

# CREATING GROUNDS FOR CONTINUITY

## The Views of Staff and Students of the Finnish Music Campus on the MusiSoiva Kampus Event Week

Anna Ahonen

Bachelor's Thesis  
November 2011

Degree Programme in Music and Media Management  
School of Business and Services Management



JYVÄSKYLÄN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULU  
JAMK UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES



Tekijät AHONEN, Anna	Julkaisun laji Opinnäytetyö	Päivämäärä 10.11.2011
	Sivumäärä 35	Julkaisun kieli Englanti
	Luottamuksellisuus ( ) saakka	Verkojulkaisulupa myönnetty ( X )
Työn nimi JATKUVUUDEN LUOMISTA. SUOMALAISEN MUSIIKKIKAMPUKSEN HENKILÖKUNNAN JA OPISKELI- JOIDEN NÄKEMYKSIÄ MUSISOIVA KAMPUS -TAPAHTUMAVIIKOSTA		
Koulutusohjelma Degree Programme in Music and Media Management		
Työn ohjaaja KREUS, Pia		
Toimeksiantaja Suomalainen musiikkikampus		
Tiivistelmä <p>MusiSoiva Kampus –tapahtumaviikko esittelee Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen opiskelijoiden taitoja. Tämän opinnäytetyön tekijä suoritti harjoittelunsa tapahtuman tuotantokoordinaattorina vuonna 2011 yhdessä toisen opiskelijan, Samu Pirisen kanssa.</p> <p>Tämän toiminnallisen opinnäytetyön tavoitteena on kuvailla Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen henki- lökunnan ja opiskelijoiden mielipiteitä tapahtumasta ja löytää alueet, joilla sen tuotantoa on parannet- tava. Tähän dokumenttiin kootut asiat on hyvä ottaa huomioon tapahtuman tulevissa tuotannoissa. Ne toimivat myös pohjana kehityssuunnitelmalle, jonka Pirinen tapahtumalle tekee opinnäytetyönään.</p> <p>Työn tiedonkeruu metodi on kvalitatiivinen. Opiskelijat täyttivät lomakkeen, jonka avoimet kysy- mykset käsittelivät teemoja, kuten tapahtuman tuotantoon liittyvät yleiset asiat, parannusehdotukset sekä opiskelijoiden oma panos tuotantoprosessissa. Lisäksi he osallistuivat palautetyöpajaan. Kuutta henkilökunnan jäsentä haastateltiin puolistrukturoiduilla haastatteluilla, jotta myös heidän näkökul- mansa tapahtumaviikkoon saatiin selville.</p> <p>Saadun palautteen ja haastattelujen perusteella tapahtuman organisaation rakenteeseen, opiskelijo- iden osanottoon ja Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen sisäiseen yhteistyöhön liittyviä sisäisiä element- tejä pitää parantaa. Kolmen oppilaitoksen käytäntöjen yhdenmukaistaminen on haastava tehtävä, mutta kun sisäiset haasteet on kerran ratkaistu, voidaan paremmin keskittyä kehittämään tapahtuman ulkoisia ulottuvuuksia.</p> <p>Tämä opinnäytetyö kuvailee tiedonkeruuprosessin ja sen tuotokset. Yhdessä Pirisen kehityssuunni- telman kanssa nämä kaksi opinnäytetyötä luovat pohjan tapahtuman jatkuvuudelle, vaikka tuotanto- koordinaattorit vaihtuisivatkin joka vuosi.</p>		
Avainsanat (asiasanat) Tapahtumatuotanto, tapahtumaprojektin hallinta		
Muut tiedot Liitteet: Loppuentti, Haastattelurunko		



Authors AHONEN, Anna	Type of publication Bachelor's Thesis	Date 10112011
	Pages 35	Language English
	Confidential ( ) Until	Permission for web publication ( X )
Title CREATING GROUNDS FOR CONTITUITY. THE VIEWS OF STAFF AND STUDENTS OF FINNISH MUSIC CAMPUS ON THE MUSISOIVA KAMPUS EVENT WEEK		
Degree Programme Degree Programme in Music and Media Management		
Tutor KREUS, Pia		
Assigned by Finnish Music Campus		
Abstract <p>MusiSoiva Kampus event week presents the musical skills of the students of the Finnish Music Campus. The author of this thesis worked as a production coordinator in the event in 2011 during her internship along with another student Samu Pirinen.</p> <p>The aim of this project-based thesis was to describe the opinions of the Finnish Music Campus staff and students on the event and identify the areas in need of improvement in its production. The issues brought to the fore in this document can be taken into consideration during the future productions and be used as a basis for a development plan for the event, which Samu Pirinen will cover in his thesis.</p> <p>The data collection method used was qualitative. The students filled in an open questionnaire that covered themes such as general issues in the event's production, improvement suggestions and the students' output in the production process. They also participated in a feedback workshop. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with six staff members in order to learn about their perspectives to the event week.</p> <p>The findings in the feedback and interviews suggested that the internal aspects of the event needed improvement. They relate to the organizational structure, student participation and the cooperation within the Finnish Music Campus. Matching the procedures of three educational institutions is a challenging task, but once the internal issues are solved, more focus can be set on further developing its external aspects.</p> <p>The thesis describes the data collection process and its outcomes. Along with Pirinen's development plan, the two documents create a basis for the continuity for the event, even if there are new production coordinators every year.</p>		
Keywords Event Production, Event Management		
Miscellaneous Appendices: Feedback Questionnaire, Interview Outline		

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 The Cultural Context in Jyväskylä .....	4
2.2 What Are Events? .....	5
2.3 Event Management: Project Management.....	7
<b>3. DATA COLLECTION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Method.....	9
3.2 Feedback Questionnaire and Workshop .....	9
3.3 Interviews.....	11
<b>4. FEEDBACK AND FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 Feedback Questionnaire.....	12
4.2 GOPP Workshop.....	19
4.2 Interviews.....	21
<b>5. DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>33</b>
Appendix 1: Lopputentti .....	33
Appendix 2: Haastattelurunko .....	35

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The Finnish Music Campus is a centre of learning and research formed by the Jyväskylä University, JAMK University of Applied Sciences and Jyväskylä College. It covers the study programmes in music and dance at Jyväskylä College, the degree programmes in music and media management and music at JAMK University of Applied Sciences and the faculty of music at Jyväskylä University. For professionals it offers views to pedagogics, research and trends in the field of music. The staff, students and visitors of the Finnish Music Campus bring cultural experiences to the Jyväskylä residents and reinforce the image of the city as a centre of expertise in music. (Finnish Music Campus, 2011.) MusiSoiva Kampus, organized for the first time in April 2010, is the first project that engages the three educational institutions in concrete cooperation. The goal of the one-week event introducing the activities and expertise of the members of Finnish Music Campus is to join forces and gain visibility together. (Jussila, 2011.) The event aims at providing wellbeing across the demographic borders and indicating that music belongs to everyone (Jussila, 2010). Its programme is spread around the town by taking the music out of the campus and bringing it to the potential audiences, the people of Jyväskylä.

