing art works which are based on new innovations. However, although all the theatre directors emphasized the importance of diversity in theatre performance, both in their form and content, the primary function of a theatre institution was said to support and develop Finnish drama, theatre, and musical theatre. This illustrates that theatre directors acknowledge the demands of contemporary culture, but are also still attached to the tradition of what kind of repertoire is expected from municipal theatre. Therefore, this reflects the normative pressures placed by the tradition of realizing the “cultural responsibilities” of municipalities.

The demands of contemporary culture and changes happening in society were also reflected throughout the interviews with regard to the future of municipal theatres. These demands reflect the mimetic pressures produced by the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy and the role of municipal theatre in it. When asked about future opportunities for municipal theatres, all interviewees mentioned the development of new forms of operation, bringing in different forms of performance and various agents from the art field and making them part of the tradition. One of the interviewees experienced the development of collaboration with dance theatres as important future opportunity. This illustrates that the directors experience pressure from outside to include the independent actors of theatre and dance in their operations.

However, still the development of the municipal theatre as a regionally important actor and cultural centre whose main task is the cultivation of drama and theatre was emphasized, although it was also acknowledged that drama and theatre is not enough anymore. In addition to different forms of theatre and performance, providing performances for younger generation of audiences was considered as an important opportunity. Also different forms of community theatre were brought forward as future development opportunities. Generally, theatre directors seem keen to open the doors of their municipal theatres to new forms of performance and different agents of the art field. Therefore, interviewees considered, that municipal theatre will not in the future only represent basic drama, but strengthen its role as a central cultural actor, who unites different agents of various art forms of the region together. Each of these issues reflects that the directors of municipal theatres acknowledge the need to renew theatre's operation. This is necessary if the theatre directors desire to maintain the role of the

theatre as a central cultural agent in their regions. Additionally, the uncertainty about the changes in cultural policy, which each of the interviewees experienced as threat, illustrate that theatres are subject to mimetic pressures. Each of the theatre directors considered that the way to deal with this threat is to develop new ways of operation together with the actors of independent field, and thus reach new audiences from younger generations.

Consequently, producing performances for children and young was mentioned as a central way of operation in each theatre. This derives from the obligation to provide repertoire for all age groups of the citizens of municipality. Additionally, providing performances for children was considered to comment on cultural policy, as they do not provide any profit. With regard to this, one of the theatre directors pointed out that municipal theatre institutions are places for making cultural policy. This is realized through repertoire decisions regarding children's performances and visiting performances:

In my opinion, theatres perform cultural policy through the decisions regarding visiting performances. You can't do that as much as you would like to because there's not enough finances for it, but if we have empty days we can get audience statistics through the visits, but mostly we don't get any profit from it. . . . I think that visiting performances which we have invited are not a business activity but realizing of cultural policy . . . I consider that performing cultural policy belongs to theatre and it becomes justified through theatres operations. (Theatre director working in a medium-sized municipal theatre operating as a non-profit limited company)

Both the coercive and mimetic pressures are present in this quote. Considering visiting performances as beneficial for the theatre with respect to audience statistics reflects the need to prove for the funders that the citizens of the municipality use theatre's services. Additionally, regarding municipal theatre as an agent in cultural policy illustrates the desire to influence the future of the policy and maintain theatre as relevant for the municipality.

To conclude, the common function of municipal theatres, which was reflected in each interview, is to provide high quality artistic experiences that bring the community together and help people to understand issues of human life. These experiences are

offered equally for every citizen. Theatres aim to communicate an understanding of diverse point of views and forms of expression. They also want to maintain a sense of community and locality in everything that they do. The ultimate goal for each theatre director is to bring theatre closer to people's lives, to bring forward diverse and new understandings and to realize theatre's therapeutic and healing role in the community. All the interviewees also clearly shared a view of municipal theatre as a cultural actor which is open to various forms of theatre and performance, but which does not lose the focus on high quality theatre art. The interviewees do not want to see their theatres turning into entertainment centers whose main purpose is to gain profit.

The context of operations defined in previous chapter is reflected in the function of municipal theatre. Theatres relations to the municipality, region and its people, as well as the cultural political role in the region, influence the operations of municipal theatres. Although each of the theatre directors considered that their regions differentiate them from each other, it seems that institutional pressures, rising from the public funding and cultural policy, produce homogeneity for defining the function of the theatre. Therefore, in the next chapter I will analyze how the repertoire of municipal theatre is defined and how institutional pressures are influencing it. I discuss what kind of conventions of defining the repertoire municipal theatres have and how those refer to homogeneity in operations.

7.2 Municipal Theatre's Repertoire: the Reflector of Local Characteristics

When asked about repertoire decisions and what influences them throughout the interviews were emphasized local characteristics, existing facilities, permanent staff and money. Each of these factors reflects coercive, mimetic and normative pressures. The coercive pressures for defining the repertoire in municipal theatres are most strongly arising from theatres' relations with their municipalities. Theatres have contracts with municipalities on for who they primarily should produce and present their repertoire:

. . . our operations are connected to the fact that we are fully owned by municipality and . . . we are regarded as service which means that culture is seen as a service, what it is of course, but this also means that every citizen of the municipality needs to be included. We are operating with

the tax money from the citizens of this region and with the funding from the state because we are a big theatre in this region, so this obliges us to consider audiences in various ways; we have to take into account all the different age groups. (Theatre director working for a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

Although this quote is from a director working in a municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality, the idea of producing repertoire as a service was also present in the arguments from both the theatre director working in the theatre operating as non-profit limited company and the directors working for the regional theatre. This illustrates that the decisions concerning repertoire are bound to thinking of what the audiences of different ages in the municipality would prefer to see. In other words, municipal theatres as public service are forced to serve different age groups in order to ensure the financial support from municipality and state. Therefore, this kind of coercive pressure strengthens the convention of regarding the repertoire as a service. In each interview, municipality's and its citizens' regional characteristics were mentioned as a starting point for defining the repertoire. Therefore, it is a convention which homogenizes the repertoire in municipal theatres.

In addition to the relationship with the municipality, the existing facilities and resources of municipal theatres have an essential role in defining what kind of repertoire they are able to produce. Two most crucial factors in this are the existing artistic personnel and stages of different size:

. . . the basic operations of the theatre haven't changed much during the centuries, we have three stages where we have been producing performances for audiences of certain age groups, so basic operations haven't changed, only the articulation changes. This is how I see it, we choose a production and people for it either inside or outside the house, then we realize it and perform it for the audiences, and this core process doesn't change . . . (Theatre director working in a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

Roughly, this description of the core process of the production of repertoire was repeated in each interview. Additionally, it was mentioned that the repertoire performed on the main stage of the theatre must be considered in a way that it attracts various audiences, and is easy to approach. Repertoire on smaller stages can be more

controversial. Each of the theatre directors admitted that existing stages of certain sizes have their benefits and problems. Only one of the directors was pleased with the size of the theatre building and its stages. The effect of the existing stages place both coercive and normative pressures upon the operations of theatres. On the one hand, stages define the form of the performances, and on the other, there are established norms what kind of performances are produced on bigger and smaller stages. In other words, there are existing conventions for defining what kind of repertoire is suitable for which stage, and how it is produced there most efficiently, both in terms of time and costs. When each of the theatre buildings follow a conventional form of art institution, it is clear that production of repertoire easily also follows established conventions which are homogenous among municipal theatres.

Existing artistic personnel, mainly the ensemble of actors were also mentioned to affect on the repertoire choices. Although each of the theatre directors mentioned that they use often visiting directors or employ freelance actors, still the existing artistic personnel provides one starting point for the repertoire decisions. One of the theatre directors emphasized first finding talents within theatres' own ensemble and then considering employing actors and dancers with temporary contracts from outside. This clearly implies that theatre directors want to ensure that their own actors have work. This reflects the normative and coercive pressures rising both from the cultural political role given for municipal theatres and the dependence on public funding. In other words, there is a norm for theatre institution to have own permanent ensemble of actors and, therefore, to be an important employer of Finnish actors. This can be considered to strengthen the conventions of considering what the boundaries of the repertoire are, and what each theatre is able to produce.

Finally, according to the interviews municipal theatres have existing conventions for building the repertoire. These conventions are quite mutual among the interviewed theatre directors. This further illustrates that theatres are dealing with mutual institutional pressures which produce homogeneity in their operations. Following argument concludes the reality of the conventions of repertoire decisions and the coercive, mimetic and normative pressures of them:

I indeed think that the repertoire policy is solved by taking into account the existing stages, different forms of theatre, to which performances people will come and do we have the right people in the house, and this is

quite a difficult equation. (Theatre director working for a medium-sized municipal theatre operating as non-profit limited company)

The quote reflects that when considering the repertoire choices, directors have to anticipate to which performances audiences can be expected to buy the ticket. Such thinking is related to the fact that for municipal theatres the number of bought tickets is a central indicator of the success of its operations. Additionally, here is reflected the pressure to receive own ticket incomes. Therefore, when producing new kind of work theatre directors face the risk that existing audiences, who are used to certain form of theatre art, begin to feel neglected and theatre loses their trust and support. In other words, the pressure of the tradition can create challenges for changing the operations of the theatre. Considering the preferences of existing audiences in repertoire decisions reflects that theatre directors are subject to normative pressures. These pressures include notions on what kind of performances can be expected to sell tickets. In a situation where theatres should provide at least one third of their finances through ticket incomes this kind of normative pressures strengthen the previously established conventions of building the repertoire. Therefore, following Becker's arguments, existing conventions enable the production of repertoire in municipal theatres in a safe and efficient mode, and changing conventions might be regarded too expensive in financially strict times.

On the other hand, each of the theatre directors acknowledged that the changes in society must be taken into account in the operations of the theatre. Therefore, already today, and even more in the future, they cannot anymore rely on their existing audiences. They need more new audiences and in order to reach them, it was stated in the interviews, that they must react to contemporary issues in their repertoire as well as develop other ways of operation, which bring theatre closer to everyday life. As ways of dealing with the demands of reaching new audiences each of the theatre directors mentioned different forms of collaboration, applied theatre and community theatre. This reflects mimetic pressures produced by the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy and public funding, as well as the pursuit of maintaining the role of theatre as central cultural actor in the region. However, when each of the interviewed directors mentioned same strategies for developing the operations of the theatre to answer the demands of the society, it reflects that they have mutual pressures to realize these kinds of activities.

