Symphony Orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain:

A Comparative Study of Funding, Cultural Models and Chief Executive Self-Perception of Policy and Organisation

HAUKUR F. HANNESSON

Dissertation submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Arts Management
to THE CITY UNIVERSITY, London
Department of Arts Policy and Management

May 1998

City University: Department of Arts Policy and Management
Doctor of Philosophy 1998
Haukur Flosi Hannesson

Symphony Orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain: A Comparative Study of Funding, Cultural Models and Chief Executive Self-Perception of Policy and Organisation

ABSTRACT

The subject of this study is arts policy in six different countries; Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom and in particular how such policies affect both the operations and self-perceptions of professional symphony orchestras (and their chief executives) operating in the countries studied.

Professional symphony orchestras in different countries have essentially very similar artistic approaches to their subject i.e. the performance of music, and are almost identically constructed with regards to number of players, which instruments are used as well as the role of artistic leadership (i.e. the conductor) in a performance situation. As such they represent a very uniform kind of arts organisation and art practice across the countries concerned, against which other, more variable factors such as legal structure and funding may be compared from country to country. One key objective of this research was to test the view that as the environment of the orchestras can differ, this could possibly affect the orchestras artistically and/or financially in significant ways.

The management teams of the orchestras are faced with multiple tasks which can be affected by national or local government arts policy, organisational structure or levels of funding. The relationship between the management teams of professional symphony orchestras and arts policy makers at local and/or national government level is therefore a complex one, despite the apparent homogeneity of the orchestral form, and often influenced by history and informal channels of influence as well as formal government arts policy.

The study examines earlier research on the subject of orchestras within several disciplines. The cultural policies and orchestral development in the six countries are analysed as well as the results of a survey amongst Chief Executives of 83 symphony orchestras (32 in Scandinavia and 51 in the United Kingdom). The results of the survey indicate that there is little difference between the attitudes of Chief Executives in the six countries to a number of internal and external factors that influence their particular orchestra. The funding of a large number of the symphony orchestras of the sample is analysed, indicating that the major difference between the Scandinavian orchestras and the British ones is the level of government subsidy. The difference between the labour market between Britain and Scandinavia is examined, indicating that British orchestras have a much much flexible arrangement when it comes to hiring musicians, since there are three forms of employment, i.e. contract, freelance and self owning orchestras, in operation at the same time whereas in Scandinavia all the orchestras studied have contracted players only. The study discusses different models of cultural policy and government involvement (with a starting point in Harry Hillman Chartrand's theories) and how this affects orchestras that operate under different models.

The study concludes that the high level of government funding in Scandinavia is necessary to maintain the same level of symphony orchestra activity as the five countries have today. The reasons for this are historical as well as social and political factors in these countries. It is also a conclusion that different models of funding do not significantly influence the internal organisational structure of the orchestras studied and that a general model of good practice for running a symphony orchestra cannot be drawn up without taking into account socio-economic and historical factors in a particular country.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the course of working on this dissertation I have been fortunate to be able to draw on the expertise of a large group of people who have assisted me in various ways and to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude.

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor at the City University's Department of Arts Policy and Management, Professor Patrick Boylan, who has guided me through the major part of this project. His guidance has always been a source of encouragement and inspiration. Thanks also to my first supervisor at the beginning of this project, Freda James (née Steel) and to other staff at the Department of Arts Policy and Management.

Special thanks are also due to all the Chief Executives of the 83 orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain who took the time to fill in my questionnaire and thereby creating a database for my research and in many cases helped me with follow-up discussions. Thanks also to the administrative staff of many of the orchestras who have provided me with the orgnisational and financial data needed.

This study covered six countries and many people and organisations in each of these countries assisted me in various ways during the course of the work. Thanks to all of these who are:

UNITED KINGDOM

• The Association of British Orchestras and their staff, in particular their Director Libby MacNamara whose valuable help during the early stages of this work was much appreciated.

DENMARK

• Erik Skovgaard Petersen at The Danish Music Council and Elna Barsøe at The Joint Council of the Regional Symphony Orchestras for providing valuable information about Danish music and orchestral life.

FINLAND

• The staff at the Finnish Arts Council in Helsinki, Tero-Pekka Henell former General Manager of Sinfonia Lahti and Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra who read through part of the manuscript and my friends Anja Maja and Reijo Koskinen who offered their hospitality on my many visits to Finland.

NORWAY

• Reidun Berg Manager for the Norwegian Radio Orchestra who provided me with valuable information about orchestral development in Norway. Kari Lilleslåtten at the Norwegian Council for Cultural Affairs for access to data on Norwegian cultural policy and to Hege Lunde and Halldis Fougner who provided me with accommodation during my stays in Norway.

SWEDEN

• Claes W. Englund director of the Association of Swedish Theatres and Orchestras for giving me access to the association's archives and for his generous support and encouragement throughout the duration of this project. Sven Olof Hagenberg-Svensson Office Manager at the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs who gave me free access to any material I needed. NOMUS - the Nordic Music Committee - and the Swedish National Concert Institute for their help with various practical details.

The Icelandic Musicians' Union (Félag íslenskra hljómlistarmanna -F.Í.H.) gave me financial support at the beginning of my research for which I am thankful.

Special thanks to all the librarians at libraries and archives in the six countries who helped me get hold of the information I needed. This was often a difficult task but the efficiency and professionalism of those involved impressed me deeply.

Special thanks also to my colleague Erin Lehman research co-ordinator at Harvard University for her inspiring contributions to my research and for reading through the manuscript of the thesis.

Last but not least I would like to thank my partner Jörgen Boman for his invaluable help in locating sources worldwide through his work as academic librarian as well as for all support and encouragement during the years I have been working on this thesis.

Gävle, Sweden in May 1998

Haukur F. Hannesson

ABBREVIATIONS AND LANGUAGE

The use of abbreviations has been kept to a minimum in this thesis. Occasionally the abbreviation S.O. might appear, indicating "Symphony Orchestra".

Throughout the thesis the collective name "Scandinavia" is used for the five countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Although "Scandinavia" is a common expression in English for these countries other expressions have also been used, in particular "The Nordic Countries", which is the expression in English favoured by public authorities in all five countries, as the original meaning of the word "Scandinavia" in many of the languages spoken in the five countries, is geographically restricted to only the peninsula that is divided between Norway and Sweden and in this Nordic sense would not necessarily imply that Denmark, Finland and Iceland were also covered by the thesis.