The event was organized for the first time in April 2010 with a producer who was hired to coordinate the process of organizing the event and lead the students of music who helped in the production duties. It seems that the content of the event was diverse and there was a great deal of it. However, due to the inadequate documentation, it is difficult to clearly see all the details related to the previous production and learn from the successes and possible failures of the event in its pilot phase. The only suggestion found in the documentation is that the planning phase should be started earlier in order to pay attention to building sponsorship relations that will be crucial for the future of the event. Apart from this, the perspective to the challenges of acquiring sponsorship for a free event remains untouched.

The author of this thesis took over the duties of the previous production coordinator as an intern of the Finnish Music Campus along with her fellow student, Samu Pirinen. The actual implementation of the event itself is not covered in the

thesis: the interns seized the opportunity to perform data collection for their theses during the internship. The aim of the thesis was to describe the opinions and thoughts of the Finnish Music Campus' staff and students on the MusiSoiva Kampus –event. Later on, issues combined in this document can be taken into consideration during the future productions and be used as a basis for a development plan of the event, which Pirinen, as already stated, will cover in his thesis. The interns collected students' and staff members' experiences and opinions on the production of the event week as well as feedback related to different areas of the production process. Along with the final report, which was given to the staff of the Finnish Music Campus at the end of the internship, this document will help the future production coordinators become acquainted with the event's special features and provide them with information on the production process, its challenges and opportunities, successes and risks. In addition, this thesis covers topics that the Finnish Music Campus' management level might find helpful when creating the internal structure for the event's production. The titles of the "teachers" vary throughout the three educational institutions and the concept of a teacher in this document covers all positions from lecturers to professors and part-time teachers.

This report is divided into five chapters. The Introduction describes the MusiSoiva Kampus –event and the author and objectives of this thesis. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical background of the thesis. First of all, it covers the event's cultural context in Jyväskylä. It is important to be acquainted with the history behind a phenomenon that one is working with and both its material and immaterial surroundings. The chapter also presents the characteristics of different kinds of events themselves, as well as the nature of event management and project based working. The methods and tools of the data are described in chapter 3 and its outcomes are combined in chapter 4. In chapter 5 the authors draw conclusions and discuss the feedback. The questionnaire and interview forms are in the appendices.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 THE CULTURAL CONTEXT IN JYVÄSKYLÄ

The Finnish language culture is said to be born in Jyväskylä since the first educational establishments with Finnish as teaching language were founded there. The grammar school for boys started in 1858 and an equivalent school for girls a few years later. Since the new schools with Finnish as the teaching language were opened, there naturally was soon need for teachers practicing their profession in the same language: the Jyväskylä Seminary was opened in 1863.

The musical life of the town arose from the visions of the Seminary's music teacher E.A. Hagfors. A series of modest performances by choirs and orchestras culminated in several song festivals organized by the Society for Culture and Education in Jyväskylä (Jäppinen, J. & Voutilainen, H-M., 2009). The first festival, a tradition deriving from Estonia, took place in Lounaispuisto in 1884 (Jäppinen et al. 2009).

In the mid-1950s, after many changes in cultural life influenced by the historical events of the world, the composer-music critic Seppo Nummi and pianist-musicologist Timo Mäkinen, whose songs were rejected by the first Savonlinna Music Days in 1955, contacted Päiviö Oksala, who was a professor at the Jyväskylä Institute of Pedagogics, with their idea of arranging a music festival in Jyväskylä. As an experiment, series of concerts and lectures on music education and musicology were set up in 1956. The event programme also included theatre, film and art. (Valkonen, K. & K. 1994, 59). The Jyväskylä music and cultural festival, later the Jyväskylä Summer Festival, was founded on the grounds of the experiment in 1957 - the same year in which the main building of the campus area designed by Alvar Aalto was completed.

The foundation for the festival in the town's cultural life had been created in the late 19th century. Where the first song festivals had operated as a scene for students to engage in national and patriotic festivities, the Jyväskylä Summer Festival became a forum for the baby-boom generation, who had gained new awareness and were looking for new directions different from those of the war

generation. (Valkonen, K. & K. 1994, 13.) At the time of the festival being arranged for the first time, the Institute of Pedagogics was aiming at becoming a university: the timing of the festival experiment was perfect. Other than leading to the Institute becoming a university, the festival also led to the establishment of a musicology chair. (Valkonen, K. & K. 1994, 59).

Since those days, many other small festivals have risen and been established in Jyväskylä creating an environment of cultural diversity over the city of students. As the festival experiment created by Nummi, Mäkinen and Oksala, MusiSoiva Kampus, the event whose programme is created and implemented by the students and teachers of the educational institutes according to their curriculum, promotes the local music education.

## **2.2 WHAT ARE EVENTS?**

Throughout the history of human kind there has been a need to mark the important events in life. Be it an event related to the changing of seasons, gathering of harvest or the cycle of birth and death, myths and rituals have been created to interpret cosmological happenings. The key moments of life are celebrated both in public and in private. In public, people measure their private lives in relation to global events such as turning of the new millennium. In private the rites of passage mark the coming of age, for example. (Bowdin et al. 2006, 4.) All in all, it can be said that behind the significance of the events are their socio-cultural implications. In the present postmodern society and the era of global media in which people may have lost touch with the common social norms and religious beliefs, they never the less need social events to mark the key occurrences of their lives. (Bowdin et al. 2006, 4.) Today, events offer their audiences means of leisure and experiences outside their everyday routines as well as chances to meet people with similar interests. This forming of “an ad-hoc society” of a sub-culture, where people with similar interests temporarily gather together may even lead to a feeling of belonging to a group outside everyday life.

According to Bowdin and his co-authors (2006, 14), The Accepted Practices Exchange (APEX) Industry Glossary of terms defines an event as “an organized



occasion such as a meeting, convention, exhibition, special event, gala dinner, etc. An event is often composed of several different, yet related functions". They continue that professor Donald Getz notes in his book *Event Management & Event Tourism* (2005) that "a principle applying to all events is that they are temporary and that every such event is unique stemming from the blend of management, program, setting and people."

Events can be categorized by their size, form or content. A "special event" usually refers to events with specific rituals, presentations and performances and they are created to mark special occasions or to achieve social, cultural or corporate goals (Bowdin et al. 2006, 14-15.) In his book *Event Studies: Theory, Research And policy For Planned Events* Donald Getz suggests that perspectives of both the organizer and a customers must be paid attention to (2007, 27). He gives two definitions for a special event:

1. A special event is a one-time or infrequently occurring event outside normal programmes or activities of the sponsoring or organizing body.
2. To the customer or guest, a special event is an opportunity for a leisure, social or cultural experience outside the normal range of choices or beyond everyday experience.

Both of these definitions apply to the MusiSoiva Kampus of the Finnish Music Campus. The features that should be given to any event, are the driving force behind the production of this theme week: In Getz's opinion the long list of factors behind the specialness of any event starts with uniqueness and continues with elements of style such as hospitality, symbolism, festive spirit, theming and authenticity, meeting multiple goals while appealing to different stakeholders and audiences (Getz 2007, 26).