In the end, however, financial resources were mentioned as the issue which most

influences repertoire decisions in municipal theatres:

. . . [money] affects so that, for example, when we have decided next year to concentrate on new Finnish musical theatre then it means that we can't afford to produce on small stage at the same time. (Theatre director working in a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

Although financial resources are scarce none of the theatre directors is willing to take financial profitability as a starting point in creating repertoire. In each interview it was emphasized that criteria for deciding what to perform cannot be based on how much it is going to produce profit. Such thinking is considered to result into producing entertainment which is not the task of publicly financed art institution. Finally, the criteria for repertoire decisions in municipal theatre includes considering the local characteristics of the region, what is relevant for audiences there and what is the meaning of a single performance in relation to whole repertoire. This all has to be balanced both with financial resources and with the resources provided by the staff and facilities of the theatre. At the same time theatre directors desire to maintain the quality high and be sure that audiences will buy the ticket. Eventually, defining the repertoire of municipal theatre is a puzzle of diverse issues and constantly constrained by time and financial resources. These factors both create and maintain prevailing conventions for repertoire decisions. On the basis of the interviews, the existing stages and notions of what is suitable to produce on them and for who seems to create homogeneity when defining the repertoire of municipal theatres. Following these conventions is strengthened by tightening finances and uncertainty about the future of cultural policy. Although all the interviewees are keen to develop collaboration with independent companies, reaching mutual agreement when dealing with different conventions of defining the function and repertoire, is challenging in financially uncertain circumstances.

7.3 Independent Dance Companies: the Enablers of Artistic Freedom

When considering what the context of operations implies for defining the function of independent dance companies, it is clear that the boundaries for operation are quite different than for municipal theatres. The context of operations for

independent dance companies is defined by applying funding annually from the National Council for Dance and various other independent foundations. The relationship between municipalities and independent dance companies does not include any kind of cultural political obligations. Additionally, there is a norm of small scale operations due to the slow development of the legitimacy of dance in cultural policy. Generally the feeling of uncertainty and randomness seems to define the context where dance companies operate. In this chapter I will analyze how the coercive, mimetic and normative pressures placed by this kind of context of operations are conveyed in the interviews with the artistic directors of independent dance companies. First I will concentrate on how the interviewees defined the function of their dance companies, and how institutional pressures are reflected in it.

On the basis of the interviews, dance companies have quite mutual view on what is important in their work, and why they want to do it. In each interview with the artistic directors, the desire to bring forward values of humanity and communality through their work was emphasized. The purpose of the work was mainly focused on providing people places to experience the wonders of human life and interaction between individual and community. As an interesting notion, one of the artistic directors mentioned that because of harsh criticism and distrust towards their work time to time coming from certain municipal administrators, it has been hard to maintain the focus and purpose of the work. However, the interviewee concluded that because of this they desire to maintain their role as a contrarian towards the values of success and competition which mass media nurses. Such a opinion was reflected in each interview and coincides quite well with the notions made by the directors of municipal theatres on the purpose of their work. Therefore, directors of both organizations regard as their function in the society to bring people together and provide ways to both experience art, and understand life through their performances.

However, in contrast to municipal theatres, in independent dance companies each interviewee emphasized the meaning of artistic freedom in deciding what kind of performances they want to do and for whom. The artistic values, career and relations of the artistic director of the dance company mainly define what kind of performances and other activities they are interested to do. Instead of considering the demographics of their audiences as a starting point for their work, the interest to deal with certain issues comes from the artistic director and other people responsible for the artistic work. In

relation to this, each of the interviewees appreciated their artistically motivated staff, which was considered to enable the evolvement of Finnish dance.

In addition, the diversity of productions and their ability to surprise audiences were emphasized as special characteristics of independent dance companies. Each of the artistic directors also mentioned that realization of their work always demands a stage and the presence of an audience. In other words, they would not be doing what they do if it did not reach audiences. In relation to this, one of the artistic directors considered production of welfare services as their special future opportunity which would bring dance art closer to the everyday life of the people in the region. In the end the, artistic directors of independent dance companies also considered that they are doing their work for their audiences, but they do not feel obliged to serve equally everyone with their repertoire. Excluding performances made strictly for children, each of the artistic directors considered that their performances are for everyone and they do not have any target audiences in mind when they begin to make a performance. Therefore, their function is not defined by for who they are performing but what they want to perform.

With regard to the context of operation of independent dance companies, this refers to the loose relationship with municipality and not having values and purposes defined by cultural policy. In other words, independent dance companies do not experience any pressures to serve certain audience groups. The emphasis placed on artistic freedom by each of the interviewees reflects also this issue. Freedom to create choreographies from own artistic interests, and without any constrains related to complicated infrastructure and bureaucracy, was strongly present in each interview. This reflects normative pressures to maintain the freedom in artistic and production work, which becomes illustrated when considering what one the independent dance company does not desire to do:

. . . at the moment we don't feel like making too massive productions in terms of the number of performers or stage size . . . we are not interested in creating a big and stiff organization around our doings and, well, in principle we aren't interested in making performances by subscription when there isn't enough time to make it well, which is one reason why I'm not that often part of collaborations of making a performance by subscription. (Artistic director whose dance company produces only own

choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2008)

With respect to artistic freedom, each of the interviewees also emphasized that the way of working is characterized by being in a search for something which you do not really know what it is. Because of this, as one of the artistic directors mentioned, instead of trying to realize certain artistic brand, directors want to challenge themselves to view things from different point of views, and produce performances of which you do not know how it is going to be in the end. It was acknowledged that this creates challenges for selling and marketing the work. On the other hand, each of the interviewees mentioned that they want to surprise their audiences and buyers. Therefore they do not want to define too strictly what kind of dance companies they are and what kind of work they do. Finally, it is clear that maintaining the freedom with regard to artistic and production work also motivates the members of independent dance companies to continue their work. This reflects that when considering the function of independent dance companies there are none as strong coercive pressures as municipal theatres have.

However, the emphasis on artistic freedom and reluctance to define operations too strictly reflects normative pressures rising from the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance. In other words, when dance companies' function and meaning has not been defined in Finnish cultural policy, they have had more freedom to decide themselves how to function. All the interviewees desired to maintain this freedom. Therefore, this norm creates some homogeneity in defining the function of independent dance companies. To summarize, on the basis of the interviews, the artistic directors consider that their dance companies' function is to bring forward values of humanity and communality. They desire to maintain the notions of artistic freedom, diversity and high quality in their work. They also regard as important to investigate both the diverse aspects of human life and the relations between individuals and community. The companies exist for audiences but also for realizing the artistic views of each director and other artistic personnel. In other words, their aim is also to provide high quality artistic experiences through their own artistic views. Finally they want to bring art and dance closer to people, as part of human life and that way enhance the wellbeing of people.

Each of the interviewees shared this view of their work and why they want to do it. These notions do not differ much from what the directors of municipal theatres

considered as the function of their institutions. They both reflect general notions of why art and culture are important in human's life. The biggest difference between the interviewed directors of municipal theatres and independent dance companies relates to how they consider the role of their audiences and regions when defining their organization's function. When speaking of municipal theatres the audiences, people of the region and local characteristics provide some coercive, normative and mimetic pressures for defining why the theatre exists, and how the repertoire should reflect its function in society. Therefore, next I will consider what the conventions of defining the repertoire in independent dance companies are, and how institutional pressures influence them.

7.4 Independent Dance Company's Repertoire: Reflecting Limited Artistic Freedom

The emphasis on artistic freedom, and its importance for the directors of independent dance companies, implies that repertoire decisions can be done freely. This furthermore suggests that because independent dance companies have not had as central role in municipal cultural policy as municipal theatres, they would have less institutional pressures defining their repertoire and other operations. With regard to the interviewed artistic directors, the freedom from institutional structures is reflected in the diverse ways how they realize their function.

Most clearly this is illustrated in whose choreographies dance companies produce and how strictly they want to limit their operations around dance art. Two of the interviewed dance companies are only focused on producing the choreographies of their artistic directors whereas two others are also producing choreographies from various Finnish and foreign choreographers. Interviewed artistic directors also had differing views on whether they employed only dance or also other forms of art, such as theatre and visual arts, in their performances. Whereas one of the artistic directors emphasized high level of technique and precision in their dance performances, the other considered that everyone from amateurs to professional dancers and actors can be included in the performance. One of the artistic directors is keen on working with community projects and emphasizing that in their artistic work. Eventually, in each interview the diversity of the dance companies' productions became emphasized:

. . . different performances provide the basis for our repertoire, meaning that each one of our performances has own character and rules. Therefore, our artistic policy is a sum of very different performances. (Artistic director whose dance company produces only own choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2003)

This illustrates that the artistic directors of independent dance companies can freely decide on what kind of repertoire they want to create. The emphasis on maintaining the artistic freedom and diversity in their operations is a convention which defines the starting point for the repertoire. However, throughout the interviews it was emphasized that eventually the freedom of independent dance companies is constrained by uncertainty about finances, the dependence on waiting for grant decisions and the low degree of infrastructure. Each of these factors has certain consequences for how the repertoire in independent dance company becomes realized in practice. Therefore, it can be considered that dance companies have coercive pressures influencing the possibilities to perform their repertoire.

On the basis of the interviews, outside factors influence significantly which performances dance companies perform, although they would have more than one of their choreographies in the repertoire:

We have very little possibility to plan our repertoire in a traditional way because it goes how it goes. (Artistic director whose dance company produces only own choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2008)

The quote refers to the inability of the artistic director to freely decide and plan which choreographies they perform, when, where and how many times. The other one of the interviewed artistic directors, whose dance company performs only their own choreographies, also shared the notion of not having much power over which dance pieces they perform during the year. Therefore, if dance company is producing only the choreographies of the artistic director, the performances which are performed during the year mostly depend on what buyers, such as festivals and cultural centers, want. Additionally, both of these directors acknowledged that other jobs of the freelance dancers which they employ affect on which performances they are able to perform and offer for buyers.

In addition to buyers and other jobs of the dancers, collaborations with festivals or other actors of the field define what independent dance companies perform. For example, a festival can order a performance from an independent dance company or a dance company can share an evening with another dance company and also share the costs of renting a performance space. All this is also linked to the fact that most of the independent dance companies do not have own performance spaces. Only one of the interviewed dance companies shares a permanent performance space with other independent communities of performing arts in the region. However, this dance company is also producing performances by other choreographers, and the space creates own constraints for defining what kind of performances can be asked to be performed there.

With regard to repertoire decisions, the two dance companies which are also producing choreographies by other dance artists have little more power over what is performed and when. Their repertoire is not as dependent on what buyers want. Both are also only professional dance companies in their municipality and region, which has an influence on their repertoire decisions. They consider more what kind of performances are suitable for their local audiences. However, in the end they are also struggling with same uncertainty and randomness created by insecure finances and lack of infrastructure.

Therefore, dependence on subsidies and grants from various sources, and lack of infrastructure in the production of works, produces coercive and mimetic pressures for defining the repertoire of independent dance companies. These pressures affect what is possible to create, where and how often it is possible to perform. Furthermore, they define who can be asked to perform or make the choreography if the artistic director is not the choreographer:

. . . we always begin from choosing the choreographer, who then decides his or her working group as is best. Of course there is always the limitation that we can't produce massive group pieces because financial resources won't allow it. Mostly the maximum number of performers in our productions is five and more than that we can't afford. (Artist director whose dance company is also producing performances by other choreographers)

In addition to the number of dancers and the size of the dance performance,

financial resources affect on how visually ambitious performances the dance company is able to produce. Same interviewee mentioned the ruggedness of visual effects as one of the characteristics of their performances. However, in relation to this it was acknowledged, that because of the lack of financial and technical resources, they do not have possibility to produce performances in which visual effects and lighting design have a central role. This automatically eliminates from their repertoire those choreographers who create performances which demand high cost visual design. However, this was only the case with the dance company who has own performance space. Other interviewees do not have own performance space and, therefore, need to consider, in addition to financial resources, how their performances can be easily moved to different theatre spaces.