Consequently the expression "The Nordic Countries" will also be used throughout this thesis, concurrently with "Scandinavia", in the British sense, i.e. as a collective name for Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

Throughout this thesis the United Kingdom will be referred to as either the UK, the United Kingdom or Britain. Same applies to the United States of America, which will be referred to as the U.S.A or the U.S.

INDEX OF TABLES

INDEX OF TABLES, continued:

INDEX OF APPENDICIES

Chapter 1 - Introduction and Objectives

1.1. The Symphony Orchestra - an internationally comparable cultural model.

A symphony orchestra can be seen as model of a cultural institution that is essentially uniform regardless of its place of residence. This statement is possible because symphony orchestras in all countries have essentially the same function, namely to play music written for a certain form of musical ensemble, from various different epochs of western musical history. Where orchestras may vary slightly in style of playing they are all however, to a large extent, playing similar music in a manner that is not radically different from one end of the world to the other. Individual orchestras may reflect local intrinsic 'company' culture and values, that affect the artistic output and quality, but the common culture, values and tradition of the western orchestra of today is the strongest factor affecting the orchestras' work of musical performance.

Where the orchestras differ, however, are in the external conditions. The cultural, economical and even political prerequisites in which the orchestras operate can vary considerably from country to country and these are reflected in the ultimate artistic result of the orchestra as well as its position in society.

Given the original argument that symphony orchestras are essentially homogeneous in their basic approach to the task they perform, i.e. create music of a distinctive type, they may act as an international constant in the variable of cultural policy making, a variable which can take different forms depending on the country in which it is implemented. This uniformity of form and basic values makes symphony orchestras excellent material as case studies for models of cultural policies: the constant in the equation, the symphony orchestra, is closely comparable across different countries and hence creates a solid basis for comparison of several variables, such as history, cultural politics, economic reality, national labour structure and practice as well as the place music has in its society, to name just a few possibilities.

Attitudes to symphony orchestras to a large extent parallel the attitudes that different societies have towards various other elements of that particular society. Issues that rank high in this context are national or other attitudes to labour, public spending, feelings of identity or nationalism as well as historical traditions.

Consequently comparisons of such a distinct and stable art form as the symphony orchestra between different countries can clarify how different countries regard and prioritise music, public funding for the arts, as well as important aspects of their own history and social reality.

Many countries in Europe have common roots in history, often characterized by wars, alliances or colonialism. These roots are in many ways reflected in modern society and are currently reflected in this part of the world in a move towards a more united Europe through the increasing importance of the European Union. With regards to cultural policy, however, one can say that national (and even sub-national "regional") traditions and values are still stronger than that of any supra national bodies. In this context different models of cultural policy in the countries principally studied (i.e. Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Great Britain) have been related to those to the central object of this study - the symphony orchestras.

The models in questions take different forms in different European countries, insofar as regarding public funding of the arts and the distribution of public funds to arts organisations. In the United Kingdom cultural policy is claimed to be based on an 'arm's length policy' where successive politically elected governments have refused to take an active role in cultural policy and planning but have instead set up a model devolving the distribution of public funds to the arts to quasi-independent bodies such as 'arts councils' (the 'arts council model'). France, traditionally, has an extremely centralised cultural policy, with a strong Ministry of Culture controlling funds[1] (though there is a marked decentralisation since 1981 from outside Paris as well as from the late 1980s in Paris, with examples such as the Paris Opera and Cité de la Musique). Since 1949 the German constitution has devolved cultural policy and action entirely to the regional government level of 'länder' (counties) though the country has a strong tradition of subsidised cultural activity. The 'arts council model' has been copied in most of the English speaking world .

Across Scandinavia, however, there is a mixture of the above systems, although in all the five Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, central government plays a key role in the forming of cultural policy and in many cases is directly involved in implementing it [2].

With these different models as a background one can say that the attitudes of governments to symphony orchestras follow roughly the same pattern as that of most

---

1 Recently there have been trends in reshaping French cultural policy by decentralising it more to the regions. In a further interesting development, the Music Directorate of the Ministry of Culture is experimenting in the dance field with dividing annual grants into specific amounts for *patrimoine* (heritage), *création* (innovation) and *diffusion* (performance and audience development). It will be interesting to see whether this experiment will be extended to other cultural fields. (Source: Fleming (1995), p. 25-6, p. 33, p.45-50)

2 see e.g. Osland and Mangset (1995), p. 16-17

other cultural institutions in the different countries. It is however somewhat surprising, as can be seen in later chapters of this study, that despite the marked differences in organisational structure and levels of funding, the various symphony orchestras of these countries are remarkably similar in terms of organisational culture.

The five countries of northern Europe, commonly referred to as Scandinavia or in the more eurocratic way The Nordic Countries (i.e. Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), share a cultural heritage characterized not only by common historical roots but also often parallel political development in the twentieth century. Government attitudes to the cultural heritage in the five countries are marked by the common view that each is ready and willing to spent considerable funds toward furthering the so called 'Scandinavian Identity' in the arts, while at the same time spending considerable funds and efforts on political and economic cooperation at various formal levels.

The close cooperation between the countries in areas of politics, economy and culture stretches back at least 40 years and is typified by the role of the Nordic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers. These political organs, that have been in operation since the 1952 (the Nordic Council) and 1971 (the Nordic Council of Ministers)[3] , have among other things ensured a free flow of labour between the countries since 1953 [4] when the Nordic Passport Union was established. With this common tradition, it would be reasonable to expect the Scandinavian countries to have similar cultural policies, and hence, similar policies towards symphony orchestras.

The basic object of this study is therefore to compare the situation with regards to symphony orchestras and their relationship to cultural policy and government of the five countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, and to compare these with symphony orchestras in the United Kingdom in parts of the study.

The key research questions addressed can be summarised as follows:

1. Does the direct political involvement of local and central government bodies in the Scandinavian countries in the affairs of Scandinavian symphony orchestras create a healthy cultural environment, in which symphony orchestras can achieve their artistic goals as well as being an important part of the community?
2. Is a high level of government funding necessarily beneficial for the arts management professional in his or her quest to achieve these goals as an orchestra manager and/or policy maker in Scandinavia?
3. Do different models of funding influence significantly the organisational culture of a symphony orchestra?

In the following study the above questions are to be addressed as well as

---

3 Nationalecykolpedin, band 14, p. 225

4 Ibid.

other aspects of the existence of Scandinavian symphony orchestras, such as their history and current status in society.