Bowdin and his colleagues also present a wide categorization of events. According to their definitions, MusiSoiva Kampus best falls in the categories of "local" and "cultural" event. Since its mission is to present the skills and talents of the students, teachers and researchers of the local educational institutes to the residents of their home town, it definitely is a local event. Its focus is on one specific field of culture, music and it definitely aims at, in the words of Bowdin and his co-authors, contributing to the social and cultural lives (2006, 18) of its audience by offering cultural experiences outside their everyday routines.

## 2.3 EVENT MANAGEMENT: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The production of an event is a project, which is why the techniques of project management are very advantageous (Bowdin et al. 2006, 265). A common mistake is to confuse the production with the event itself when the truth is that the work starts months before and often also lasts for months after the actual event. Project management covers the whole process beginning with initiation and planning followed by implementation, monitoring and controlling the event, all the way to the shutdown phase. Project management “aims to integrate management plans from different knowledge areas into a cohesive, workable plan for the entire project” (Bowdin et al. 2006, 265).

Bowdin and his colleagues state that the trends found in the leading textbooks on project management suggest that world business is moving towards accomplishing business objectives through separate projects. Hence, products and services have to be managed as projects as a response to this change. For a definition of a project, they refer to Grey and Larson’s book *Project Management: The Managerial Process*: “a project is a complex non-routine one-time effort limited by time, budget, resources and performance specifications designed to meet customer needs.” (Bowdin et al. 2006, 265-266). According to this definition, (special) events are projects. The event is the final deliverable part of the project, just as it is the asset of the project.

### 3. DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

The objective of this report was to identify and describe the core opportunities and challenges regarding the issues related to organizational and procedural aspects of the production of the MusiSoiva Kampus event. First, the challenges related to these issues were documented and described in the final report which naturally was created as the result of the production process. Secondly, the Finnish Music Campus is provided with this report in which the potential improvements and opportunities are identified from the point of view of the production coordinators, six staff members and students involved in the production of the event. The aim was to create grounds for the continuity of the event's production even if the people involved may not be the same every year. Finally, Pirinen will create the development plan of the event.

First, the documentation done during the previous production of the event was studied carefully. Petri Jussila, the former project manager of the Finnish Music Campus, was interviewed early during the planning phase in order to find more information from the first year in which the event was implemented. Learning details of the production of the event during the pilot phase the year before was challenging due to the inadequate documentation. This is one of the reasons why it was decided this time to place the emphasis of the data collection to the students involved in the production of the event. It is important to pay attention to their ideas and opinions, since they have more practical knowledge about the implementation of the production and its needs for improvement than the management of their degree programme. In addition to the production tasks, many of them act also as performers during the event which increases the importance of their versatile perspectives.

After the event's implementation phase, the students' feedback was collected with an open question feedback form and in a feedback workshop that collected their ideas for the future. Selected and voluntary staff members were interviewed individually.

### **3.1 METHOD**

The method used in the data collection process was qualitative since it was set to collect opinions and insights of the people studying and working on the Finnish Music Campus and to create suggestions for improvements and development for the next production of the event. The instruments used were semi-structured interviews, a feedback workshop and open question feedback questionnaires filled in by the students.

In qualitative research the researcher collects information, analyses it by focusing on the meaning behind the words and then describes the process (Cresswell 1998, 14). The goal is to build a holistic picture based on the views and opinions of the members of the organizations and individuals behind the production of MusiSoiva Kampus. The method also gives possibilities to write in a formal style, bring oneself into the study and emphasize the role of the researcher as an active learner (Cresswell 1998, 18). It is an ideal approach for a thesis project on the production of the MusiSoiva Kampus because the event has been organized only once before and there is very little written material to work on. It was chosen because the feedback collected from the members of the Finnish Music Campus last year suggested that there might not be an adequate number of responses for conducting a valid quantitative analysis based on them.

According to Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara (2003, p.129), the main features in qualitative research include research methods that allow the informants' voice and opinions to be heard by using people as the instruments of data collection rather than measurable data. As in project based working, also qualitative approach requires adjustable implementation and changing the plan according to circumstances.

### **3.2 FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE AND WORKSHOP**

The student group was formed by approximately 30 students of music taking the compulsory basic studies in cultural entrepreneurship (Kulttuurialan yrittäjyys).

The skills and backgrounds of the students varied greatly due to the diversity in their personal interests, previous experiences and the phase of their studies.

During the first contact lesson after the event week, they were asked to fill in an exam-like open question form to collect their feedback of the production process of the event week. To ensure adequate participation they decided to replace the interview with an exam-like form with open questions. This decision proved to be a successful one: the attendance during the lesson was the highest during the whole process and the students really concentrated on and committed to sharing their opinions and feelings in a written form.

During the next contact lesson, a group interview was planned to be conducted with the students in order to find out what their feelings and opinions about the process after the implementation phase were. The purpose of these techniques was to listen and collect information while encouraging the students to discuss the issues in an informal way, the interaction being part of the method. The aim was to create a comfortable environment where the production coordinators would not be in a position of power but ask questions, listen and, most importantly, keep the discussion on track and ascertain that everyone had a chance to share their opinions. (Casey & Krueger 2000, 9.) However, the interns soon discovered that the group they were working with was not one that would actively perform and interact in a group interview. The group interview was replaced with a workshop session based on a GOPP (Goal Oriented Project Planning) - workshop adjusted to the needs of this thesis project. GOPP is a method that allows the group to participate in creating a coherent plan for a project (Kemi-Tornion ammattikorkeakoulu, 2011). In this case, the model was formed to serve the purpose of collecting feedback from the production of the year 2011 and creating ideas for the future developments. Even though new ideas were created, the workshop was not as successful as the exam considering active participation and information.

### **3.3 INTERVIEWS**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted among a selection of staff members of the Finnish Music Campus involved in the production process. Semi-structured interviews give both the researcher and the person being interviewed the freedom of making additions to the topics and issues listed by the researcher beforehand. When aiming at receiving profound information and opinions, it is easier to collect information with an interview than send out a ready-made questionnaire to which it may be very challenging to receive responses. (Robson 2008, 74.)

## **4. FEEDBACK AND FINDINGS**

### **4.1 FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE**

The method of using the questionnaire was chosen in order to ascertain that as many students as possible would have their voices heard since it had proven that only a few would actively take part in an open discussion. Open questions give a chance to the respondents say what they really think by not giving suggestions about the answers, where multiple choice questions offer choices of which the most suitable one has to be chosen ( Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara 2003, 188). The purpose of the questionnaire was to give the students an opportunity to reflect on their own learning and the production process of the event week. The questions were formed in a way that allowed the interns to evaluate their role as instructors of the group. The questionnaire template can be seen in Appendix 1: Lopputentti.

The questions in the form deal with both general and personal aspects of the project from needs for improvement and ideas about developing the event and its production to personal aspects of learning and motivation. They cover three themes related to the MusiSoiva Kampus -event and its production: the students were asked for their feedback and opinions on general issues regarding the event production (questions 4, 8, 9 and 11), suggestions for improvements (questions 7 and 10) and their own output regarding the process (5 and 6).