Interestingly there were small differences with regard to how much independent dance companies consider their existing audiences when defining their repertoire. Those dance companies who are employing also other choreographers besides their artistic directors, and are the main professionally operating dance companies in their region, consider slightly more what kind of performances their audiences are used to seeing. In this case the tradition and previously performed repertoire also has some influence on what kind of work the artistic directors consider relevant for their audience. Therefore, the directors consider in some amount the local culture of their municipality and region, but still they give artistic freedom to the choreographers and dancers who they employ. They do not define any kind of limits with respect to audience demographics.

The interviewed artistic directors whose dance companies produce only their choreographies considered less the target audience of their performance, if it is not clearly a children's performance. The considerations on who might be interested to see the performance were said to be done always after the performance is ready to be performed and marketed. Artistic directors considered this more as the job of their producers or managing directors. Instead of audiences, when starting a new choreography, artistic directors can, however, consider what kind of works buyers have been previously most interested in:

. . . when half of our performances are produced by ourselves and other half is bought, of course, in the background, it affects which kind of performances have sold the most. So you begin to think that 'oh this kind of thing sold this time', so maybe in the future it might be easier to sell

performances which are somehow familiar as a concept. (Artistic director whose dance company produces only own choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2003)

Although it was acknowledged that relations to other agents of the field and the interests of buyers have an influence on which performances dance companies perform from their repertoire, interviewees still emphasized that they can freely do their creative work. In either case, whether the performances performed are the choreographies of the artistic director or visiting choreographers, there is always guaranteed the freedom of artistic expression. The starting point for each work comes from the artists themselves and their interests.

Generally, when compared to the interviews with the directors of municipal theatres, for the artistic directors of independent dance companies the knowledge of the existing audiences had less influence on repertoire decisions. Instead, the emphasis is on what artistic directors and other artistic personnel consider as interesting, motivating and influential to deal within their work. This reflects the normative pressure of maintaining artistic freedom in independent dance companies. However, this freedom does not span over when, where, how often and what independent dance companies can perform. When deciding when and where to perform they are dependent on which performance spaces are available and where they can afford to perform if they are not asked to perform. Their timetables for creating a new performance are dependent on grant decisions and what kind of performance space is available. When deciding what to perform they are dependent on which freelance dancers are able to perform on certain occasion. Eventually, when defining how often certain performance is performed, independent dance companies are mostly dependent on what buyers want.

Each of these issues is related to uncertain finances and dependence on operational subsidy by the National Council for Dance. Additionally, they reflect lack of infrastructure in independent dance companies which relates to the slow development of the legitimacy of dance in Finnish cultural policy. Therefore, defining the repertoire of independent dance companies is constrained by coercive and mimetic pressures. These pressures maintain conventions with regard to what, when, where and how often dance companies can perform their repertoire. Although, independent dance companies are diverse in terms of the artistic contents and freedom, yet they are homogenous in their ways of producing the repertoire and performing it. Therefore, the context of

operations of independent dance companies, defined in previous chapter, affects their operations. This further suggests that the relations which independent dance companies create in their operations are as well constrained by the context of operations.

8 THE CONVENTIONS DEFINING THE RELATIONS AND COLLABORATION

As mentioned in the beginning of the theoretical framework of the thesis, previous relations which organizations have to other organizations influence the ways of operation. Therefore, those relations are part of organizations' context of operation. They both create, and are subject to institutional pressures. With regard to municipal theatres and independent dance companies, it has already been established that the level of institutionalism in their relations to municipality differ significantly. This influences their ways of operation which eventually define with who they collaborate. Additionally, previous relations and experiences on collaboration with other actors of the field influence what kind of collaborations theatres and dance companies are used to realize. Furthermore, relations to other actors of the field are subject to institutional pressures and, therefore, influence organization's interest and possibilities to collaborate. In this chapter I will analyze how the directors of municipal theatres and independent dance companies define relations and collaboration to other actors of their organizational fields, and how institutional pressures are reflected in them.

8.1 Municipal Theatres: Emphasis on Local Relations and Formal Collaboration

In the interviews concept of organizational field was applied for understanding how the directors of municipal theatres perceive their relations to other organizations. Although few of the interviewees had first difficulties to understand what the concept of field means, the material collected from their answers provides useful information for analyzing the relations and collaborations of municipal theatres, and how institutional pressures influence them. Throughout the interviews there were present three different ways to define the organizational field of municipal theatres. In other words, three different points of views on how interviewees defined which actors are included in their field. In the broadest view, the organizational field of the theatre was perceived as the whole field of Finnish art.

In one way or another, each of the interviewed theatre directors considered that theatre as art form includes all the other art forms. Therefore, they emphasized that,

whether it is music, performance or visual arts, both the professionals and amateurs are part of their organizational field. However, two of the theatre directors acknowledged that mainly they have been operating within the network of other municipal theatres and theatres subsidized by law. Both also regarded that the situation is changing and it is ever more the matter of “what is between the ears” when thinking of with whom they are operating:

. . . in my opinion, at the moment, the production of art is opening up to new ways, and collaboration between established professional theatres and other agents will be the operational field of the future . . . in other words, the field is expanding and diversifying and because of these changes the function of theatre isn't that narrow any more so that we would only speak of theatre institutions as their own field. (Theatre director who works in a big municipal theatre fully owned by the municipality)

The consideration that the field is opening at the moment implies that before the relations between municipal theatres and other agents of the field have not been that open. Emphasis on opening the doors of municipal theatres for new forms of operation with other organizations, both in and outside of art field, reflects the mimetic pressures placed by uncertainty about the future role of the theatres in cultural policy. Additionally, the coercive pressures, which the relationship to municipality and the funding from three directions produce, are also reflected in how interviewees perceived the organizational field. Due to this, the field was also viewed as including the theatres which are of same size and subsidized by law. Finally, in the narrowest definition, the field was considered to be formed by the agents of performing arts who operate in the same region. The way to perceive the organizational field of municipal theatre differed slightly depending on the geographical location of the theatre. Therefore, although there is no one clear definition, it is evident that regional factors have also significant meaning for defining the relations of municipal theatre.

These considerations reflect institutional pressures related to the cultural political relationship with municipality and the dependence on the finances from three directions. As the finances for the operations of the theatres mainly come from the municipality and its region, theatres must be considered as the theatres of the region, and directors must pay attention to the relations with the local agents of the field.

However, they cannot either exclude organizations of Finnish art world as they are financed by the state. Therefore, interviewees also included all the agents and forms of art in their organizational field. Eventually, the ways to define the organizational field of municipal theatres reflects institutional coercive, mimetic and normative pressures.

When discussing about what kind of relations and collaboration the directors of municipal theatres have had and desire to have, these pressures emerged in two ways. The interviewed directors of municipal theatres were all very open to having relations and collaboration with various agents from both in and outside of art field. However, each of them also emphasized the importance of creating and maintaining relations to different local actors of their organizational field:

. . . this municipal theatre should be seen as a sort of 'mycelium' which means that the municipal theatre, or actually this is not a municipal theatre but a regional theatre, in this city and region has connection to all practitioners and cultural actors here, both amateurs and professionals . . .
(Theatre director who works for a medium-sized theatre operating as regional theatre)

In other words, it is suggested that municipal theatre should be regarded as a centre which connects different cultural agents of the region together. Such a view was present in every interview. Each director was also very keen to have relations with different kind of independent companies and freelance artists. Furthermore, relations and collaboration with the agents of municipal social sector were considered as essential to maintain and develop. Each of these issues reflect coercive and normative pressures produced both by the cultural political relationship with municipality and the dependence on public funding, as well as, the mimetic pressures produced by the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy and public funding for art institutions.

The interest to open the doors for collaboration with independent companies and freelance artists reflects the pressure to change operations in municipal theatres according to the demands of contemporary culture. By emphasizing throughout the interviews that municipal theatres have relations to independent companies and desire to collaborate with them, the directors justified the importance of their operations both locally and nationally. Additionally, four of the five interviewed directors mentioned that before becoming directors of municipal theatres they were also working in independent companies and groups. Therefore, they have a desire to keep good relations

to independent companies, and consider them more as collaborators than competitors.

However, at this point it is worth noting that the answers concerning relations to other agents of the field, either subsidized by law or independent ones, were mostly made from the point of view how theatre directors want that their theatres are seen, and how they are going to operate in the future. Therefore, also four of the five interviewees acknowledged that they have not yet been collaborating as much as they would want to, but it is going to be a central objective in the future:

. . . you would like to think and realize different kind of relations and connections, and mostly it is only restricted by what is between your ears, meaning, what you can see as possible. Too often collaboration is realized only between two theatres and most 'radically' between a theatre and a dance company, . . . but there are big problems in terms of finances so that how do you collaborate with some group and also take care that your own staff is employed. (Theatre director who works in the medium-sized theatre operating as regional theatre)

This quote, as well as different comments throughout the interviews, reflects that realizing collaboration in municipal theatres is constrained by both own thinking and the structures of the theatre. In other words, realizing collaboration is constrained by normative and coercive pressures. Therefore, although collaboration is happening between municipal theatres and independent companies, it is subject to institutional pressures. On the basis of the interviews, for municipal theatres the strongest pressures influencing collaboration arise from the relation to municipality, existing structures and securing finances from the municipality, state and through ticket incomes. These pressures strengthen conventions of collaboration in municipal theatres and, eventually, produce homogeneity among them.

This was emphasized throughout the interviews in how the directors of municipal theatres have realized collaboration in the theatres in question. There emerged mainly three common ways to collaborate with independent companies, which each of the interviewed directors either mentioned as realized or future way of operation. These included joint productions, providing a space for visiting performances and having an independent company or individual freelance artists as part of own production. Most pleased the interviewed directors seemed to be with collaborations between municipal theatre and independent company when the content of the

performance by independent company has had a strong connection to the repertoire and artistic policy of the municipal theatre.

Additionally, as successful experiences of collaboration were mentioned those where two to three municipal theatres with an independent director and freelance actors, or a smaller company subsidized by law, have together produced a performance. In this case the theatres provide the finances and facilities, whereas the independent director and actors, or the smaller theatre or dance company, have been responsible for the artistic production. Finally, no matter what the form of collaboration is, it was strongly emphasized that municipal theatre should maintain its profile as the theatre of the people who pay for theatre's operations through taxes and buying tickets. This reflects that the conventions defining the function and repertoire of municipal theatre have an influence, when the directors define the relations and collaboration to other agents of the art field. First and foremost, the convention of emphasizing the regionality and locality of the theatre has strongest role when deciding on the operations of the theatre.