1.2. Previous and current international research on symphony orchestras.

The symphony orchestra is currently being seen as a more interesting research object for scholars of various disciplines, as will be discussed later in this chapter. Many recent studies have tended, however, to focus on the orchestra as an organisational unit and apply and/or develop organisational theory based on empirical studies of one or more orchestras in one country, often comparing the orchestra as an organisation with other types of organisational structures. Examples of this kind of research in Europe include work of Eve Chiapello, France, who has examined the internal structure of French orchestras [5], François Dupin, France, who has done similar research as Chiapello [6], Ann-Sofie Köping, Sweden, whose Ph.D. thesis analyses the Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra from the point of view of the economist [7], and Turid Rödne, Norway, who with an anthropological background studies the Stavanger Symphony Orchestra [8]. As an example of older research on orchestras in a Scandinavian country is the work of Nils L. Wallin from 1977, focusing of the (Swedish) symphony orchestra as a unit in modern society, and in the U.S.A. the unpublished Ph.D. thesis of Leon Emanuel Lunden from 1967 focusing on major U.S. symphony orchestras' labour relations [9].

Research of more international nature where aspects of the symphony orchestras' activities are compared can for example be found in Rolf Davidson's studies of repertoire of Scandinavian symphony orchestras. In the first of his three studies [10] Davidson examined the repertoire policy in relation to the performance of contemporary Norwegian music, of 47 orchestras in Scandinavia for the concert seasons 1990-91 and 1991-1992, as well as examining repertoire lists from four Scandinavian music colleges for the same purpose. In his second study Davidson considered the repertoire policy of Norwegian orchestras from 1970-1992 as well as

---

5 Eve Chiapello is the author of the study *LES ORCHESTRES - L'interdépendance des modes d'organisation, des structures et des types de productions culturelles* (September 1993). This study examines various aspects of French orchestras, such as structure, administrative/artistic relationship and relationships between musicians in the orchestra.

6 François Dupin is the author of the study *L'Orchestre nu* (1981). This study analyses the internal workings of an orchestra.

7 Ann-Sofie Köping is currently working on her Ph.D. at the Stockholm University Business School on the subject of organisational structure of the Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra. Her working papers presented include *The Production of a Symphony Concert* (1992) and *The Symphony Orchestra as a Working Place* (1993).

8 Turid Rödne is a sociologist at the University of Stavanger, Norway. She is currently conducting an anthropological study of the Stavanger Symphony Orchestra.

9 Wallin (1977) and Lunden (1967)

10 Davidsson (1992): Norsk Samtidsmusikk i Norden

the repertoire of four Norwegian music colleges 1980-1993 [11] and in his third study examined the repertoire policy of Swedish symphony orchestras from 1980-1990, particularly regarding new Swedish music [12].

In North America the symphony orchestra has been the object of research from various angles for a long time. In a valuable article in the magazine *Harmony* Erin Lehman [13] summarised the literature of research on orchestras from 1960 to the present day. Lehman divides the research into categories according to discipline in the following manner:

1. Practitioners and Industry Experts, including
a) orchestra case studies,
b) industry analysis and
c) trade journal articles.
2. Economics.
3. Nonprofit, Management, Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management
4. Political Science and Public Policy
5. Sociology
6. Social Psychology [14]

Most of this recent research reflects the environment of North American symphony orchestras and in many cases looks at the inner workings of an orchestra. There are however, according to Lehman, several studies that focus on international aspects of orchestral life and cover even comparison across art forms. For the purpose of this study it is interesting to look the particular research that focuses on cross national research of orchestras. The following list of sources is, to a large extend, based on sources cited in Lehman's article.

1. Practitioners and Industry Experts, including a) orchestra case studies, b) industry analysis and c) trade journal articles. Under the category of orchestra case studies Robert Craven's research on orchestra profiles in the United States (1986) and around the world (1987)[15] gives an overview of orchestras in an international perspective. A key work analysing the 'symphony orchestra industry' is Philip Hart's work from 1973 [16] with case studies of specific orchestras, covering

11 Davidsson (1993): Överhuvudtaget visar sig norborna inte särskilt stolta över sin kultur - de flaggar hellre med annat.
12 Davidsson (1996): En undersökning av repertoaren vid svenska symfoniorkestrar med tonvikt på nyare svensk musik (1996)
13 Lehman, Erin V. (1995) (b), p.37-54
14 Ibid, p. 39-47
15 Craven 1986 and 1987
16 Hart, 1973

areas such as repertoire, conductors, musicians' union and audiences. Other American reports have followed up on this work [17] including writings with an international dimension [18] and across different art forms [19] . Articles in trade journals articles provide a forum for discussion of symphony orchestra management and often give valuable information about the workings of a symphony orchestra [20] . The focus of these articles are, however, in most cases concentrating on the inner managerial and artistic workings of an orchestra.

2. Economics. The research into symphony orchestras has not escaped the debate of the economic importance of the arts. In the *Journal of the Association of Cultural Economics* (established in 1973)[21] a series of articles such as "Cost Functions for Symphony Orchestras" (1985) by Mark Lange et al., and Mark Lange and William Luksetich's "The Cost of Producing Symphony Orchestra Services" (1993) are printed. An international study under the hat of economics is Jean-Pierre Guillard in "The Symphony as a Public Service: The Orchestra of Paris" (1985)[22] . In this study Guillard discusses the French government's subsidising of a "symphony orchestra network" versus the funding structure of American, British and other European orchestras. Another comparative analysis is Marianne Felton's study "Historical Funding Patterns in Symphony Orchestras, Dance and Opera Companies, 1972-1992" from 1994 [23] .

3. Nonprofit, Management, Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management. Most of the material listed in Lehman's article under this heading has to do with the arts in general or symphony orchestras in a non profit environment of the American or British kind that does not really have the same relevance in Scandinavia. Although interesting there is very little, or no research in this field that is of comparative international nature.