#### **Organization and Production**

The question about planning and implementing the event raised the issue of organizing the production as a part of the entrepreneurship-course and the students' role in it. The majority thought that planning was carried out well (19/30) and that the event turned out to be a success and was implemented as planned (22/30), but that there still were many aspects they would like to change. The root for many of the problems discussed by the students was the fact that the production tasks of the MusiSoiva Kampus -event were not included in the de-

scription of the entrepreneurship course and the students were not informed about it until late November. They had all (30/30) believed that the course would have been completed by the Christmas break and the all the five credits would have been accomplished by then. The students were divided into production teams which were appointed certain areas of responsibilities, such as the programme for the schools and kindergartens, cooperation with commercial firms and cooperation with non-profit partners et cetera. However, almost a half of the students (14/30) felt that the group as a whole was too big for the project and that there were not enough tasks for everyone. The flow of communication was not adequate within the teams (11/30) due to absences and lack of motivation on the part of some students, which resulted in confusion about the division of work and responsibilities. In addition to requests for earlier information about the project, quite many also demanded the actual planning phase to be started earlier. Quite a number of the students had scheduled other engagements for the time slot that was meant for the contact lessons and otherwise they had a busy spring ahead of them with examinations, training and other responsibilities.

A small number of the students stated that the task of writing the production plan was an unnecessary waste of time, one even wondered if the task was given just to keep the students busy when there were “no better things to do”. Despite the occasional confusion and frustration, the students gave good grades to the coordinators for their performance. The respondents, that explicitly spoke out their opinions about the quality of the guidance, 25 altogether, said that they received enough guidance from the coordinators (15/25), the guidance was excellent (7/25) or inadequate (3/25). The majority (19/30) felt that the coordinators were easy to approach and available immediately when needed, also outside the contact lessons.

Another important issue was the flow of communication. Every student was asked to create a Gmail account for the projects needs during the first contact lesson. Half of the respondents (15/30) found Gmail and Gdocs a good tool for communication, another half (15/30) did not comment on them at all. Seven respondents revealed that there were students who did not check their Gmail often enough thus creating problems for the teams' division of work and responsibilities, as did the recurring absences. Five students pointed out that the most chal-



lenging issue with communication was that between the production group, including the coordinators, and teachers in charge of content creation, as well as the performers creating content on their own (5/30). The students were under the impression, that these groups were not planning the event in cooperation and it was difficult to find information about their plans, needs and schedules.

The majority of the students thought that there was no cooperation between the three educational institutions of the Finnish Music Campus (17/30). The belief in the event's level of significance was not very high in its current form. Fourteen students thought that the significance would improve if there was more cooperation. On the other hand, some stated that the event was important precisely because of the cooperation which otherwise was very limited. Consistent cooperation between the three would create significance to the event (13/30). Students would like representatives of all the three institutions to engage in the planning process and students from all the three to join the production team (6/30). They also suggested students from all the educational institutions to join forces and create common performances for the event programme (3/30).

To the question about the internal and external visibility of the event, the majority answered that there was sufficiently of both. Seventeen out of thirty students thought that the external visibility was a success and 23 out of thirty stated that the students and staff members were well aware of the event. However, five students had met with members who had never heard about it and four felt that there should have been more external publicity for the event. Two respondents thought that the marketing phase should have been started earlier and there should have been more of it if the budget had allowed. The opposite opinions stated that there was sufficient internal visibility, but more should have been invested in the external visibility.

### **Learning and motivation**

Only five students answered that they had not learned anything or that they had been so familiar with the details of an event production process that there was nothing new to them. The rest of the group listed to have learned issues related to cooperation skills (3/30), marketing (3/30), event production in practice (15/30)

and the importance of planning and documentation (5/30). Eight students found issues that they would have liked to learn more about: budgeting, media and public relations, budgeting, event production theory, budgeting and the bureaucratic aspect to event production.

Problems related to the information given about the course and the late notification about the course continuing in the spring had an enormous effect on the motivation of the students. When asked, only seven students said that they were enthusiastic about the project, or at least fairly motivated. Twenty-two students explicitly expressed their low motivation, or not having it at all. A number of them felt that concentrating on performances and being a musician was enough, because production experience was totally irrelevant for their studies or future competences (9/30). Another significant issue was the size of the group: according to the feedback, the production teams were too big leaving some members feel useless and frustrated (8/30). The indifferent attitudes and absences of fellow team members affected motivation in a negative way (2/30). Some felt having been left between the work of the coordinators and the performers or teachers responsible for creating the content (3/30) and some would have wanted to have more say concerning the programme content (3/30). There were even suspicions of a need of volunteer workforce from the Finnish Music Campus' behalf:

*“Did they really want us all to learn something about being a part of this project, or were we just a free workforce needed to implement the project. Why was the project not included in the course description of which it was an essential part?”*

Having received negative feedback from the previous organizers also resulted in lack of motivation with one student working on the project this year (1/30). There were complaints about the heavy workload (12/30) as well as feelings of frustration caused by the lack of responsibilities and feeling that there were not enough tasks to perform (9/30). The work division made by the member of the teams themselves turned out to be inconsistent leaving some bored and keeping some busier than was intended (1/30).

A number of factors that had a positive effect on motivation were also described. The active students who had taken some responsibility felt positively about seeing the fruits of their work and were motivated by the responsibilities they possessed (3/30). Some students were interested in event production and felt fortunate because of having been given a chance to be a part of the process and learn more (4/30). Opposite to the students who felt that the project was irrelevant to their future, there were also students who felt that the knowledge they achieved would help them in the future (4/30). Other positive aspects mentioned were well organized flow of communication, the coordinators' relaxed attitude towards the complex project and the implementation of the event week itself which received only little negative feedback.

### **Suggested improvements**

A half of the student group (15/30) did not want the production to be a part of the entrepreneurship course because they would have wanted to concentrate on their responsibilities as artists rather than as producers. Five students did not want students of music to take part in the production at all. The rest (10/30) would make it optional in the form of project studies or change the implementation of the course in some other way. A smaller number thought that both performing and producing were too large a workload for one week (9/10). Only three students were satisfied with how the course as a whole was conducted. Some would have wanted more lectures on event production theory, some wanted to have less contact lessons, some had missed the whole point of their participation along the way and some felt overwhelmed by the workload they had.

Other suggestions mainly dealt with the timing and flow of information, group size and issues related to the content and schedule. The production teams have been formed by students of JAMK during the existence of the event, but they would like to invite students from Jyväskylä University and Jyväskylä College to take part in the planning and production phases as well to increase the level of cooperation between the three educational institutions in some other ways too. However, quite a number of students feel that the groups were too big this time and that the number of students participating in the project should be reduced (10/10). Despite the fact that the majority of the students also performed during

the event week and that the groups as a whole were given free hands in bringing their ideas about the performances, a few of them still felt that they would have liked to have more say in the content of the event programme (2/30). When asked how the event week could be developed year after year, the group suggested features such as audience involvement, theme concerts, cooperation with more distinguished partners ( the City Theatre, Paviljonki, Lutakko, for example), evening concerts and a small event planned and implemented by representatives of all the three educational institutions to be added when planning the next event week. Three students would also like to include more popular music and jazz to the event programme in the future, because this year classical music dominated the programme. Two students also suggested organizing bigger concerts with more famous artists and greater ambition which would be a tool for increasing the event's visibility and attract more audience. The venues should change every year and music should be brought to places that are not usually associated with music.