The interviewed directors were also very strict about what the benefits of collaboration are for their theatre, and how professionally independent companies are operating. It was acknowledged that visiting performances bring new point of views inside the theatre. However, it was also demanded that the work of the visiting company speaks to the local audiences:

. . . I prefer that we open the doors for those who believe that they have something to say, but if I give the stage with 420 seats to someone, I assume that they have something to say for 420 people . . . or then you can go to the smaller stage where is only 60 seats . . . anyway these buildings have been built for bigger audiences and in principle we can speak to everyone, and this can be a place for different things, but I really expect that there is thinking and considerations at the background of the performance. (Theatre director working for medium-sized theatre operating as non-profit limited company)

Throughout the interviews there was present this kind of emphasis on theatre's own principles in production and repertoire decisions. One of the theatre directors mentioned that in collaborations, which are realized on the main stage, the connections to local artists and independent companies are emphasized. Such arguments further illustrate that when considering relations and collaboration with other actors of the art field

director's decisions are influenced by normative and coercive pressures rising from both the cultural political role of the theatre and the dependence on public funding. In other words, for municipal theatres collaborations should provide something which interests local, preferably new, audiences so that they will buy tickets.

With regard to reaching new audiences, all the interviewed directors considered collaboration as an ever more important part of their operations in the future, and when finances are becoming scarcer. This reflects that, when concerned about the future of public funding and cultural policy, theatre directors experience mimetic pressures to develop collaboration with independent companies. However, the emphasis on maintaining the local profile of municipal theatre, and communicating it through repertoire decisions, has strong influence on with who municipal theatres consider having collaboration. Therefore, coercive and normative pressures rising from the cultural political role and relation to municipality define the ways of collaboration. Additionally, the mimetic pressures placed by the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy encourage the realization of collaboration as a new way of operation. However, this can result into developing collaboration only for the sake of ensuring public funding and, therefore, homogenizes the forms of collaboration in municipal theatres.

The existing conventions which define the relations and collaborations of municipal theatres are once again locality and regionality as starting point, ability to bring inside the theatre something new which it is unable to produce itself, suitability for theatre's stages and for the interests of local audiences. Finally, collaborations which municipal theatres have realized are quite formal, such as joint productions, which demand shared finances and mutual engagement from each of the participating theatre. Therefore, they also demand that collaborating independent companies have professional and established ways of operation. When considering what differences theatres and dance companies have with regard to the context of operations, institutional pressures and the conventions defining the function and repertoire, it can be assumed that same differences are present in how they realize collaboration. Therefore, the following chapter deals with the conventions defining the relations and collaborations of independent dance companies with other actors of the art field.

8.2 Independent Dance Companies: Emphasis on Small-scale Relations and Informal Collaboration

With regard to how the artistic directors of independent dance companies perceived their organizational field there was much diversity. On the one hand, interviewees considered that they are operating only with the other dance artists of Finland. On the other hand, both professionals and amateurs of different art forms and sectors of educational and social services were included in the field. Additionally, three of the four interviewees included international networks of dance into their field:

. . . when the basis of our operations is dance art, performing arts, then we are operating in that field, but we provide also education because our dancers are teachers and have been working as my assistants in festivals around Finland and internationally. (Artistic director whose dance company produces also performances by other choreographers and has been receiving the subsidy since 2003)

Among the interviewees such a diverse understanding of organizational field, and what it includes, reflect the low level of infrastructure and freedom to define own operations as they desire. In other words, the mimetic and normative pressures arising from the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance.

For those artistic directors whose dance companies are the only professional dance agents in the region, locality affects partly the way of understanding which organizations and other agents are operating in the same field. In the experience of one particular interviewee the regions and agencies who are tackling with same problems are more familiar, and therefore included in their field, than the art organizations from totally different surroundings. Such thinking was also present in answers which defined the field of the dance companies as that of independent companies. This reflects that the interviewed artistic directors make some distinctions between theatres subsidized by law and independent companies, when considering with who they are operating. With regard to this, two of the artistic directors considered that their companies are reaching for big audiences, and operating already according to the demands for theatres subsidized by law. However, they also acknowledged that, in spite of this, they still have same problems as other independent dance companies. Such arguments were repeated throughout the interviews with the artistic directors, and reflect coercive

pressures placed by the dependence on discretionary public funding.

The diverse definitions of the organizational field of dance companies imply two central themes for defining their relations to other organizations. Each of the artistic directors emphasized their relations to other dance companies and freelancer choreographers and dancers around Finland. Therefore, the organizational field of Finnish independent dance companies is understood to include all the actors of Finnish dance, regardless of whether they are subsidized by law or the National Council for Dance. Additionally, the interviewed artistic directors considered themselves as part of the whole Finnish art field and operating also outside the framework of dance. However, still there was present a notion of dance as bit more marginal art form in the Finnish art field. This reflects the cultural political background of dance experienced as subordinate to other art forms for many years. Eventually, both the diverse definitions of the organizational field, and not emphasizing dance companies' relations only to local agents of art, reflect the influence of normative pressures rising from undefined cultural political role in municipality.

When speaking of independent dance companies, how the interviewed artistic directors defined their relations to other agents of the field, and what kind of collaboration they have done, reflect dealing with constant uncertainty and randomness. Therefore, the institutional pressures rising from the dependence on the discretionary operational subsidy, the cultural politically undefined relationship to municipality and the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance, affect the ways of building relations and the level of formality in collaboration:

. . . our circles of partners are very small scale, for example rehearsing spaces we get by swapping favors with local dance schools . . . as long term partners you could probably name the National Council for Dance or Ministry of Education and Culture as funders but other long term partners I can't think of at the moment. Of course different festivals are occasional partners who can ask us to perform time after time, but that always depends on whether they find our performances interesting.
(Artistic director whose dance company produces only own choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2008)

Such randomness, as reflected in the previous quote, regarding relations to other agents of the field was emphasized in each interview. Interviewees mentioned that they

have good relations to other independent dance companies. The work of regional centers of dance around Finland was appreciated in bringing different dance artists together. Each of the artistic directors stated that they are also working as freelancers outside their own companies, and performing in each other's choreographies was regarded as inspiring. This reflects well the notion of maintaining freedom in dance company's operations, and not being bound to restrictive structures. Such a freedom is also reflected in the forms of collaboration with other independent companies. The interviewees mentioned that they have mostly collaborated with other independent companies by organizing joint evenings of two performances. They also regarded information sharing and joining forces with other independent companies in lobbying as forms of collaboration. Both of these do not demand many changes in dance companies own operations and can be regarded as quite informal forms of collaboration.

Mostly it was considered that because of the lack of bureaucracy and infrastructure, relations and collaboration with other independent companies is easier than with municipal theatre institutions. Only one of the interviewed artistic directors stated that they are constantly collaborating with the local municipal theatre. This collaboration mainly involves freelance dancers employed by them as part of theatre's productions and theatre's actors as part of dance company's productions. However, they do not have any relations to other municipal theatres in Finland. Generally, the level and form of relations to local municipal theatre varied significantly throughout the interviews. Whereas one of the artistic directors considered that they do not have any kind of relations to municipal theatres, the other had joined forces with local municipal theatre in lobbying. Two of the directors also regarded that working in municipal theatre's musicals as collaboration.

However, only one dance company had visited in a municipal theatre with own production through collaboration which was supported by the funding from the Ministry of Education and Culture. Interviewee's experience on the collaboration was that although their performances had filled the auditorium in 80-90% it was still considered unprofitable as the demands for municipal theatres on what they should yield are so high. In the end, the collaboration between these two did not continue. Although there is diversity in how independent dance companies collaborate with municipal theatres, the general notion was that it is occasional and difficult to realize. However, the few experiences which the interviewed artistic directors had with municipal theatres were

positive in artistic terms:

The response from the staff of the theatre and audiences has been warm and enthusiastic, but often when you discuss with the directors of municipal theatres about the practical difficulties which they have with planning the repertoire and resources, so even if they would like to organize collaboration it is quite a difficult puzzle at their end. (Artistic director whose company produces only own choreographies and has been receiving the subsidy since 2003)

As reflected in this quote, the interviewed artistic directors had either the assumption or experience that collaboration with municipal theatres is difficult to realize. Such a presumption affects how independent dance companies regard the possibilities to collaborate with municipal theatres. The previous quote also illustrates that collaboration with municipal theatres is constrained by conventions of building the repertoire and, therefore, also subject to the institutional pressures of municipal theatres. Additionally, when independent dance companies are collaborating mostly with other independent companies their ways of collaboration are influenced by mimetic pressures rising from the low degree of infrastructure and the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance.

On the basis of the interviews, it is clear that municipal theatres and independent dance companies have quite different conventions for collaboration. Additionally, when considering that municipal theatres have strong normative pressures with regard to maintaining their profile as the theatre of their region, and independent dance companies with regard to maintaining their freedom, there might be challenges in achieving mutual agreement on how to collaborate. Eventually, when the coercive and mimetic pressures produced by both the different funding streams and the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy are added to this equation, collaboration between the two might be experienced too challenging and time consuming to realize. However, the open attitude of the directors of municipal theatres towards changing their operations and getting more involved with independent companies promises good possibilities for collaboration in the future. Although the artistic directors of independent dance companies seem skeptical about collaboration with municipal theatres around Finland, they are hoping for it. Cultural policy and different funding streams create the strongest coercive and mimetic pressures for the operations of both organizations. Therefore, as

acknowledged throughout the interviews, it is ever more matter of “what is between the ears” when deciding with who and how to collaborate, and whether it is seen possible between municipal theatre and independent dance company.

9 CONCLUSION

As mentioned in the beginning of this work, when embarking upon collaboration and aiming for mutual agreement on how to realize it, the context from which each participant comes, and what it means with regard to their culture and ways of operation cannot be ignored. In this work I have argued that the practice of collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies is challenged by institutional pressures and existing conventions. I have considered that both organizations operate in different contexts which produce institutional pressures and maintain certain conventions. The differences in the contexts of operations are mainly due to the differences in the streams of public funding, what the position of both types of art organizations within cultural policy is, and what their relationship to the municipality and region is. When regarded from this point of view the work of municipal theatres is influenced by the cultural political relationship between the theatres and municipalities, the dependence on funding from the state, municipality and ticket incomes, and the uncertainty about the future of cultural policy and public funding as well as the role of theatre institution in municipality. Correspondingly, the work of independent dance companies is influenced by the slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance, the dependence on the discretionary operational subsidy by the National Council for Dance, and the cultural politically undefined relationship to municipality.

I have considered that such contexts for operation produce institutional coercive, mimetic and normative pressures. They encourage maintaining certain conventions for defining the function, repertoire and the relations of the two art organizations. Throughout the interviews I have looked for recurring themes which each of the interviewee mentions. These themes, I consider, reflect the influence of institutional pressures which are also considered to homogenize organizations. Homogeneity in operations is considered to further encourage operation in established ways, and together with those who operate in similar ways. Therefore, as a conclusion, I will in this chapter discuss which issues in the conventions of defining the function, repertoire and relations of municipal theatres and independent dance companies refer to homogeneity, and challenge collaboration between the two types of art organizations.