4. Political Science and Public Policy. Under this discipline it is the environment of the symphony orchestra and not the orchestra itself that is the focus. To mention one or two examples of this kind of research, Milton Cummings, Jr. and Richard Katz (1987)[24] provide, for example, an in-depth look at cultural support in

---

17 The Rockefeller Foundation report (1965), the Wolf Report (1992), the ASOL task force report (1993), John Robinson (1993)

18 Galinsky & Lehman, 1995

19 Zolberg, 1980; Heilbrun, 1993

20 Some of the magazines named in Lehman's article in *Harmony* (no. 1,1995) are *Symphony, International Musician, Senza Sordino, International Arts Manager* and the *American Record Guide.* Key writings include articles by Debra Borda (1994), Ernest Fleischmann (1989), Henry Fogel (1988), Tomas Morris (1989), Robert Levine (1993), Joe Robinson (1987), Michael Morgan (1994) and Howard Garniss & Steve Young (1985).

21 Lehman (1995) (a), p. 41

22 In *Journal of Cultural Economics* 9 (2): p. 35-47, 1985

23 In *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 24 (1): p. 8-32, 1994

24 Cummings, Jr., Milton C., and Richard S. Katz The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987

various countries, including the United States. Several other works deal with the environment of the arts in general [25] as well as analysing how the use of quantitative indicators affect behaviour and performance in the cultural sector [26].

5. Sociology. The approach sociologists have taken to the research subject of orchestras is to examine them as social systems [27]. Many of the studies are of interest and as an example particularly relevant to this study is Jutta Allmendinger and J. Richard Hackman's "The More the Better? A Four-Nation Study of the Inclusion of Women in Symphony Orchestras" (1995) [28]. This study is a part of a larger study at Harvard University which will be discussed later in this chapter.

6. Social Psychology. The largest study of symphony orchestras on an international level in recent years, and which also could be put under this label, is a project undertaken by a team of researchers from Harvard University and the Max Planck Institute in Berlin with Professor J. Richard Hackman and Professor Jutta Allmendingar as principle investigators [29]. Together with research coordinator Erin Lehman and other co-workers, Hackman and Allmendinger conducted a cross national study of leadership and mobility in symphony orchestras in four countries; East Germany, West Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States between 1989 and 1992 [30]. 81 orchestras were originally contacted and in the end 78 participated in the study [31]. As mentioned earlier the study covered leadership and mobility in symphony orchestras in the four countries, but also covered certain demographic aspects. The main research questions are as follows:

1. In what ways do orchestras in the four countries differ?
2. What are the career patterns of symphony orchestra musicians?
3. What is happening as more women join symphony orchestras?
4. What helps make an orchestra into a great musical ensemble
5. What is happening to East German orchestras? [32]

A number of reports and articles have been published with the findings on this study [33] and more will follow in the near future. The research question that is most interesting in the context of this author's study is the first one. This will be

25 For example Wyszomirski (1987) and Schuster (1989) and (1992)
26 Schuster (1994 a,b)
27 Lehman (1995) (a) p. 45
28 In *Social Forces* December 1995, 74(2):423-460
29 Lehman (1995) (b), p. 325
30 Ibid.
31 Lehman (1995) (b), p. 325 and 327; Hackman/Judy (1996) p. 1-2
32 Allmendinger, Hackman, Lehman (Report No. 7, 1994), p.1
33 For a complete list of reports and/or published articles of this research project, see bibliography under: Allmendinger (all entries), Galinsky & Lehman (1995), Hackman, J. Richard/Judy, Paul (1996), Lehman (1995)(a and b), Lehman & Galinsky (1994)

discussed further in Chapter 6 comparing findings from the following chapters of this study.

1.3. Context and structure of this author's study

As will be discussed further in Chapter 3 this study of Scandinavian and British orchestras can in some aspects be compared with some other international research done on symphony orchestras. This is in particular true when the orchestra is being examined as an arts organisation in society and how economical, managerial and/or even political factors influence the organisation in different countries. When discussing various internal organisational aspects, role and function of musicians within the organisation, however, this present study doesn't cover such aspects in details. It was a conscious choice to limit the scope of research to a relatively large number of Nordic and British orchestras addressing only a limited range of the orchestral environment.

Some of the studies, notably the Harvard study, have used similar methodology as this author's study. The basis for empirical material has been collected by surveying a sample of orchestras and the research questions assessed and interpreted according to the survey findings. The structure of the surveys are in some ways similar, as will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

This study will cover background chapters to Scandinavian and British cultural policy and orchestral development, a chapter on the survey done amongst 83 Scandinavian and British symphony orchestras, chapters on the financial environment of the orchestras, comparisons between Britain and Scandinavia, and a discussion section focusing on issues brought up by the study and the context of this with regards to orchestras in Scandinavia. Finally a chapter listing the conclusions of the study together with ideas for further research.

Chapter 2 - Presentation of National Cultural Policies

2.1. The Orchestral World in Scandinavia and Britain

The five Nordic Countries share, in many aspects, a common history. This is strengthened by the fact that three of the five countries have been colonies of the remaining two: Iceland and Norway were for centuries under Denmark and Finland under Sweden.

One can talk about a historical division of the Nordic area into two parts, which even still today has an effect on various aspects of the countries' cultural and political life. Government in all the countries is still reflecting history in the way public administration is organized. The main division in the area is that of an East Nordic and West Nordic zones. The Danish realm in the west encompassed, apart from Denmark, present day Norway and Iceland, as well as the two autonomous areas of the Faroe Islands and Greenland. The Swedish realm encompasses present day Sweden and Finland as well as the (Finnish) autonomous area of the Åland Islands in the Baltic Sea [1].

The system of public administration in the five countries today is directly modelled on the historical traditions that each country has inherited. Generally speaking it can be said that the administrative organs - the cabinets and the central administrations - were founded and attained their present form during the time that the two realms were in the main completely intact [2].

The dissolution of the Danish and Swedish realms took place in gradual stages, with Norway becoming Swedish and Finland Russian before all countries became sovereign states in the early part of this century [3]. The basic structure of the administration was however already in place and radical changes have not happened to it since.

The five countries have today heads of states that are hereditary

1 Nordic Democracy, G. Petrén (1981), p. 163
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.

constitutional monarchs in Denmark, Norway and Sweden and popularly elected presidents in Iceland and Finland. The exercise of administrative powers granted the head of state is mostly formal and ceremonial except in Finland [4] . Culture in Nordic governments is typically represented in a special Ministry of Culture or through a culture department in a Ministry of Education. Country to country differs in how active a role the ministry (or the department) plays in the cultural policy making. Again one can look at the east/west division of the countries, with Denmark, Norway and Iceland maintaining larger ministries and working more with details of cultural policy at ministerial level whereas Finland and Sweden have a different system of government, where the ministries are smaller and play a less active role in this process [5] .