The responses show that the overall planning process must be started earlier (11/30) and made more efficient (6/30). In addition that the students must be informed earlier about the production tasks (30/30). Both the students and teachers must be committed to the process early to ensure a smoother flow of information and a functioning work division. It was made clear that both the flow of information and the level of commitment were not adequate. Not even all the teachers knew that they were actually involved and that planning the performances was regarded as their responsibility. In addition, there were demands for the reconstruction of the whole organizational structure behind the event's organization and even one suggestion of teachers being paid for the planning tasks.

*“First of all, the event week must be established as a regular part of the Finnish Music Campus’s annual programme and make students and teachers committed to it. Once the basic functions of the event’s production have been made viable, the organization could start thinking about starting cooperation with other artistic institutions.”*

One student also reminded that the lessons learned must be taken into account, which is one way of creating continuity for the event production during the following years.

## 4.2 GOPP WORKSHOP

The 18 students present during the last contact lesson were divided into four groups representing the students involved in the production, teachers involved in the production, production coordinators and the Finnish Music Campus in general. These four groups took turns combining their ideas on four checkpoints spread around the class room: 1. Content of the event, 2. The different parties' role in the production, 3. Benefits gained from the event and 4. The significance of the cooperation within the Finnish Music Campus. The idea was that the groups would brainstorm and write down improvement and development ideas in the light of each checkpoint from the point of view of the parties of the production they were representing. However, the rate of attendance was the lowest compared to all of the lessons during the spring, and apparently, so was the level of enthusiasm. As mentioned earlier, the results were not as comprehensive as anticipated, but some new ideas were created during the session.

The "Students" group would like to add more unusual working environments, such as workplaces not associated with music, to the event programme and organize an open house day in the new Music Campus on Pitkäkatu. In their opinion, the programme has been diverse, but they would like to pay more attention to the elderly and create performances for them. According to this group, the students' responsibilities lie with in the roles of performers, marketing assistants, contacts persons and participants of the production. The students form the base of the production's organizational pyramid and they benefit by gaining experience in event planning and musical experiences as both performers and members of the audience in addition to their credit points. From the students' point of view, the significance of the cooperation within the Finnish Music Campus lies in making new contacts and making the Finnish Music Campus familiar to new audiences. Lack of motivation, one-sided cooperation and the heavy workload of those students who are part of the production group as well as perform during the week are issues to which careful attention should be paid to in the future.

"Teachers" did not have a great deal left to say. In their opinion, the content of the event programme was more than adequate and the roles of the teachers are

as they should be: guiding and teaching the students. According to them, the significance of internal cooperation is very high.

The group brainstorming ideas from the point of view of the production coordinators wrote that the good side to the event project was that it was a chance to accomplish project studies for the students working as coordinators. They suggested that the future coordinators should try and influence on increasing the cooperation between the three educational institutions within the Finnish Music Campus. Furthermore, the performances would have to be planned specifically for the needs of the event week, in addition to demonstrating the content of the curriculum. Otherwise, they were quite content with the coordinators' roles as leaders of the production process, but pointed out that the coordinators could also be in charge of giving tasks to the other actors in the production organization. In their opinion, the coordinators benefit from the project by being paid for accomplishing credits. In addition, they suggested building up a group of coordinators which would be formed by representatives from all the three educational institutions. The event being "JAMK-centered" could be avoided by engaging students and other actors from Jyväskylä College and Jyväskylä University to the planning process as well.

Cooperation within the Finnish Music Campus was emphasized in the brainstorming of the group thinking about these issues from the angle of the whole Music Campus. The visibility of the event, as well as the number of students' and teachers' common projects across the school borders must be increased. The event week provides a framework for implementing cooperation and almost anything should be possible when the skills and talents present in the Campus' are taken into account. They mentioned incoherence and the emphasis on individual performances as being the weaknesses and found ways to attract new applicants and increased visibility as opportunities to the event week and the whole Finnish Music Campus in its context. They also had an idea about a larger production, such as an opera, a musical or a larger scale concert, which would involve the input of students from different fields: singers, dancers, an orchestra combined of the students of the Finnish Music Campus. Another idea was to organize a composition competition that could be included in the existing optional

composition course. The students of the course have performed their creations in a concert during the both event weeks in both years.

## 4.2 INTERVIEWS

The purpose of the interviews was to find out the opinions and feelings of the teachers and staff members about the event week after the implementation phase. A survey that was conducted during the previous year did not receive many replies which is why the coordinators decided to experiment another kind of approach to data collection. Instead of sending a multiple choice questionnaire to all the members of the Finnish Music Campus, semi-structured interviews were carried out with six persons involved in the production. The attempt was to put the emphasis on quality instead of quantity.

The first version of the interview frame (Appendix 2: Haastattelurunko) was tested in an interview with Petri Jussila on February 25th. The scope of the later interviews was originally meant to be made even wider, but the first version turned out to function quite well because it did not take too much time and covered all the necessary topics. The assumption was that especially the teachers would be busy in the spring and that the length of the interviews had to be kept reasonable.

The advantage of a semi-structured interview is that it allows freedom to both the interviewers and the respondents. The interview frame supports the interviewers in the interviewing situation. There is no need to present all the questions individually, or in a pre-set order, because many details are covered in other contexts. Overall six persons were interviewed during the spring. In addition to the Finnish Music Campus' former project manager, the interns interviewed one teacher from each educational institution, a teacher who teaches students of all the three institutions and their internship instructor. These interviewees were chosen so that all the educational institutes of Finnish Music Campus were represented. The presentation of the interview results was conducted by keeping the respon-



dents anonymous. Each interview lasted approximately thirty minutes and took place in each interviewee's office. The cooperation within the Finnish Music Campus, advantages for teaching, timing of the event, the improvements needed and the future of the event were themes that the interviewees concentrated on the most. These areas were dealt with in greater detail than others.

According to the interviews, the overarching challenges related to the event's organization and procedures culminate in the internal cooperation in the Finnish Music Campus. Everyone agreed that there was cooperation, but improvements were needed. "There has been an attempt to reduce overlapping in the curricula, but it has been rocky", said one of the teachers. More information on the opportunities is needed. The interviewees said that there was a basis for more functional cooperation, and that the MusiSoiva Kampus was the peak of the iceberg. The main objective of the event from the Finnish Music Campus's point of view is gaining visibility for all the three educational institutions in one common project and according to one of the interviewees, such a common project has more positive than negative sides to it.

When asked about the advantages that the event offered to a teachers' job, they all listed positive aspects such as giving the students a chance to express themselves as artists and gain more experience as both performers and producers. In addition, the event creates opportunities for the students to become acquainted with each other's work, because the students of the three educational institutions are quite unknown to each other. Finally, the event offers insights to the Finnish Music Campus and its opportunities in general. "The workload of the students in the production teams is not overwhelming but sufficient", stated one interviewee when the students' concern of the heavy workload was brought up.

Only the interviewee representing Jyväskylä College replied that the timing of the event was excellent, because the results of the academic year are best seen in the spring. Others said that from the teaching schedules' point of view the timing for content creation was perfect but that the event itself should be scheduled for another week because of the students' examinations. "March is better, April bad and May impossible". When the aim is marketing the study programmes to potential future applicants, the timing of the joint application system should be tak-

en in to account. More attention should also be paid to potential competition in the form of other concerts during the same week.