9.1 Challenges for Collaboration

The function of municipal theatre which each director shared is defined as offering theatre experiences for the citizens of all ages of the municipality and region. Furthermore, municipal theatre's function is to develop Finnish theatre and drama, bring different forms of performance closer to people of the region and practice cultural policy through its repertoire decisions and other activities. Accordingly, the function of independent dance companies which each artistic director shared is defined as to provide people places to experience the issues of human life, interaction and communality through realizing the artistic view of the director and artistic staff of the dance company. Furthermore, dance companies desire to act as contrarians to values of growth, competition and success. They aim to realize and maintain artistic freedom, and are constantly in search for new ways to integrate dance with everyday life.

On the basis of how the interviewees defined their organization's function, both the directors of municipal theatres and independent dance companies desire to enhance the wellbeing of their audiences by providing places to understand and experience issues of human life through art. However, municipal theatres differ from independent dance companies by emphasizing their role as central cultural actor in their regions. This creates more pressure with regard to what they can do. In addition to artistic decisions, they must consider how their productions relate to their regions and to the lives of the people there. In the end, they are also bound to consider will the local audiences buy tickets to their performances, and do ticket incomes provide third of theatres' finances. Therefore, from the point of view of a municipal theatre, when considering collaboration with an independent dance company, challenges might rise from the existing norms of what is considered as suitable for theatre's audiences so that they will buy tickets.

Instead of defining the function according to the characteristics and people of the municipality, in independent dance companies a reason for being is grounded on the artistic career and interests of the artistic director and employed freelance dancers. With regard to the audiences, the desire to present performances for them also exists in independent dance companies. However, on the basis of the interviews, they do not define their operations according to their audiences, as emphasized in municipal theatres. Therefore, from the point of view of independent dance companies, the

demands of municipal theatres for considering the local characteristics in the creation of an art work might be experienced challenging or too constraining.

However, issues which both the directors of municipal theatres and independent dance companies find important in their work, and why they want to produce art, are mutual and quite universal. They do their work because they want to provide alternative point of views on human life, investigate it and offer answers to questions which could not be otherwise answered. How the function of both organizations is defined by the directors mostly reflects normative and mimetic pressures. Theatres are homogeneous in defining their function according to the notion that they realize the cultural responsibilities of their municipalities. Independent dance companies again are homogeneous in basing their function on realizing artistic freedom. Therefore, when speaking of how the function of both organizations is defined, challenges for collaboration, on the one hand, can rise from that the directors of municipal theatres do not consider the artistic work of independent dance companies as relevant for the people of their municipality and region. On the other hand, the directors of independent dance companies might not consider the local characteristics of the municipal theatre as relevant starting point for their work. In other words, conflicts might rise when reaching mutual agreement on the relevance of the collaboration for the audiences of the municipal theatre and for the artistic interests of the independent dance company. However, this does not seem quite likely as the directors of municipal theatres are open and willing to bring new forms of theatre, dance and performance into their repertoires, and find new ways of operation.

The conventions defining the function of both organizations do not present serious challenges for developing collaboration, but they do define some criteria for repertoire decisions. The conventions of repertoire decisions, and how repertoire is produced, might create bigger challenges for collaboration. The issues which each interviewee repeated with regard to repertoire decisions reflect prevailing conventions of emphasizing the locality of the operations of municipal theatres, and realizing the artistic freedom of independent dance companies.

The conventions of defining the repertoire in municipal theatres reflect also the function of theatre as providing performances mainly for the local people. Therefore, production of repertoire in municipal theatres is mostly subject to coercive pressures. In each of the municipal theatre, included in the study, the repertoire is defined according

to demands produced by both serving the existing audiences of different ages and gaining new ones. Furthermore, existing theatre building, the facilities and stages which it provides, and employing permanent artistic and production staff, are considered when making repertoire decisions. Each of these factors is a convention which enables steady production of repertoire in municipal theatres. Eventually, the production of the repertoire must be balanced with financial resources. Uncertainty about finances and the future of cultural policy was repeated in every interview and, therefore, challenges the production of repertoire in unconventional ways. Due to this, the production of repertoire in municipal theatres is defined by following the secure steps of existing rules and procedures. In the end, theatres are homogeneous in how the repertoire decisions are defined and produced, as each of them has long established structure for it. Furthermore, in financially insecure situations theatres might feel too risky to change their operations as that could result into higher expenditures.

With regard to independent dance companies the conventions which define their function as the enablers of the artistic freedom of choreographers and dancers, and the providers of experiences for people, are also reflected in how their repertoire decisions are defined. Both the normative as well as coercive pressures are present in the conventions of creating and performing the repertoire of independent dance companies. The starting point for repertoire in each of the interviewed dance companies is to guarantee artistic freedom for the choreographer and dancers to create the performance from own interests. Additionally, with regard to the contents of the repertoire, there should be diversity and differences in such a way that audiences and buyers feel surprised and do not always know what to expect from the dance company.

However, although choreographers and dancers in dance companies can fairly freely create what they want, the performances which are performed depend on what buyers want, when and where dance companies are able to perform. Additionally, scarcity and uncertainty about finances enables mostly performances which are not too ambitious in terms of the number of performers and technical realization. On the other hand, none of the interviewees mentioned that they would pursue for producing visually grandiose performances. With the resources which they now have they are content with keeping their operations small scale. Eventually, when the dance companies employ freelance dancers and choreographers, and do not have permanent performance facilities, the number of how many times they are able to perform certain performance

depends on the schedules of the dancers and which performances buyers are interested to see. Therefore, repertoire decisions in independent dance companies are defined more by randomness and leaving many issues to chance than strict planning. In other words, independent dance companies are homogeneous in their ways of enabling artistic freedom insofar as financial resources, application deadlines for grants and subsidies, other engagements of dancers and choreographers, interests of buyers and possibilities to rent performance space allow.

Finally, the differences in institutional pressures of both types of organizations are reflected in their conventions of having relations and collaboration. Coercive, normative and mimetic institutional pressures influence municipal theatres' relations to other organizations and experiences on collaboration. Previously realized relations and collaboration in theatres are defined by locality and formality. In other words, municipal theatres prioritize relations and collaboration to local agents of art field. Realized forms of collaboration include joint productions between two or more municipal theatres, providing performance space for visiting performances, and having a smaller theatre or dance company participating in the production of municipal theatre's own performance. Each of the interviewed theatre directors is interested to develop more collaboration with independent companies, but they do not want to lose their local characteristics and the essence of their repertoire policy. Furthermore, from independent companies they demand professionalism and thorough thinking with regard to the artistic contents. Particularly, visiting performances must fill the seats of either bigger or smaller stages and speak to the local audiences, so that the theatre does not lose its own identity. In other words, theatres are homogeneous in their forms of collaboration and emphasizing relations to local actors of art. Additionally, theatre directors must consider what collaboration brings to the theatre and local audiences, and whether it is able to provide ticket incomes.

For independent dance companies mimetic pressures which maintain their operations small scale influence the conventions of having relations and collaboration with other organizations. Therefore, randomness also defines independent dance companies' relations to other organizations and experiences on collaboration. Independent dance companies have relations and small scale collaboration with other independent companies. Therefore, the forms of collaboration which each of the interviewed artistic director mentioned include information sharing and joining forces

with local independent companies or municipal theatre when lobbying the municipal decision makers. According to the interviews, for independent dance companies it is common to have temporary and informal relations, which do not demand too many changes in own operations. On the one hand, this implies that they are keen to maintain their freedom also in collaboration, but on the other, that they do not have possibilities at the moment to collaborate in any other way. In other words, independent dance companies are homogeneous in their ways of having small scale collaboration and informal relations through which they mostly support each other and share important information. Those who had experienced some collaboration with local municipal theatres had mostly worked as part of theatre's own production, typically a musical. Common experience and assumption on collaboration with institutions is that it is difficult to realize for both organizations. Such a preconception among the directors of independent dance companies affects the interest to aim for collaboration with municipal theatres and, therefore, challenges it.

Eventually, the conventions defining the relations and collaboration of municipal theatres refer to more formal forms of collaboration, than the conventions of independent dance companies. This further suggests that development of collaboration between the two is challenged by different notions about the form and level of collaboration. The existing informal forms of collaboration among independent dance companies reflect coercive and mimetic pressures. The slow development of the cultural political legitimacy of dance and low degree of infrastructure, as well as having to deal constantly with the uncertainty about future finances, does not enable development of more formal forms of collaboration in independent dance companies. Municipal theatres are used to formal forms of collaboration and demand professionalism from their partners. Therefore collaboration with independent dance companies might be experienced challenging if their operations seem too uncertain and informal for the directors of municipal theatres.

In both organizations own repertoire and how it reflects their function and purpose is still the main focus of operations. When institutional pressures influence and support the conventions which define the basic operations, then realization of collaboration is subject to same conventions. Additionally, for both types of art organizations, dependence on the public funding and uncertainty about the future of cultural policy produces significant coercive and mimetic pressures. These pressures

maintain established conventions either by forcing or inviting to act in certain ways. In the end, changing existing conventions all together for creating something new in uncertain situations can be experienced in both types of organizations too risky and challenging. On the basis of this discussion, it can be concluded; institutional pressures and existing conventions challenge collaboration because changing them is time consuming and creates additional costs. Furthermore, when the conventions defining the function, repertoire and relations of theatres and dance companies are quite different then the directors of these art organizations might have different views on the benefits and objectives of collaboration. Changing institutional pressures and their influence on existing conventions would demand changes as well in public funding as in the structures and practices of municipal theatres and independent dance companies. Establishing formal forms of collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies also demands mutual interest and trust, which is challenging to achieve when the two have not been actively collaborating.

9.2 Implications for Practice and Future Research

The differences in the conventions which define the repertoire and relations with other organizations illustrate that municipal theatres and independent dance companies are subject to different institutional pressures. As concluded in previous chapter, changing these pressures is difficult to realize. However, both the interviewed directors of municipal theatres and those of independent dance companies expressed mutual concern about the future of cultural policy and how public funding is going to be distributed. This suggests that there might be possibilities to tackle together against the threats that these concerns create. Collaboration could be something beneficial in this. Through collaboration and development of new forms of operation the will to publicly support both organizations could be secured.

However, as mentioned earlier, public support places constraints on the operations of both types of organizations. If the directors of municipal theatres and independent dance companies feel that they need to be constantly alert with the future of public funding, collaboration together might be experienced too challenging in a financially insecure situation. Therefore, although mutual threats create possibilities for

developing collaboration they also challenge it, if the organizations do not see them as possibilities to act together. Finally, the common concern about the future of the public funding and cultural policy illustrates that cultural policy creates institutional pressures for both organizations. Therefore, it can be considered that cultural policy and public funding might have a role in encouraging collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies.