Culture is also a responsibility of local government in all five countries. The involvement of local government differs, however, between the countries depending on the different status local government has in different countries. More administrative tasks are for example delegated to local authorities in Sweden and Finland than in Denmark, Norway and Iceland [6] .

Although the development of the form of government in the Nordic countries has been influenced by government in Britain [7], cultural representation in British central government has had a lower profile than in Scandinavia, since until recently the British minister responsible for culture has often not sat in the country's cabinet as the Scandinavian ministers do [8] .

In the following sections the intention is to look briefly at each country and examine the way culture has been, and is, represented in government, particularly with reference to orchestras. These studies also examine briefly each country's cultural policy and cultural institutions and especially relations to the orchestral framework and orchestral development in each country.

---

4 Ibid., p. 164

5 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 37-39 and
Nordic Democracy, G. Petrén (1981), p. 170

6 Nordic Democracy, K. Ståhlberg (1981), p. 184

7 Nordic Democracy, G. Petrén (1981), p. 164

8 See further under the section on the United Kingdom in this chapter as cultural representation in the British government is more complicated than in Scandinavia.

2.2. DENMARK

History of Cultural Representation in Government

The start of modern public administration in Denmark can be traced to the constitutional reforms in 1848-1849. In 1536, with the Reformation, the responsibility of cultural affairs had been transferred from the church to the monarch [9]. With these mid-19th century reforms the absolute power of the Danish monarch was formally abolished and public administrative duties were transferred to ministries thus establishing the principle of ministerial administration which also is practised in Norway and Iceland [10]. This change meant that administrative duties that had formally been the affairs of the crown, now moved to ministries headed by a minister, who was formally responsible for all decisions taken within the ministry [11].

Cultural affairs were initially taken over by the Ministry of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs. Prior to the constitutional reform the relationship between culture and government had been characterized by the involvement of the crown in cultural matters.

Although ministries were set up in 1849, their development was rather slow, and during the period 1849-1890 public administration did not grow to any extent. Between 1890-1919 there was a considerable increase in the central government's active involvement in various aspects of society and a change from the 'laissez-faire' policy of the previous period [12]. In 1849 the entire Danish public administration had been divided between only seven ministries [13], of which the Ministry of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs was one. In 1916 this ministry was split into two though cultural affairs continued to be represented by the Ministry of Education [14].

It was only in 1961 that the Ministry of Education was split and a special Ministry of Culture was created [15]. This new ministry covered not only areas previously handled by the Ministry of Education, including many areas of the arts, arts education and libraries, but was also given several items from the Ministry of Justice,

---

9 Duelund (1994), p. 22, Duelund (1995), p. 29-31, Bogason (1992), p. 46

10 Bakke (1988), p. 41, Duelund (1994), p. 22, Duelund (1995), p. 29-31, Meyer (1973), p. 3

11 Grønnegård Christensen & Ibsen (1991), p. 23-27, Kristinsson (1994), p. 54, Meyer et al (1980), p. 45

12 Bogason (1992), p. 46-47, Grønnegaard Christensen & Munk Christiansen (1992), p. 64

13 The seven fields covered by the ministries were: foreign affairs, war, marine, justice, education and ecclesiastical affairs, finance and affairs of the state's interior (Petersen (1973), p. 94).

14 Rohde (1996), p. 4-9, Petersen (1973), p. 114

15 Ibid.

including the film industry. Museums were also transferred from the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Trade and from the Ministry of the Prime Minister, and affairs pertaining to environmental protection as well as research funds also passed to the Ministry of Culture [16]. To this day the Ministry of Culture continues to be the highest public administration organ of the Danish central government in cultural affairs. Although the ministry was founded by a French model, i.e. a strong central cultural ministry, there are elements of an arm's length policy in cultural policy in Denmark. This will be discussed further in the next section on Danish cultural policy. Local government has also been active in planning cultural policy. From a structural point of view the Ministry of the Interior has suggested a model for public administration, which most of the local councils in Denmark follow although there are exceptions from this [17]. Normally, however, there are four standing committees under each local council one of which is a standing committee for cultural affairs [18].

General Cultural Policy of Denmark

As with the other Nordic countries Denmark has seen a development of its central government cultural policy characterized by increasing state subsidies to the arts, in particular from the 1960s and onwards. The increased public funding has been formalised by various laws on cultural matters, which often stipulate the structure and administrative routines as well as funding pattern. Denmark has, in part, applied the arm's length principle, and created several quasi-independent councils for the distribution of funds to the arts. An interesting variant on the arm's length principle, as practised in Denmark, is the "double arm's length principle" which is characterised by a further distance from political decision makers, by putting in an extra organisation between the fund distributing body and the Ministry of Culture. This model is for example used for the State's Music Council (Statens Musikråd) which is the distributing body for funds to music. The council itself consists of 9 members of whom four are nominated by the Minister of Culture and 5 are nominated by the State's Music Councils Representation Group (Repræsentantskab). This group consists of 40 members all nominated by various music organisations and are formally appointed by the Minister of Culture. Their role is to monitor the work of the Music Council and to give input about general conditions in the musical life of Denmark. There is a similar organisation for other art forms [19]. It is interesting to note, however, that even though funds are distributed to Danish musical life to a large extent in this form, the Danish regional symphony orchestras do not come under the jurisdiction of the State's

16 Rohde (1996), p. 8-9
17 Danish: "indenrigsminsteriets normalstyrelsevedtægt"
18 Nue Möller (1973), p. 291
19 Duelund (1995), p. 55-68

Music Council, but are instead dealt with directly from the Ministry of Culture. These consequently have a special entry in the state budget, which in Denmark is a legislative act that has to be passed through parliament each year [20].

As in many of the other Nordic countries the formal relationship between government and the arts in Denmark is manifested through legislation. Historically this goes back as far as 1926 when a legislation was passed on radio broadcasting, based on the BBC's public service model and containing elements of an arm's length principle [21]. In the following table from Bakke (1988) the original legislations in the cultural field is listed as well as an indication of the level of public administration responsible for a particular legislation.

Table 2.1. The first legislation in various fields of culture, the goal of the legislation and organisational level for the practical administration of the intention of the acts of law in Denmark.