The suggestions for improvements revolved mainly around the same issues as the feedback collected from the students: the staff and students must be informed about the event week much earlier and students from all the educational institutions should be engaged in the production. The group should also be much smaller and its members voluntarily taking part in the process. They would leave the responsibilities of the event production to JAMK University of Applied Sciences but, for example, engage student organizations of Jyväskylä University in tasks such as those related to public relations. Their willingness for volunteer work in the event production should also be carefully studied. In addition, there were requests for more teachers performing in the concerts and similarly to the students they also wished bigger concerts involving both students and teachers from all three educational institutions. One interviewee wished that there were more concerts with entrance fees so as to take the event in to a more professional direction and teach the audience that music is also a profession and musicians must be paid for their work just as any other professionals.

The majority of the people interviewed thought that the MusiSoiva Kampus should be established as an annual part of the Finnish Music Campus's programme. Only one interviewee spoke as if the future of the event was not certain: "If the event is organized next year..." not speaking out against or for the event. Others wished continuity and consistent procedures for the production. "It looks like the role of the students of music and media management continues as production coordinators in the form of internship at the Finnish Music Campus". One of the teachers even wished that music and media students could also produce the concert series of JAMK University of Applied Sciences outside the event week.

## 5. DISCUSSION

Anna Ahonen and another student of music and media management, both third year students at the time, heard about an internship opportunity at the Finnish Music Campus in mid-November 2010. After expressing their interest, they met Eva Halme, the head of Degree Programme in Music and the production secretary of the same programme, Jaakko Antila, who was to become their internship instructor, to discuss the practices, marketing and the budget for the event. It was agreed that the teachers would be in charge of motivating the students to become a part of the event as artists, while the production coordinators would lead the work of the students who would work in the production process with them. Next Monday the coordinators attended a weekly meeting with the staff of the degree programme to introduce themselves and hoping that meeting the teachers face to face would create basis for contacts and ideas for the event. Phone calls and e-mail exchange started soon with Antila and a few teachers. In addition, one of the interns attended a lesson with the student group to introduce himself and the production that was about to start. After their examinations in December, the coordinators sent the first internal bulletin to the staff of the three educational institutions and wrote a project plan which would be a framework for the event production and in which the planning process would be documented. They also created a system for documentation of tasks and meetings throughout the process: reports on successes and challenges were combined at the end of every week. As the students of music and media management, the interns consider themselves outsiders in the environment of students and teachers of music. An outsider may bring ideas from a new point of view. Their main goal was to benefit the production with their knowledge in the production and business side to music and events. At this point the interns decided to write their theses of *MusiSoiva Kampus*.

The full-time work started in the beginning of January 2011. Due to the construction work at the Pitkäkatu-campus, the Finnish Music Campus could not offer office space for the interns, who thus were not able to participate in the everyday working life of the staff. Instead, they reserved an office space at the main campus on Rajakatu. Being a part of the working environment of the teachers and staff on Music Campus would have given them a better chance to interact with

and learn from the teachers and their jobs, which would have been helpful during the production process allowing a straight access to the staff members with no need to make phone calls and send e-mails. Because of the busy spring schedule of the teachers of JAMK, the interns were invited to attend the weekly meetings only twice; in the beginning of the semester and after they had collected the feedback from the students who participated in the production of the event week. They offered to meet the teachers and staff at Jyväskylä University and Jyväskylä College, but were never invited. The best time to watch teachers and their students work was the event week. Many ideas were exchanged during the preparations of the concerts. This was valuable time from the production coordinators' point of view. In many occasions this was the first time that they met the teachers face to face. The discussions revolved mainly around the same issues that are described in Chapter 4. In addition to new ideas and opinions on the event week, the interns heard a lot of unofficial hearsay, which cannot be accounted as a formal research data.

The biggest part of the production coordinators' work was covered by leading the students in the production team and putting the event programme together. Contact lessons with the students started immediately after Christmas break. There were only a few concerts confirmed for the event at this point. The work started slowly and was in full speed only when all the students had returned from their break and more concerts and other performances were added to the event programme. The issues rising from the lack of clear organizational structure and chain of command became most apparent when performing the two major duties. There was overlapping with the actions taken by artists, who could have left contacting the kindergartens and schools, for example, to the production coordinators and the production team. They should have informed the coordinators that they were creating their own content for the schools and kindergartens and kept them up to date on their work. In the case of the programme targeted to these groups, the overlaps were revealed to the coordinators a week after the event. Despite their help and interaction during the planning process, it became clear that the teachers involved with this content were not in charge when the actual content for the event was concerned. The information about the details of the performances were scattered among the teachers, performing students and the members of the production team whose responsibility the programme targeted to

kindergarten and schools was. The production coordinators remained unaware of the situation throughout the planning phase because of the lack of flow of information: coordinators thought that the teachers were guiding these students, while teachers thought the students worked in cooperation with the coordinators who would have taken immediate actions to reorganize this part of the production, had they known about the situation. This is the most outstanding example of the breakdowns in the flow of information.

Working with the student group, the production coordinators poised between issues related to workload, motivation and distribution of work through the whole spring semester. In theory, they would have coped with the project without the group of students, but the its existence enabled planning and expanding the tasks in a way that would engage more people. However, the low level of motivation in the group, caused by the hastiness of the studies at the time and the late information given about the project, was apparent from the beginning and made the coordinators hesitate with giving responsibility to them in the most important tasks such as negotiations with external venue owners. A few of these tasks were given to the students, but in one occasion, for example, the communication with the external party was left short, never ending it in a proper manner. The coordinators were not told about this before it was too late and the event was already starting.

According to the students' responses during the data collection process, the start of the project should have been firmer and the content more constant throughout the process. In the beginning, each team was asked to create a production plan according to their responsibilities under the guidance of the production coordinators. They were explained that the document could be amended and additions made to it throughout the process and that its importance was in keeping all the group members up to date in case of absence or confusion. The group was reminded about updating the document during every contact lesson and guidance was given whenever needed. However, the answers to questionnaires revealed that these issues were not assimilated by everyone. Despite the slightly negative attitudes towards the task of writing the production plan, the majority admitted that it taught them a great deal, or was at least something they would remember.

Other than combining information in the production plans, the students wrote press releases, created media contact lists and potential online publications to publish the press releases. No matter how important these assignments were for the event, a number of students felt that the work was unnecessary and that they were asked to do it just because there was nothing else to do at the time. They were also given time and free hands to plan and organize a marketing strike that would have taken place on Kauppakatu in the beginning of the event week. The students who would have had time for the planning were not interested, and the students who would have been interested did not have time because they had already taken greater engagement in the production. For example, Humppa-brunssi and the initiative for the cooperation with Tanssisali Lutakko, started as an idea of one student, who also took over its planning and implementation. Other students supported her by trying to find a band for the event from the Finnish Music Campus. Once they could not find one, they formed Tanssiyhtye Kolibri and played themselves.

