

University of Groningen

Values behind Arts Funding in the Netherlands

van den Hoogen, Quirijn

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van den Hoogen, Q. (2017). *Values behind Arts Funding in the Netherlands*. Paper presented at Social Theory & Practice in the Arts, Minneapolis, United States.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.




Values behind funding the arts in the Netherlands

Dr. Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen
Groningen University
Q.L.van.den.hoogen@rug.nl

Relationship theatre - society

- Bourdieu: autonomy
 - Possession of capitals leads to autonomy
 - But theatre is fully enmeshed in social relations
- Our understanding: *claim* to autonomy
 - Possession of capitals may lead to claiming autonomy
 - Various capitals allow for claims, not only 'theatrical capital'
- Value regimes (Boltanski & Thévenot) as helpful tool



Autonomy and value regimes

Intrinsic

versus

Extrinsic

(Autonomy

versus

Heteronomy)

Inspiration – art, artistic quality, experience

Domestic – stylistic traditions, heritage

Industrial – artistic expertise

Fame – image

Civic – general interest

Industry – eff. / eff. + quantifiability

Market – competition, profit

Project city – networking, connections

Hypothesis:

Central compromise for public funding is C + I, neoliberalism implies M + U

Crowdfunding involves Market, Fame, Domestic values

Dutch (Spoken) Theatre Funding

Theatre Distribution
(and some production) € ??? mln.
Local Authorities
(and Local Art Funds)

National Fund for PA
(Production) € 28 mln.

BASE INFRASTRUCTURE
(Production) € 118 mln.
Ministry OCW
advise by Council for
Culture

Theatre Venues

- Building
- Programming (not always)
- Marketing

Experimental theatre
(projects and 4 year funding)

9 theatre companies – ‘spot’ in the system

- Developing repertoire
- Audience development
- Development of Talent
- Touring requirement

Strict (entry) rules for cultural
governance and entrepreneurship

Local funds

Sponsors

Private funds

Crowdfunding
€ 644.908

€ 4.4 mln.

Values in project proposals on Voordekunst.nl


Dominant regimes	
Inspiration	Creative idea, personal and artistic legitimization
Civic	Social legitimization of the project
Domestic	For heritage projects (replaces I) and when artistic references are made (our style resembles ..., we were inspired by ...)
Industrial	Expertise of project maker (they can realize this)

Secondary regimes	
Industrial	Clear budget (how will the money be spent?)
Market	Transparency: service in return However: 35% of donors funds without selecting a service in return or pledges higher amount than the service in return
Project City and Fame	Developing network or the project maker Reference to renown artists (who endorse the project)


Operationalization in questionnaire

Regime	Question 3 (past donation)	Question 6 (future donations)
Inspired regime (I)	Autonomy Artistic Development	Content of the project Development of makers
Domestic regime (D)	Preservation of Traditions Local Identity	Makers are relatives/friends The project occurs in my neighbourhood
Fame regime (F)	Media Attention Image	Respected makers are involved/endorse Media Attention
Civic regime (C)	General Interest Accessibility (of art and culture)	Art and culture are important for society Doing something good for society
Market regime (M)	Economic Surplus Competitative	The service in return My donation can make the project successful
Industrial regime (U)	Efficiency Expertise	Transparency in how donation is spent Expertise: trust in abilities of project makers
Project City (PC)	Networking Flexibility	Partners in the project Good step in the career of the maker

Past donations



Future donations



Crowdfunding versus public subsidies

- Public subsidies = C + I (and expertise),
M + U win in current times
impact of neoliberalism
- Crowdfunding = C + I and expertise,
data does not reflect relevance D
M: perceived success of project
M: 65% do buy a product
35% do not receive what they
pay for