Goal of the first legislation				Public Administration Level		
		Production/ own activity	Promotion	State	County Council	Local
Radio and TV	1926		x	x	x	
Cinemas	1933		x	x		x
Libraries	1936		x	x		
Envir. Protect.	1937		x	x		
Newspapers	1938		x	x	x	x
Museums	1941*		x	x	x	
Sports	1948	x	x	x		
Visual Art	1956	x	x	x		
Music	1961		x		x	
Theatre	1963**		x	x		
Literature	1964	x		x		
Crafts	1969	x	x	x		
Architecture	1978	x	x			

* Legislation on conservation of buildings was passed in 1918 (passed to the Ministry of the Environment in 1966)
** Legislation on Theatre Activity in Copenhagen was passed in 1889, and an Act for the Royal Theatre in 1935 [22].

20 Kristinsson (1994), p. 92 and The Danish State Budget 1995 (Finansloven 1995), p. 1190-1197. In the State Budget Paragraph § 21.22. is Music in general, paragraph § 21.22.01 is the regional symphony orchestras (the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra does not appear here), paragraph § 21.22.11. it the State's Music council.

21 Duelund (1995), p. 56 and Bakke (1988), p. 48

22 Bakke (1988), p. 48

With regards to music, and in particular orchestras, two Acts are of special importance. The first one is the Act on State Subsidy to the Regional Orchestras in 1961. This Act was later merged into the general Music Act of 1976 [23].

The original Music Act was passed on October 1, 1976. The purpose of the legislation was to ensure that access to music should be more easily accessible for the whole population and decentralising the decision making process with regards to funding (arm's length principle). Ensuring a more even spreading of concerts and music education to the whole country was also a goal, as well as giving performing musicians (as in contrast to "creative" musicians i.e. composers) access to funding. In addition to that a more decentralised decision making policy was required, in line with general trends in cultural policy in Denmark at the time, which strived towards a model of a greater "cultural democracy" [24]. Several amendments have been made of the Music Act since 1976, the first one in 1981, then 1986, 1987, 1990 and 1994, each amendment aiming at adjusting the legislation to new prerequisites but keeping the original profile of the legislative idea [25]. Denmark is probably one of few countries in the world, if not the only one, that has such a comprehensive legislation about musical life.

The Music Act covers a wide area. It gives the basic guidelines for the funding of the regional symphony orchestras, the State Music Council and the State's Music Councils Representation Group (Repræsentantskabet). It furthermore legislates the operation of 16 county music councils (amtsmusikudvalg), which consist of representatives from the county councils as well as the music organisations. The role of these county music councils is to distribute funding from the county purse to the local musical life [26].

The Ministry of Culture is the public administration organ that administrates the Music Act as well as other institutions that have to do with music.

Cultural Institutions in Denmark

Apart from the institutions that come under the Music Act, the Ministry of Culture administrates six other institutions that in some way or another have to do with music. These are The Royal National Library (Det Kongelige Bibliotek) which has a large collection of printed music and books on music; The Royal Theatre (Det Kongelige Teater) which to a large extent is an opera house, though interestingly enough it is financed through the Theatre Act not the Music Act; The State's Art Fund (Statens Kunstfond) which gives grants to "creative" artists, including composers,

23 Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 25
24 Ibid., p. 14-15
25 Ibid., p. 22
26 Ibid., p. 9

that cannot get funding from any other sources; The Cultural Fund (Kulturfonden) which supports new intercultural initiatives both from individual artists and institutions; National Lottery (Tips- og lottomidlerne) which to a small extent gives grants to musical projects and Danish State Broadcasting Service (Danmarks Radio) which runs the biggest symphony orchestra in Denmark as well as a concert orchestra, professional choirs and a Big Band. The Big Band is, however, partly financed by the State's Music Council.

Apart from these institutions three ministries are involved in the public subsidy to music education. The Ministry of Culture subsidises the six music colleges, the Centre for Popular Music (Center for Rytmisk Musik og Bevægelse) as well as schools for librarianship, where for example music librarians are educated. The Ministry of Education is responsible for funding the general education system, in which music education occurs. The community music schools, however, where for example instrumental teaching is done, comes under a special paragraph in the Music Act. The Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs funds church music schools, where church musicians are educated[27].

The most important of the Danish cultural institutions, with regards to music, however, is the State's Music Council. Its structure has already been described before, but it is appropriate to look briefly at its function and areas of responsibility.

After the latest revision of the Danish Music Act[28] the State Music Council is to fund the following areas:

1) Professional orchestras, choirs and ensembles
2) Concert activity, including venues, festivals and music drama
3) Experimental music education or music education with a regional profile, as well as artistically focused amateur choirs, amateur orchestras, - ensembles and their organisations.
4) Information, research and publishing activity
5) Other activities that can be seen as promoting Danish music or musical activity either in Denmark or abroad.

---

27 Ibid., p. 11-12

28 The Danish Music Act is available in English translation (manuscript) under the the title: Ministry of Culture, Consolidation Act No. 142 of February 28, 1994: Promulgation of the Music Act. The Danish title is: Kulturministeriets lovbekendtgørelse nr. 142 af 28. februar 1994: Bekendtgørelse af lov om musik - Kulturmin.j.nr. 92:001.1/4100-1. The Music Act has been amended several times since it was passed in 1976. The original legislation and amendments are as follows (in the Danish original):
Lov nr. 306 af 10. juni 1976, Lov om musik
Lov nr. 248 af 27. maj 1981 om ændring af lov om musik
Lov nr. 333 af 4. juni 1986 om ændring af lov om musik
Lov nr. 375 af 10. juni 1987 om ændring af lov om musik
Lov nr. 412 af 13. juni 1990 om ændring af lov om musik
Lov nr. 142 af 28. februar 1994 om ændring af lov om musik

Every year the council receives about 1500 different applications for funding and distributes grants that range from DKK 3,000 (approx. £ 270)(travel grants for musicians) to DKK 3,700,000 (approx. £ 330,000) (to the Danish Music Information Centre) [29].

As was said earlier, the State's Music Council does not distribute funds to the five regional orchestras,to the Danish radio orchestras or to the orchestra of the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen. The council's influence in the matter of Danish orchestras is therefore minimal and the direct influence of the Ministry of Culture a considerable more important policy aspect for the orchestras. The regional orchestras have a coordination committee (Landsdelsorkestrenes samråd) which employs one administrator and acts as the orchestras' information and lobbying centre.