By watching the student group work, the interns learned about the way they were used to work and how diverse the level of their skills, knowledge and motivation towards the event production was. At times, it was not clear whether the challenges resulted from lack of skills or lack of motivation, but the interns assumed that only a few of them had previous experience in event production and that the planning process and the methods used were not what they were used to in their studies. Working independently without strict guidelines or adjusting creative competences into other than creative artistic work seemed to be the most challenging issues. The interns were not teachers and never tried to pose as such because of the fact that they did not possess any tools that the teachers did. The students' performances during the production were not graded which left a wide scale between those who would not get the marks and those who would. The interns had no choice but to try and inspire the students by their own example. From their point of view, working in the project was based on each student's personal motivation and willingness to work with them. They might have prevented the confusion about the meaning and importance of the different production tasks by giving firm, formal lectures on the event production and its phases and operations. It looked like teaching and guiding attached to the practical side to the work was not enough this time. They were quite surprised with the low level

of self-direction in the group. Then again, if the students were given great responsibility on all the levels of the work, the two hours contact lessons during one day in a week would not have been enough to complete the work. To generalize roughly, there were no signs of interest to work independently outside the lessons. The workload of those who did could have been reduced, if more students had stepped in. The overarching problem was crystallized in a response to a question about personal motivation in the feedback questionnaire:

*“I was not really motivated because true responsibility was not given. On the other hand, if it was given, I would have cursed the project to the lowest Hell. There’s a vicious circle for you.”*

The constantly changing and unpredictable nature of project-based working was not adopted by everyone. Changes in event programme, for example, had created confusion about the work division and the teams, without a realization that the changes in one piece affected the whole puzzle. It can be concluded that all in all this project gave the students, who usually were in the roles of performers, a chance to see what is on the other side and helped them realize how much more there is to an event outside the actual performance. They had an opportunity to see the whole span of the production process and to recognize all the tasks included in the different phases of the process. The students, who felt that they would have wanted to learn more, suggested including more theory and issues related to budgeting, permits and licenses in the future. This time, the tasks on these areas were taken care of by the coordinators.

In the beginning of their internship, the production coordinators, in addition to the interview with Petri Jussila, studied the feedback collected the year before and listened to the opinions on the previous production which they heard on informal occasions. They felt that the main issues revolving around the challenges and opportunities in the production of the event had culminated with the organization of the production. JAMK University of Applied Sciences had taken the main responsibility in the production, but the chain of command and the communication flow remained unclear and must be improved. It can be interpreted from the feedback collected after the implementation phase in 2010 that these issues had already resulted in lack of motivation, misunderstandings and contradictory atti-

tudes towards the event and the cooperation as whole. The event that was set out to improve and increase the cooperation between the three educational institutions, but had already conflicted with its objectives. If MusiSoiva Kampus continues as an annual event presenting the skills, talents and cooperation of the three educational institutions, in addition to realizing cooperation with a wider range of partners enabling a waster presence and reaching more audiences, the guidelines for the cooperation regarding the event must be mutually agreed on. These guidelines must provide the event's future internal organization with an organizational structure and communication flow, make them familiar with the Finnish Music Campus as a whole, and introduce the main players in the production organization formed by representatives from all three educational institutions.

Increasing the level of cooperation within the Finnish Music Campus was one of the goals set for MusiSoiva Kampus 2011 too. Again, the goal turned out to be the most challenging one. The concert of the students who had taken the composition course during the spring semester was the only one with artists from all the three units of the Finnish Music Campus. The basis for the cooperation must be set by the management level of the Finnish Music Campus. The two production coordinators, who did not know that their own degree programme was a part of the Finnish Music Campus before their internship, felt pretty helpless with the task of creating internal cooperation. However, compared to the previous year, more cooperation was created through concert venues: Jyväskylä University and Jyväskylä College offered their venues for the event free of charge. This addition creates basis for deepening the cooperation for the event in the future.

In addition to creating stable grounds for the internal cooperation in the event's production among the three educational institutions, motivating the staff and creating good spirit is a challenge that should be faced by the management level. The event must be presented as a valuable part of the Finnish Music Campus's annual programme and an opportunity to illustrate the work and accomplishments of the teachers and students, not the necessary evil that it has sometimes been considered. It was obvious that some teachers, especially in JAMK University of Applied Sciences, were extremely busy with their work. Once in a while the coordinators were faced with slightly negative attitudes towards their work



which they interpreted to rise from the large workload the teachers had as it was, even without engaging in the event. Taking content for the event programme from the curricula in addition to introducing what actually is taught in the Finnish Music Campus would also be an attempt to prevent increasing the teacher's workload in regards to the event programme. Increased level of the internal publicity for the event among all the study programmes of the Finnish Music Campus might also attract more students to create their own concerts and performances for the event.

From the production coordinators' point of view, and in the light of the feedback collected for this thesis, MusiSoiva Kampus is a valuable project for the Finnish Music Campus as a whole, as well as for its members individually. But like with many young events, there are issues to be solved to ensure the existence of its future and the smoothness of its internal operations. All in all, the goals set for the event were met on a satisfactory level. The concerts introduced versatile skills and talents hosted by the Finnish Music Campus, and the number of visitors was higher than expected. Especially shopping centre Forum was regarded as a good place to introduce the functions of Finnish Music Campus to the townspeople who are not familiar with it yet. The event week was a success and turned out as planned, but more attention should be paid to the internal operations of the production. Obviously, matching the procedures of three educational institutions is a challenging task, but once the internal issues are solved, more focus can be set on developing the event further. The basic functions and details that need improvement are described in this document. The final report, which will be an attachment in Samu Pirinen's thesis, describes the operations and actions during the production of MusiSoiva Kampus 2011 in more detail that would have been possible in the context of this document.

## REFERENCES

Bowdin, G., Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, R. & McDonnell, I. 2006. Events Management. Second Edition. Events Management Series. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Casey, M. A. & Krueger, R. A. 2000. Focus Groups. A Practical Guide for Applied Research. Third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Cresswell, J.W. 1998. Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Finnish Music Campus, 2011. Musiikkikampus – osaamiskeskittymä. Referred to on March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011. <http://musiikkikampus.fi/musiikkikampus>

Getz, D. 2007. Event Studies: Theory, research and policy for planned events. Events Management Series. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. & Sajavaara P. 2003. Tutki ja kirjoita. 6th edition. Dark oy, Vantaa.

Jussila, P. 2010. Luovaa byrokratiaa. MusiSoiva Kampus –tapahtumaviikko lähestyy February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010. Referred to on March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011. <http://blogit.jamk.fi/luovaabyrokratiaa/2010/02/26/musisoiva-kampus-tapahtumaviikko-lahestyy/> JAMK Blogging Service.