However, the cultural policy makers and the ones deciding on public funding should acknowledge what kind of coercive, mimetic and normative pressures they produce for collaboration. When it is pursued for the sake of securing public funding only, it can also deteriorate the art field by encouraging only certain forms of collaboration. Additionally, if municipal theatres feel a pressure to collaborate with independent companies only for securing their funding and status in the society, the benefits for independent companies might be forgotten. Therefore, collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies should be first based on mutual interest. Additionally both should be aware of the conventions that influence their work, and how they could be changed so that it is beneficial for both parties.

In this thesis collaboration and how it is challenged is dealt within the framework of institutional theories. When approached from this point of view the reasons for the challenges of collaboration are understood to rise also outside of art organizations. This manner of an approach could be criticized as too theoretical and impractical when collaboration has been and is happening without any changes in institutional pressures. Although art organizations are subject to institutional pressures, it does not mean that collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies could not be realized. Then, it is worth considering what the conventions which define the ways of collaboration in both types of art organizations are. In other words, are there in the existing ways of collaboration something that prevents it from evolving into more established practice between municipal theatres and independent dance companies. Institutional approach enables understanding on what lies behind everyday actions and why people in certain organizations act in certain ways. When understanding these links it is possible to perceive different options for existing ways of operation within certain context. Although institutional pressures cannot be changed in one night, various possible ways to deal with them can be realized when one first acknowledges existing conventions and their limitations.

Various suggestions for future research rise from the discussion about the challenges of collaboration. In this thesis I have only considered the effects of cultural policy and public funding on providing the context of operations and producing institutional pressures for municipal theatres and independent dance companies. However, as acknowledged in the beginning of the work there are many other agencies in the Finnish art world that can influence the context of operations, and either produce or strengthen institutional pressures for both organizations. Therefore, future research could concentrate on how the competing services provided by entertainment industry influence on the operations of municipal theatres and independent dance companies, do the operations of entertainment centers, such as movie theatre complexes, place any pressures for the operations of theatres and dance companies, for example.

Additionally, questions about audiences were placed during the interviews of this study, but answers to them were quite vague. Either interviewees did not have any current information based on audience research, or answers were based on general studies on theatre or dance audiences. Eventually, the questions also proved to be outside the scope of the study. Therefore, it would be interesting to research more carefully the audiences of municipal theatres and independent dance companies, what kind of characteristics they have and could there be found some synergy benefits with regard to collaboration.

During the writing process I realized that independent dance companies have also quite significant differences in their ways of operations. The differences concern issues such as whose choreographies they are producing, what their relation to municipality is, and what the focus of their operation is. These differences suggest that it would be necessary to study in more detail how their ways of operations have developed. In relation to this it would be interesting to conduct a research on the legitimation process of dance and its position in the Finnish cultural policy from the beginning of last century until the beginning of 21st century. As part of this would be a discussion on how the development of cultural policy influences the appreciation of dance in the society, and what kind of discourses it produces among the artists themselves. Such a research could be beneficial when regarding cultural political decisions concerning other developing art forms, such as contemporary circus.

With regard to this, during the process of understanding the context of operation for independent dance companies it was challenging to construct thorough view on their

relations with municipalities. Therefore, it would be also necessary to conduct a study on how municipal administrators regard the role of dance within their cultural services. Additionally, the financial support provided by the municipalities for dance was difficult to obtain. Thorough statistics on how much municipalities support dance could provide important information for the development of the relationship between dance and municipalities.

9.3 The Evaluation of the Research Process

The suggestions for future research are based on themes and subjects which emerged during the research, but could not be answered. The question to be answered was: how institutional pressures and conventions of operations challenge collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies? During the process the stages of constructing the theoretical framework, conducting the interviews, transcribing and analyzing the material were intertwined. Understanding the theories, which were not familiar from previous studies, and constructing the interview guide when theoretical framework was not fully completed, were the most challenging parts of the process. Additionally, lack of interviewing experience affected the process of collecting the material, for instance, the ability to formulate questions clearly.

Although the perspective on studying the challenges of collaboration was clear, the form and focus of research questions were still under development when the interviews had to be conducted. This also had an influence on the interviewer confidence. However, during the reading and analysis of the transcribed material central themes in relation to the theoretical framework became clear, as well as, the formulation of research questions. Therefore, theoretical concepts and the interview material were in dialogue during the process of analysis. Due to this it was possible to narrow down the focus of the research questions and categorize relevant information from the interviews. Eventually, in spite of the uncertainties during the process of the study, the combination of institutional theories and qualitative method enabled construction of theoretical understanding on how collaboration between municipal theatres and independent dance companies is challenged by institutional pressures and conventions of operations.

WORKS CITED

- Acar, Muhittin and Chao Guo. "Understanding Collaboration Among Nonprofit Organizations: Combining Resource Dependency, Institutional, and Network Perspectives." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol 34, no 3, September 2005: 340-361. Sagepub. Web. 8 Nov. 2010.
- Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. 25th anniversary ed. Berkley: University of California Press, 2008. Print.
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." DiMaggio and Powell. 63-82. Print.
- , eds. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. London: University of Chicago Press, 1991. Print.
- Duelund, Peter, ed. *The Nordic Cultural Model*. Copenhagen: Nordic Cultural Institute, 2003. Print.
- Eskola, Jari, and Juha Suoranta. *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen*. 5th ed. Jyväskylä: Vastapaino, 2001. Print.
- Finnish Theatre Statistics 2010. *Tinfo*. Teatterin Tiedotuskeskus 2011. Web. 10 Sep. 2011.
- Flick, Uwe. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications, 2002. Print.
- Haapanen, Irmeli. "Kenttäväki arvioi suomalaisen näyttämötaiteen nykytilaa: Yhteistyön puute ja rahoituksen kankeus jarruna." *Turun Sanomat* 27. Mar. 2011: 22. Print.
- Healey, Patsy. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Print.
- Heikkinen, Merja. *The Nordic Model for Supporting Artists: Public Support for Artists in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden*. Helsinki: Arts Council of Finland, 2003. Print.
- . *Valtion taiteilijatuki taiteilijan määrittelijänä: Määrittelyvallan ehtoja ja ulottuvuuksia pohjoismaisen tukimallin suomalaisessa muunnelmassa*. Helsinki:

- Arts Council of Finland, 2007. Print.
- Hirsjärvi, Sirkka, and Helena Hurme. *Tutkimushaastattelu: Teemahaastattelun teoria ja käytäntö*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus Helsinki University Press, 2009. Print.
- Kanerva, Anna and Minna Ruusuvirta. *Suomalaisen teatterin tulevaisuus teatterintekijöiden ja kuntien silmin: Yhteenveto teatteriselvityksestä*. *cupore.fi*. Foundation for Cultural Policy Research, 13 Dec. 2006. Web. 15 Apr. 2010.
- Karhunen, Paula. *Tanssiproduktioiden tuki ja tuontantoehdot: Valtion produktiotuen kehitys ja merkitys 1991-2008*. Helsinki: Taiteen keskustoimikunta, 2008. Print.
- Karikoski, Mari. "Tanssiryhmien harkinnanvarainen avustus." Message to the author. 19 Dec. 2011. E-mail.
- Koskela, Sanna, and Sanna Rekola. *Askel Tulevaisuuteen. Tanssin vapaan kentän kehittämishankkeen loppuraportti*. *Tanssin tiedotuskeskus. Dance Info Finland*. Tanssin tiedotuskeskus, 26 Feb. 2003. Web. 18 Oct. 2011.
- Kurkela, Tiia. *Hyvinvointivaltion lippuluukulla: Teattereiden ohjelmistopoliittiset ja taloudelliset selviytymiskeinot rahoitusympäristön muutoksissa*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston valtio-opin laitos ja Taiteen keskustoimikunta, 2000. Print.
- Kvale, Steinar. *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage Publications, 1996. Print.
- Luukko, Minna. "Tilastoa kuntien tuista." Message to the author. 3 Oct. 2011. E-mail.
- Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä 2003:13. *Selvitys teattereiden valtiosuusjärjestelmän toimivuudesta*. *Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö*. Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2003. Web. 21 Apr. 2010.
- Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 15:2000. *Teattereiden yhteistyön kehittäminen*. Helsinki: Opetusministeriö, 2000. Print.
- Phills, James A. Jr. *Integrating Mission and Strategy for Nonprofit Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Powell, Walter W. "Expanding the Scope of Institutional Analysis." DiMaggio and Powell. 183-203. Print.
- Repo, Riitta. *Tanssien Tulevaisuuteen*. Helsinki: Taiteen keskustoimikunta, 1989. Print.
- Roberts, Joan M. *Alliances, Coalitions and Partnerships: Building Collaborative*

- Organizations*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers, 2004. Print.
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. California: Sage Publications, 1995. Print.
- Sallinen, Minna. *Kaupungin kulttuurivervollisuudesta kulttuuripalveluksi: Kunnallisten teattereiden ja orkestereiden kehittyminen 1940-1980*. Helsinki: Cupore, 2009. Print.
- Santtila, Katri. "Kysymyksen teattereiden ja orkestereiden yhteistyöhankkeista." Message to the author. 13 Jan. 2011. E-mail.
- Scott, W. Richard. *Institutions and Organizations*. California: Sage Publications, 1995. Print.
- . "Unpacking Institutional Arguments." DiMaggio and Powell. 164-182. Print.
- "Tanssitaide". *taiteenkeskustoimikunta.fi*. Web. 23 Sep. 2010.
- Tanssitaidepoliittisen työryhmän muistio 24:1999. *Tanssin tila ja tulevaisuus*. Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita. Helsinki: Opetusministeriö, 1999. Print.
- "Teatteri- ja orkesterilaki 3.8.1992/730". Stat. 23.11.2007/1066. 23 Nov. 2007. *Finlex*. Web. 2 Nov. 2010.
- Vilokkinen, Helena. "VL: koonti(1).doc." Message to the author. 3 Aug. 2010. E-mail.
- . "VL: koonti(6).doc." Message to the author. 3 Aug. 2010. E-mail.
- . "VL: koonti(7).doc." Message to the author. 3 Aug. 2010. E-mail.
- . "VL: yhttyö08.xls." Message to the author. 3 Aug. 2010. E-mail.

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: Interview guide

Haastattelurunko / Interview guide

Taustatiedot / Background informations:

1. Mikä teatteri tai tanssiryhmä ja taustaorganisaatio? / The name of the theatre or dance company and background organisation?

Missä toimii? / Where do you operate?

2. Johtaja, nimi? / The director, name?

3. Mitkä ovat muutamalla sanalla teatterin tai tanssiryhmän / In couple of words, what are your theater's or dance company's

vahvuudet? / strengths?

heikkoudet? / weaknesses?

mahdollisuudet? / opportunities?

uhat? / threats?

4. Onko teatterin tai tanssiryhmän missio, visio ja arvot kirjattu? / Have you written down theatre's or dance company's mission, vision and values?

Miten missio, visio ja arvot on löydetty? / How have you decided on these mission, vision and values?