Orchestral Development in Denmark

The oldest orchestra in Denmark is the Royal Danish Orchestra (Det kongelige Kapel), which today is the permanent opera orchestra at the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen. The orchestra was founded in 1448 as a court brass ensemble by the king Christian the First. This makes the Royal Danish Orchestra the oldest orchestra in Scandinavian, older than the similar orchestra founded in Stockholm some decades later. The orchestra slowly developed from being a troop of trumpeters to include singers in the 16th century, for the first time including violins (or viols) towards the end of the 17th century and finally coming close to the role that the orchestra has today as an opera orchestra in 1770. The orchestra kept its independent orchestra status and in the later half of the 19th century, more precisely on December 8, 1883 started giving independent symphony orchestra concerts: a tradition it has kept until this day [30]. As was said in an earlier chapter orchestras that are primarily opera orchestras are not included in this study, hence the Royal Danish Orchestra is not among the Danish orchestras covered.

In the autumn of 1925 the Danish Radio Orchestra (Radioorkesteret) was founded with 11 members, but soon grew to the size of a symphony orchestra and in 1933 the orchestra had reached the full size of about 60 contracted musicians to which a group of 30 regular freelance players were added when needed [31]. The orchestra has to this day been a part of the Danish National Broadcasting Service (Danmarks Radio) and receives most of its operating costs through licence fees. It is the largest orchestra in Denmark, perhaps the only one that can be considered a really "full size" symphony orchestra currently employing around 100 orchestral musicians [32].

29 Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 10

30 Wenzel Andreasen (1983), p. 8-11

31 Andersen and Ressel (1965), p. 25-36

32 Danmarks Radio-Koncerter 1994-1995, p. 17

Before the Second World War several ensembles which later where to become symphony orchestras were established in the larger cities outside Copenhagen. It can be said however that the main orchestral development in Denmark has happened after 1945 and is characterised by a strong central government and legislative influence, and in come cases, initiative.

Already in on October 29, 1943, while Denmark was still under German occupation, the Ministry of Education appointed a committee with the brief to investigate the possibilities for future financing of regional orchestras. This committee delivered its report on May 29, 1947 and suggested that four regional orchestras should be established and that a part of the Danish Radio's licence fees should finance this as well as a special tax on cinema tickets. The committee also proposed that the orchestras should consist of 64 musicians each [33].

These proposal did not develop any further, however, and on April 21, 1952 a new committee was appointed and delivered its report in July 1955. The proposals resulting from this suggested that three orchestras, those in Aarhus, Aalborg and Odense should consist of 53 musicians each as well as 43 musicians in an orchestra in the south of Jutland. The committee did not give any proposals for the Copenhagen/Zealand region [34].

A few years were to pass until a concrete initiative came in the matter. In the parliamentary session of 1960-61 the Minister of Education presented a bill of law proposing a grant from the state budget to orchestras outside the Copenhagen area [35]. This was passed as an act of law on May 17, 1961 [36]. The essence of this act was that the state would give grant to orchestras that employed at least 34 musicians on a full time basis and that the orchestra was structured in such manner that it could perform new as well as old orchestral music in an artistically acceptable fashion. The state grant was to give the orchestras 50% of the wages of the musicians, although with a maximum cost of 58 musicians' wages. One exception was made where there was an allowance for the state to give up to 75% of this cost if special cultural prerequisites existed [37]. Very soon three regional orchestras, those in Aarhus, Aalborg and in Odense, met the requirements of this act.

The Aarhus Symphony Orchestra, or the Aarhus City Orchestra (Aarhus By-Orkester) was founded in 1935. The orchestra was mainly financed by the Aarhus

---

33 Betænkning-Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991, p.9. It is interesting to note that around about the same time similar ideas about the financing of orchestras were being debated in Iceland. It was suggested there that an orchestra should be financed by a special tax on cinema tickets. This was, however, protested by cinema owners and never came into force (see section on Iceland).

34 Betænkning-Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991, p.10

35 Danish title: Forslag til lov om statstilskud til orkestre uden for hovedstadsområdet.

36 Danish title: Lov nr. 136 af 17. maj 1961

37 Betænkning-Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991, p.10, Rohde (1996), p. 14 -15, Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 23-25

City Council and the Aarhus Theatre and consisted initially of 26 musicians [38]. The orchestra was the first orchestra to be established on a more permanent basis outside the Copenhagen area and consists today of 68 musicians [39].

In Aalborg, in the north of Jutland, the Aalborg City Orchestra (originally in Danish Aalborg By-Orkester later Aalborg Symphony Orchestra) was founded in 1943 by initiative of interested citizens and with the support of the Aalborg City Council [40]. The orchestra consists of 63 musicians today [41].

In Odense, on the island of Fynen, the Odense Symphony Orchestra was founded as the Odense City Orchestra (Odense By-Orkester) on September 2, 1946 [42]. The orchestra consists today of 72 musicians [43].

As said earlier the legislation of 1961 allowed for a larger subsidy from the state budget than 50% of wages of musicians in exceptional cases. The thought here was primarily to allow the government to take initiative to finance an orchestra in the south of Jutland, near the boarder with Germany. German orchestras, in particular the Flensburg City Orchestra, toured frequently in the area and it was considered important cultural policy to establish a Danish symphony orchestra in the area to strengthen the Danish input in the local music life. The requirement of allowing the state subsidy to go up to 75% was put in the act primarily because of the situation Southern Jutland and in April 1963 the South Jutland Symphony Orchestra (Sønderjyllands Symfoniorkester) was founded [44]. The orchestra, consequently, received a higher proportion of state subsidy than other regional orchestras in Denmark at the time. This orchestra currently employs 63 musicians on a full time basis [45].

In 1964 a special act of law was passed in the Danish parliament about state subsidy for a regional orchestra in Sjælland, the area of and around Copenhagen [46]. This act of law was to all intents and purposes similar to the more general legislation of 1961, but it was specifically aimed at changing the summer season orchestra at the Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen to a full time year around orchestra. The Tivoli Concert Hall Orchestra thus changed it name in 1965 and became the Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra (Sjællands Symfoniorkester). In this act it was furthermore stipulated that the orchestra should give concerts on the island of Zealand as well as on the islands of

38 Albeck in Aarhus Symfoniorkester 50 år (1985), p. 10-14
39 Aarhus Symfoniorkester-Perspektivplan 1995, p. 5
40 Aalborg By-Orkester, p. 14 -15
41 Aarhus Symfoniorkester-Perspektivplan 1995, p. 7
42 Vestergaard (ed.) (1996), p. 57
43 Vestergaard (ed.) (1996), p. 69 and
Aarhus Symfoniorkester-Perspektivplan (1995), p. 6
44 Rohde (1996), p. 14-15, Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 23-24
and Hahnemann in Vagn-Hansen (ed.) (1988), p. 13-15
45 Aarhus Symfoniorkester-Perspektivplan (1995), p. 7
46 Danish title: Lov nr. 169 om statstilskud til et landsdelsorkester for Sjælland

Lolland-Falster and Bornholm and should also be available to the Royal Danish Music Conservatory's conductors' classes. Concerning the part of the financing that did not come from the state budget itself, the act stipulated that at lease 3/4 of the remaining wage costs should come from government at local level and up to 1/4 from the orchestras self generated income [47].