Jussila, P. 2011. Former Project Manager, Finnish Music Campus. Interview on February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011

Jäppinen J., Mäenpää H., Kankaanpää T., Hintsanen, P., Fredrikson E. 6 & Ratschinskij M. Aikajana. Jyväskylän Aikamasiina. Referred to on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009. <http://www3.jkl.fi/historia/aikajana/ennen.shtml>

Jäppinen J. 6& Voutilainen H-M. 1881-1910. Markkinapaikasta mainio kaupunki. Lyhytjohdatus Jyväskylän historiaan. Referred to on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2009. [http://www3.jkl.fi/historia/lyhyt/1881\\_1910.shtml](http://www3.jkl.fi/historia/lyhyt/1881_1910.shtml)

Kemi-Tornion ammattikorkeakoulu. GOPP. Työpajavetäjän opas. Referred to on April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011. [www.oamk.fi/utills/opendoc.php?aWRfZG9rdW1lbnR0aT0xMDAwNw==](http://www.oamk.fi/utills/opendoc.php?aWRfZG9rdW1lbnR0aT0xMDAwNw==)

Robson, C. 2008. How to do a Research Project. A Guide for Undergraduate Students. Singapore: Markono Print Media Pte Ltd.

Tum, J. et al. 2006. Management of Event Operations. Events Management Series. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Valkonen, K. & M.1994. Festival Fever. Finland Festivals. Otava Printing Works, Keuruu

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1: LOPPUTENTTI

### Kulttuurialan yrittäjyys

### Loppuentti

KZZS0200

MusiSoiva Kampus

Anna Ahonen, Samu Pirinen

12.4.2011

**Vastaajan nimi:** \_\_\_\_\_

Tämän tentin tarkoitus on antaa vastaajalle tilaisuus pohtia kevään aikana toteutetun tapahtumaviikon tuotantoprosessia ja omaa oppimistaan. Kysymykset on muotoiltu niin, että tuotannosta opinnäytetyötään tekevät tuotantokoordinaattorit voivat vastausten pohjalta analysoida myös omaa onnistumistaan ryhmän ohjaajina. Kehitysehdotusten koamisessa tuotantoon osallistuneiden opiskelijoiden ideat ja mielipiteet ovat tärkeitä. Halutessasi voit vastata myös nimettömänä.

### Yleistä tapahtumatuotannosta:

1. Mitkä ovat tapahtumatuotannon päävaiheet? Luettele jokaisen vaiheen keskeiset tehtävät.
2. Mikä on dokumentoinnin merkitys tuotantoprosessissa? Luettele keskeiset dokumentit (3) ja niiden merkitys tuotannolle.
3. Kuinka esiintyjän ja tuottajan tehtävät eroavat toisistaan tapahtumapäivänä?

### MusiSoiva Kampus -tapahtumaviikosta:

4. Ota kantaa ja perustele: Kuinka hyvin mielestäsi sujui ja onnistui

- tapahtuman suunnittelu

- tapahtuman toteutus
- tiedonkulku tuotantoprosessin aikana
- ohjauksen riittävyys ja tuotantokoordinaattoreiden lähestyttävyyys

5. Mitä opit tuotannon aikana? Mitä olisit halunnut lisää?

6. Kuinka motivoitunut olit prosessin aikana? Mitkä seikat motivaatioosi vaikuttivat (positiiviset ja negatiiviset asiat)?

7. Luettele kolme konkreettista parannusehdotusta ensi vuoden tuotantoa ajatellen.

8. Pitäisitkö tuotannon jatkossakin osana Kulttuurialan yrittäjyys –kurssia? Kuinka järjestäisit musiikinopiskelijoiden osallistumisen jatkossa?

9. Oliko tapahtuman näkyvyys mielestäsi riittävää? Tiedotettiinko tapahtuman tuotannosta ja ohjelmasta mielestäsi riittävästi Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen sisällä?

10. Millä tavalla tapahtuma mielestäsi voisi kehittyä vuosi vuodelta?

11. Kuinka merkittävä tapahtumaviikko on Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen sisäisen yhteistyön kannalta?

Minuun saa/ei saa ottaa yhteyttä palauteasioissa kevään aikana.

Sähköposti: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX 2: HAASTATTELURUNKO

### Bachelor's Thesis

Anna Ahonen & Samu Pirinen  
MusiSoiva Kampus  
Suomalainen Musiikkikampus

### Haastattelurunko

14.4.2011

### Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen opettajat / henkilökunta

Haastattelun tarkoitus on selvittää MusiSoiva Kampus -tapahtumaviikolla mukana olleiden Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen opettajien ja muun henkilökunnan mielipiteitä ja tuntemuksia tapahtuma päätyttyä. Aikaisempina vuonna kyselyihin ei saatu kovinkaan montaa vastausta, joten tänä vuonna kokeillaan toisenlaista lähestymis- ja tiedonkeruutapaa. Kaikille Musiikkikampuksen jäsenille lähetettävän kyselyn sijasta muutamille tapahtumassa mukana olleille henkilöille lähetetään haastattelupyynnöt. Määrän sijasta pyrimme siis panostamaan laatuun.

Tämän haastattelurungon ensimmäinen versio testattiin Petri Jussilan haastattelussa 25.2.2011. Alkuperäinen tarkoitus oli tehdä myöhemmistä haastatteluista laajempia, mutta ensimmäinen versio osoittautui toimivaksi, eikä sen asioiden läpikäyminen vienyt liikaa kummankaan osapuolen aikaa. Ennakko-oletus on, että haastatteluajkojen saaminen saattaa olla haastavaa muiden kiireiden vuoksi.

Haastattelurungon on tarkoitus toimia haastattelijoiden tukena haastattelutilanteessa. Kaikkia kysymyksiä ei välttämättä esitetä yksitellen, sillä asiat toivottavasti käyvät ilmi toistensa yhteydessä. Tätä dokumenttia ei myöskään näytetä haastateltaville. Puolistrukturoidun haastattelun laajan rungon vahvuus on siinä, että se antaa haastattelutilanteessa vapautta sekä haastatteliijoille ja haastateltavalle.

### Yleistä:

3. toimenkuva
4. toimenkuva Suomalaisella musiikkikampuksella?

### Suomalainen musiikkikampus

- toiminta käytännössä
- musiikkikampuksen organisaation toimivuus
- osapuolten aktiivisuus
- yhteistyön toimivuus/sujuvuus
- tapahtuman merkitys yhteistyön näkökulmasta

### MusiSoiva Kampus 2010

- olitko mukana jollain tavalla

## MusiSoiva Kampus 2011

### **Tuotanto**

- tapahtuman ajoitus/OPS
- tuotannon ajoitus
- ohjelman kokoamisen ajoitus + deadline
- viestinnän sujuvuus
- toiveita jatkoon KY-opiskelijoiden suhteen?
- tapahtuman sisäinen näkyvyys
- tapahtuman ulkoinen näkyvyys
- parannusehdotuksia?

### **Yhteistyö**

- yhteistyön toimivuus tapahtuman puitteissa
- muutoksia yhteistyössä viime vuoteen verrattuna?
- tapahtuman järjestämisen “mielekkyyttä”
- Suomalaisen musiikkikampuksen merkitys
- 3n tasavertaisuus tapahtuman aikana?
- kaikkien 3n opiskelijoita mukaan tuotantoon?

### **Palaute**

- Miten tapahtuma kaiken kaikkiaan onnistui?
- Miten organisointi onnistui?
- Miten markkinointi onnistui?
- Miten yhteistyö oppilaitosten välillä onnistui?
- Miten yhteistyötä voitaisiin kehittää?
- Tapahtuman hyöty opetusmenetelmien kehittämisessä?
- Kehittämisehdotuksia tapahtumalle ja koko musiikkikampukselle?