Ketkä ovat niistä päättäneet? / who have decided on them?

5. Mikä on teatterinne tai tanssiryhmänne toiminnan tarkoitus? / What is the purpose of your theatre or dance company?

Miksi olette olemassa? Mitä puuttuisi jos teitä ei olisi? / Why do you exist? What would be missing if you weren't here?

Taiteellinen missio / Artistic mission:

6. Miten kuvailisitte teatterianne tai tanssiryhmäännne taiteellisesti? / How would you characterize your theatre or dance company artistically?

Onko tiettyä taiteellista linjaa, jota noudatetaan? Mikä se on? / Do you have certain artistic policy? What is it?

Mitä taiteellisesti arvostatte? Taiteellinen tavoite? / What do you artistically value? Your artistic objective?

7. Miten luonnehtisitte ohjelmistoanne? / How would you characterize your repertoire?

Minkälaisista esityksistä ohjelmisto koostuu? / What kind of performances are included in your repertoire?

Miten taiteellinen linja näkyy ohjelmistossa? / How is the artistic policy illustrated in the repertoire

Mitä teemoja ohjelmiston esitykset käsittelevät? / What kind of themes the repertoire includes?

8. Mitkä asiat vaikuttavat ohjelmistovalintoihin? / What kind of factors influence your repertoire decisions?

Ketkä päättävät ohjelmistosta? / Who makes the repertoire decisions?

Mikä rajoittaa ohjelmistovalintoja? / What kind of factors restrict repertoire choices?

Mikä mahdollistaa tietyn ohjelmiston? / What kind of factors enable certain repertoire?

Vaikuttavatko aiemmat esitykset? / Do the previous performances influence on future performances?

Vaikuttaako teatteritalo ja tilat? / Does the theatre building and facilities influence on repertoire decisions?

Miten taiteellista linjaa seurataan ohjelmistovalinnoissa? / How do you follow the artistic policy in your repertoire decisions?

Miten missio, visio ja arvot näkyvät ohjelmistovalinnoissa? / How does the repertoire reflect mission, vision and values?

9. Mikä on hyvä ohjelmisto? / What is good repertoire?

Minkälainen esitys sopii ohjelmistoonne? / What kind of performances fit to your repertoire?

10. Mikä on huono ohjelmisto? / What is bad repertoire?

Minkälainen esitys ei sovi ohjelmistoonne? / What kind of performance does not fit to your repertoire?

11. Ketkä ovat kohdeyleisöänne? / Who is your target audience?

Onko yksi isompi yleisöryhmä vai useampi pienempi, esim. lapset, nuoret, perheet, eläkeläiset? / Do you have one bigger target audience group or several smaller ones?

Onko jokin yleisöryhmä jonka haluaisitte tavoittaa? / Do you have in mind any audience groups which you would like to reach?

Onko jokin yleisöryhmä, jolle teatteri ei suuntaa ohjelmistoa? / Do you have in mind any audience groups which you do not target any repertoire?

12. Oletteko tehnyt yleisötutkimusta? Onko se sellaisessa muodossa, että siihen voi tutustua? / Have you conducted an audience research? Is it in a readable form and possible to read?

Millainen on teatterinne kävijä? / How would you characterize your theater's audiences?

13. Kerro mitä palveluita kaupunginteatterinne tai tanssiryhmänne tarjoaa? / What kind of other services your theatre or dance company provides?

Väliaikatarjoilut, hyvinvointi, yleisötyö? / restaurant or cafe services during the intermission, services related to audience's well-being?

Onko muita palveluita kuin esitykset? / Do you have Any other services than performances?

Mitä muita palveluita haluaisitte tarjota? / What kind of services you would like to provide for audiences?

Toimintakenttä / Organizational field:

14. Mikä on toimintakenttänne? Keitä muita sinne kuuluu? / What is your organizational field? Who do you include in it?

Muut kaupunginteatterit, vapaan kentän toimijat, tanssi, sirkus, esitystaide, muut kulttuuripalvelut? / Other municipal theatres, independent companies, dance, circus, performance art or other culture services?

15. Miten erotutte muista kaupunginteattereista tai tanssiryhmistä? / How do you differ from other municipal theatres or dance companies?

Seuraatteko muiden teattereiden toimintaa ja ohjelmistoa / do you follow the operations and repertoire of other theatres?

Ovatko muut teatterit kilpailijoita vai yhteistyökumppaneita? / Are other theatres competitors or collaborators?

Toimivatko teatterit samalla alueella vai vertaako toimintaansa teattereihin ympäri Suomea / Do you compare your own operations to theatres at the same region or around Finland?

16. Miten erotutte vapaan kentän toimijoista? / How do you differ from independent companies?

Keiden vapaan kentän toimijoiden ohjelmistoa seuraatte? / Do you follow the operations and repertoire of independent companies?

Lukeutuuko alueen muihin toimijoihin vapaan kentän edustajia? / Is there any independent companies in your region?

Ovatko vapaan kentän toimijat kilpailijoita vai yhteistyökumppaneita? / Are independent companies competitors or collaborators?

Miten ohjelmistonne eroaa vapaan kentän ryhmien esityksistä? / How does your repertoire differ from the performances of independent companies?

17. Mitä esityksenne tarjoavat verrattuna muihin tarjolla oleviin ajanviettopoihin? Minkä kanssa kilpailette? / What does your repertoire offer when compared to other possible free time activities? With what do you compete?

Esim. elokuvat, liikunta, tv, konsertit, ravintolat, Mitä esityksenne tarjoavat enemmän? / For example, movies, sports, television, concerts, restaurants, what does your repertoire offer more?

Miten vaikuttavat toimintaan? / How do other competing activities influence on your operations?

18. Mitä toivotte tulevaisuudeltanne tällä kentällä? / What do you wish for from the future on this field?

Appendix 2: Original Finnish quotations from the interviews

Alkuperäiset suomenkieliset lainaukset haastatteluista

Chapter / Luku 6.2

teatteri on mun mielestä siis ennen kaikkea laitos, jonka pitää paikallisesti pystyy perustelevaan oma työnsä. Paikallisesti tarkoittaa tässä maakunnassa ja kaupungissa eli ensimmäinen asia on se, että meidän pitää pystyy täyttää perustehtävä, et meidän pitää pystyä palvelemaan tämän alueen ihmisiä hyvällä ohjelmistopolitiikalla ja sit toinen asia on se, et miten maailma ja teatteri muuttuu niin siihen täytyy reagoida. (Teatterinjohtaja keskisuuresta teatterista, joka toimii voittoa tavoittelemattomana osakeyhtiönä)

kunnat elää kalenterivuositain ja taidelaitoksen toimintaväli on, jos puhutaan suunnittelusta, ohjelmistosta, kiinnittämisestä ja ikään kuin visioista, päätöksistä joita täytyy tehdä, ni se aikaväli pitäis olla kyllä tommonen kolme neljä vuotta eteenpäin eli mahdollisuus kyetä tekemään jo tota ajatuksia ja sitoomuksia, et se on aika vaikee tässä tilanteessa. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täysikunnallisesta teatterista)

no uhat on ilman muuta se, et kun julkinen rahoitus pienenee niin se, et miten vaikuttaa ohjelmistosuunnitteluun, koska se on ratkasevin päätös, joka tietysti vaikuttaa niihin omiin tulovirtoihin, on se et mikä on se ohjelmistopäätös, et toistaseks me ollaan aika korkealla pidetty et meil on aika paljon semmosii kokeellisia just tuol [pienen näyttämön] puolella, meil on ollu kantaesityksiä päänäyttämöllä ja muuta, mutta et siis nimenomaan kantaesitystä ja hiukankin niinkun uutta tutkivien mahdollisuudet on varmaan tiukkenemassa sitte. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täysikunnallisesta teatterista)

yleensä se, että millä tavalla kulttuurin rahoituksesta ajatellaan eli se on varmaan koko kentän uhka ja kysymys siitä, että millä tavalla koko tää teatterikenttä tulee määräytymään, onko suomen teatterikartta sen näköinen kuin tällä hetkellä siis muutaman vuoden päästä . . . kuinka paljon tämmösessä rahoituksessa yhteiskunta tulee ohjaa kulttuurilaitoksia siis myöskin tälläseen muuhun rahoitukseen tarkoitan omaan varainhankintaan, eli periaatekysymys on mun mielestä valtavan suuri täs syntymässä siitä, että missä määrin nähdään, mitkä kulttuurilaitokset yhteiskunnallisesti merkittävänä, jotta niitä tuetaan sekä valtion että sitten omistajatahojen kannalta. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täysikunnallisesta teatterista)

Chapter / Luku 6.4

tanssitaide-toimikunnan harkinnanvarainen tuki on sellanen, et sitäkin haetaan vuosittain ja siinä ei oo sellasta jatkumoa, et toki se asettaa sellasta niinkun painetta aikamoista, ja myös se, että miten niinkun taiteellisen johtajan näkökulmasta se, että kuinka mä pystyn pyytämään ketään koreografia tänne töihin jos mä en pysty lupaamaan sille ennen kuin vasta joulukuussa, että okei sä pystyt aloittaa helmikuussa sen työskentelyn, koska rahoitukset tulee siinä main, vasta sitten varmistuu ja näin. Se on sellasta, niinku ei voi sanoo pitkäjänteiseksi, et pitää kokoajan olla sillai vähän niinkun varpaillaan asioiden kanssa, et se on sellasta uuvuttavaa. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa myös muiden koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2008)

lähtien)

mul on semmonen tuntuma, että kaupunki on ehkä kokenu, et tää meidän linja on heille erittäin hyödyllinen, että me tehään niinkun tämmöstä KULPS-yhteistyötä kaupungin kanssa, joka on semmonen kaupungin kulttuuri ja liikunta polku elikä kaupunki subventoi sen kautta noitten koulujen teatterivierailuja ja sit me järjestetään kans semmosii työpajoja kouluille” (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa vain omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2003 lähtien)

kamppailu siitä omasta olemassa olemisesta ihan suhteessa kaupungin rahoitukseen, että joka vuosi käydään ne samat taistelut ja tota marras-joulukuussa ei vielä tiedetä seuraavan vuoden rahoituksesta ennen kuin sitten joulukuun valtuustokokous sen päättää ja nuijii pöytään, et se niinku se on semmonen alituinen [uhka]. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa myös muiden koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2008 lähtien)

Chapter / Luku 7.1

meidän täytyy ajatella, että tän taidelaitoksen pitää kohdata erilaisia ihmisryhmiä, erilaisia katsojaryhmiä, erilaisia ikäryhmiä, mut meidän pitää yrittää tavoittaa se koko yhteiskunnan kokijapinta, et me ei saada, me ei voida niinkun rajautua liian tarkkaan ja siinä mun mielestä se ikään kuin se tälläsen laitosteatterin yhteiskunnallinen tehtävä on. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täysikunnallisesta teatterista)

teatterit tekee mun mielestä kulttuuripolitiikkaa myöskin sillä vierailupolitiikallaan, et sitä ei voi tehdä niin paljon kuin haluais, siihen ei ole yksinkertaisesti olemassa varoja, mut joskus meille tulee tyhjiä päiviä ja silloin me saadaan periaatteessa tilastoja myöskin, et meil on se oma lehmä ojassa, et me saadaan niinku katsojatilastoja, mut useimmiten, jos ne on omariskejä ni useimmiten me pyöritetään niit tappiolla. . . . mä koen sen, et se on kulttuuripolitiikkaa ja se ei ole liiketoimintaa silloin kun se on meidän vierailupolitiikkaa silloin kun se on meidän omaa . . . mutta tota mun mielestä kulttuuripolitiikan tekeminen kuuluu teatteriin. Sen niin kun muunkin tarjonnan voi perustella sillä teatterin toiminnalla. (Teatterinjohtaja keskisuuresta teatterista, joka toimii voittoa tavoittelemattomana osakeyhtiönä)

Chapter / Luku 7.2

tavallaan se toiminta-ajatus tietysti menee siinä mukana, kun me ollaan täyskunnallinen ja . . . me kuulutaan tähän palvelutuotantoon ikään kuin, että kulttuuri nähdään jotenkin niinkun palveluna ja tota sitähän se tottakai on, ei siinä mitään, mutta se silloin niinkun pitää sisällään kaikki kaupungin asukkaat jo ihan automaattisesti, koska me toimitaan kuntalaisten veromarkoilla ja tietysti taas valtiolta me saadaan rahaa sitä varten et me ollaan iso teatteri tällä alueella et se kyl myös velvoittaa meitä sillä tavalla, että yleisö pitää ottaa monella tavalla huomioon, monenikäiset pitää ottaa huomioon. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täyskunnallisesta kaupunginteatterista)

eihän tää perustoiminta hirveesti oo muuttunu vuosisatojen myötä, tääl on kolme näyttämöö, jolla on tehty näille samanikäisille, siis se perustoiminta ei oo tavallaan muuttunu mikskään, mut se miten se artikuloidaan ulos ni se sit vaihtelee. Näin mä sen vähän nään, et valitaan joku produktio, sitten siihen haalitaan tekijät joko talosta tai talon ulkopuolelta, sen jälkeen se toteutetaan ja esitetään yleisölle ni sehän on se ydinprosessi, eikä se ydinprosessi muutu miksikään. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täyskunnallisesta kaupunginteatterista)

mä oikeesti olen sitä mieltä, että nää näyttämön huomioon ottaminen, ja sitten kaikkien teatterilajien huomioon ottaminen ja sitten se, että mihinkä yleisö tulee ni ne on ne, jotka ratkaisee sen ohjelmistopolitiikan ja se on aika vaikee yhtälö ja sit tietysti vielä yks on se, että onko meillä ne ihmiset talossa (Teatterinjohtaja keskisuuresta teatterista, joka toimii voittoa tavoittelemattomana osakeyhtiönä)

[raha] vaikuttaa esimerkiks, et ens vuonna kun me sit painotetusti ollaan valittu et me tehdään sitä uutta suomalaista musiikkiteatteria ni se valinta tarkoittaa, et meillä ei oo rahaa tehdä pienelle puolelle samaan aikaan, me ei voida tuottaa, eli vaikuttaa. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täyskunnallisesta kaupunginteatterista)

Chapter / Luku 7.3

liian isojen teosten siis tarkoita, väkimäärältään tai näyttämökooltaan tai jotenkin tämmöseltä kattaukseltaan liian isot esitykset ei oo mun juttu, joskin täs täytyy taas jättää se sivuportti auki, et joku päivähän mä saatankin innostua sellasesta ,et tekeekin jonkun massaspektaakkelin, mut nyt tuntuu et semmonen ei kiinnosta tällanen niinkun suuren jähmeän järjestelmän luominen tän tekemisen ympärille. No ei kiinnosta lähtökohtasesti tilaustyöt, joissa ei ole aikaa tehdä sitä teosta kunnolla, tä on yks syy miks mä ryhdyn tekee hyvin vähän tällasia niinkun yhteistöitä niinkun tilausteosyhteistöitä. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa vain omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2008 lähtien)

Chapter / Luku 7.4

me ollaan hyvin pitkälle lähetty siitä ideasta, että tavallaan meidän ohjelmisto on hyvin erinäköistä siis, että teokset on hyvin niinkun löytäneet sen oman luonteensa, luotuaan tavallaan uudet säännöt jokaista esitystä varten ja se taiteellinen linja on sitte semmonen niinku hyvinkin erilaisten teosten summa. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa vain omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2003 lähtien)

hyvin vähän meil on niinkun mahdollisuutta tehdä sellasta ohjelmistosuunnittelua sellasessa perinteisessä mielessä, koska ne menee miten menee. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa vain omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2008 lähtien)

meillä mennään aina silleen, että sitten kun ikään kuin koreografi on valittu niin sitten hän muodostaa sen oman työryhmänsä niinkuin itse parhaaks näkee. Toki siinä tulee aina se, että ei voi niinku olla massiivisia ryhmäteoksia, että aika usein oisko meillä viis

tanssijaa ollu niinku maksimi koko mitä voi olla teoksessa, et sitte tulee niinku rahalliset resurssit vastaan, että sen isompia ryhmäbiisejä ei voi olla. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa myös muiden koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2008 lähtien)

se tietysti vaikuttaa, että kun meidän esityksistä ehkä puolet on itsetuotettuja ja puolet tilattuja ni sitten ne tilattujen esitysten niinkun, että mitä ne on niin se sitten määrittää ne tilaajat, mikä menee kaupaksi ja siitä sit tulee ehkä semmonen et 'ahaa tämmönen juttu nyt meni' ni sitten se voi ehkä silleen jossain takaraivos, jos usein sit se havainto on ollut, että on helpompi myydä esitystä, joka on jo jotenkin konseptina tuttu. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2003 lähtien)

Chapter / Luku 8.1

tähän taiteen tuottamiseen niin mun mielestä tähän liittyy nyt kauhean läheisesti juuri tämmönen uusavautumisen aika eli, että keskeiseks nousee esimerkiks näiden kiinteiden ammattiteattereiden ja muiden toimijoiden välinen yhteistyö. Se tulee olemaan enemmän sitä tulevaisuuden kenttää . . . Et kenttä on laajenemassa, monipuolistumassa ja sen takia, että tää tehtävän kuva on muuttumassa, niin ilman muuta se ei oo enää niin kapea, että puhuttais vain esimerkiks, että laitosteatterit on yks oma ehdoton tämmönen alueensa vaan, näin mä näkisin tällä hetkellä. (Teatterinjohtaja suuresta täyskunnallisesta kaupunginteatterista)

tä pitäis ajatella tä kaupunginteatteri semmosena niinkun rihmastona, jossa se kaupunginteatteri tarkoittaa tietyllä lailla koko tätä, tähän ei oo kyllä kaupunginteatteri vaan . . . aluetatteri, tavallaan et se tarkoittaa tätä kaupunkii ja sit se tarkoittaa tätä aluetta millä ois niinkun yhteys näihin harrastajiin, kaikkiin kulttuuritoimijoihin täällä. (Teatterinjohtaja keskisuuresta aluetatterina toimivasta kaupunginteatterista)

erilaisia kytköksiä ja ikään kuin tälläisiä yhdisteitä haluais koittaa ajatella ja tehdä ja niissä on vaan, tuntuu et niissä on enemmän vaan rajana se oma korvien väli elikä se, että minkä osaa nähdä mahdollisena, et turhan usein se yhteistyö on vaan sitä, että kaks teatteriin tekee yhteistyötä ja radikaaleimmillaan sitä, että tehdään tanssiteatterin kanssa, . . . mutta tosi isoja problemeja on niinku just noissa rahoituksissa, että miten ikään kuin tehdä yhteistyötä jonkun ryhmän kanssa ja sitten pitää huolta että se oman talon väki saa työtä. (Teatterinjohtaja keskisuuresta aluetatterina toimivasta kaupunginteatterista)

mielummin avataan nyt ovet sitten ja antaa ihmisille mahdollisuuksia jotka uskoo siihen, että heil ois jotain sanottavaa, mut jos mä paan tonne, mul on 420 paikkaa tuolla jos mä annan tän niille ni kyl mä oletan, että onko teillä sanottavaa 420 ihmiselle vai haluutteko mennä [pienelle näyttämölle] jossa on 60 ihmistä. . . . nää talot on kuitenkin tehty, että nää puhuttelee isommalle porukalle. Sitten keksittiin pienet näyttämöt ja nämä, elikä me pystytään periaatteessa puhumaan kaikille, kaiken kokoisille jutuille, et kyl tännekin käy mun mielestä juttuja, mut mä oikeesti edellytän sitte et siellä on niinku ajattelua ja mietintää takana. (Teatterinjohtaja keskisuuresta voittoa

tavoittelemattomana osakeyhtiönä toimivasta teatterista)

Chapter / Luku 8.2

totta kai taiteen kentällä, kun me tehdään meidän peruasiana on tanssitaide ja esittävä taide ni kyllähän me sillä kentällä toimitaan, mutta myös tuota koulutusta, koska [tanssiryhmän] tanssijat myös antaa taiteen perusopetusta et kyl meillä myös niinkun hyödynnetään ja kyllähän tuota meidän tanssijat nä meidän tää vakiporukka ni ne on joko mun assarina ollu kansainvälisesti tai sitten täs maassa näillä festareilla sekä suomessa et kansainvälisesti. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuotta myös muiden koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2003 lähtien)

se on hyvin pienimuotosia nämä yhteistyökumppaniirit, että tilojen suhteen esimerkiksi, että me saadaan harjoitustilat tämmösellä niinkun ihan oravannahkakaupalla . . . nyt jossain määrin sekin siis valtion tanssitaide-toimikunta tai opetusministeriö, tämmösiä niinkun pitkäaikaisia yhteistyökumppaneita ei taida nyt tulla muita mulle mieleen, et sit on satunnaisia, totta kai nää monet festivaalit ni niitä voi kattoo yhteistyökumppaneiksi, että ne on niinkun toistuvasti ottaneet keikalle sinne, mut se ei oo niinkään niinkun, et se riippuu vaan siitä teoksesta et kiinnostaako se niitä. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa vain omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2008 lähtien)

responsi on aina niinkun toisaalta sen henkilökunnan puolelta kauheen lämmin ja sitte yleisönkin puolelta et 'jee et kiva et saadaan tänne tällästä' et tota, mut et sit just sitten kun monenkin kaupunginteatterin johtajan kanssa keskustele sitte käytännön vaikeudesta, että mikä heillä on sen oman ohjelmistosuunnittelun ja resurssien kanssa. että vaikka haluisivatkin järjestää niin se on niin hankala palapeli siellä päässä. (Taiteellinen johtaja, jonka tanssiryhmä tuottaa omia koreografioita ja on saanut tukea vuodesta 2003 lähtien)