In 1976 all the legislation about orchestras was incorporated into the new Music Act, which has been discussed before. The biggest change in the funding policy towards the orchestras was that now the state changed the funding model and instead of funding 50% (75% for the Southern Jutland Symphony Orchestra) of the musicians' wages, a model of deficit funding was established and it was 50% of the orchestras' deficit that was now to be funded from the state budget. The orchestras were also given several requirements in this and later amendments of the Music Act such as working with conservatories, opera companies and promoting Danish Music [48].

The biggest change in the funding prerequisites for the Danish regional orchestras came with the amendment of the Music Act in 1990. The guaranteed percentage of deficit funding by the state was abolished and replaced with an amount decided annually by the state budget, on the condition that a subsidy was also received by government at local level [49]. This has created financial difficulties for the orchestras and after a new orchestral committee appointed by the Minister of Culture in 1991 had given its proposals in September 1992, several centrally controlled funds in the Ministry of Culture were created to give funding to specific projects that the orchestras might want to undertake, in particular projects in relation to new Danish music. The funding situation for Danish orchestras has, however, as a result of the change in funding principles been more unstable in recent years than before [50]. All the regional orchestras in Denmark are run as self owning institutions, or foundations (selvejende institutioner), whereas the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra is a unit of the Danish State Broadcasting Service [51].

---

47 Betænkning-Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991, p.11

48 Betænkning-Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991, p.11 and Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 23-24

49 Betænkning-Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991, p.12 and Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 24-25

50 Pedersen & Solvang (1994), p. 25

51 Ibid., p. 23

2.3. FINLAND

History of Cultural Representation in Government

Finland was until 1809 a region in the Swedish state, normally referred to as the "Eastland" [52]. In 1809 she became an autonomous Grand Duchy under the Russian tsar (who also became the Grand Duke of Finland) [53], something that was to remain the same until Finland became independent in 1917. Finland's road to independence during the first decades of this century was a rocky one and after the newly established Soviet Union recognised Finland as a sovereign independent state, civil war broke out [54].

It took some time to establish political stability after the bloody civil war and it was not until after parliamentary elections in 1919 that Britain and the United States recognised Finland's independence [55]. Despite this unrest, Finland however, carried traditions in government from her Swedish past before the union with Russia [56]. During the Swedish rule a large number of Swedes has emigrated to Finland and became, as the years went, the upper class of the country, setting themselves aside from the ordinary Finns by speaking a different language as well as being better educated and more wealthy. Finland remains until this day a bilingual country, with a minority population of Swedish speakers, who at the beginning of the century had historical privileges when taking into account the size of this minority group. It can be said that there was a sort of a "South African" situation in Finland with the difference that the dividing factor was not race, but language and wealth.

Since the government administrative system dated form the days of Swedish rule, the civil servants, most of whom were Swedish speaking, had made sure that the official language in government offices was Swedish. The new constitution of 1919 changed that and both Finnish and Swedish became languages of the state [57].

In 1919 Finland was therefore a newly independent state whose young political life was coloured by instability, both due to economic and cultural divisions, but still had a tradition of government and civil service that was to remain a constant factor in society, strengthened by the unbroken Swedish tradition through, amongst other things, the use of Swedish as an official language.

---

52 Puntila (1974), p. 14

53 Cultural Policy in Finland, National Report (Ilkka Heiskanen) (1995), p. 31

54 Puntila (1974)

55 Ibid., p. 103

56 The Basic Principles of Finnish Government, p. 5 and Cultural Policy in Finland, Report by the Panel of European Experts, p. 25

57 Puntila (1974), p. 124-125

The Ministry of Education is the highest authority of cultural affairs in Finland. This has been the case since the founding of the Finnish republic and the present structure was formally laid down in a 1922 law concerning the number and general jurisdiction of ministries, followed by a 1943 State Council (i.e. Finnish Cabinet) regulation, and in decrees concerning ministries and their departments [58]. Although culture has been represented at this level since 1918, there have been slightly different attitudes and emphasis in the relationship between the ministry and cultural institutions and individual cultural workers during different decades.

Up until the 1960s the idea of "the patron state" dominated the thought in the relationship between government and culture [59]. This was by no means a new idea that had come with the founding of the republic, but dated from the days of autonomy when the "patron state" idea started at the beginning of the 1860s; and (in 1864) the Finnish Senate (the "domestic government") earmarked in its budget the first appropriations for the promotion of the fine arts in the country [60]. Earlier the "national support" to the arts had been channelled through established literary cultural institutions and organisations but this action by the senate was the beginning of a system of grants to artists. Already earlier, institutions had received support from the state, when the Swedish Theatre (in Helsinki) and its orchestra received public subsidies in 1856 [61]. More institutions were to follow.

The idea of the patron state, i.e. deciding on public support to artists and arts organisations case by case by parliament or administration, based on the reputation, merit or artistic promise was dominating during the 1920s and 30s. The establishment of arts boards with expertise to distribute these funds came about during this time, however, and the idea of an arm's length principle started surfacing when parliament stopped appointing members to the arts boards and the board became self recruiting (members nominated by artist organisations)in the 1950s [62]. An important milestone in the funding principle for the arts in Finland was the establishment of a National Lottery (started after a Swedish model in 1926) and in 1930 revenues from this accounted some 40 per cent of the total appropriations allocated to the arts by the central government [63].

With the arrival of the idea of the "welfare state" the relationship between culture and government started changing. Already in the 1940s ideas about developing arts boards to distribute state funds to the arts were being tried out, but it wasn't until 1965 when a report of an ad hoc committee planning the reorganisation of the

58 Nousiainen (1971), p. 285

59 Cultural Policy in Finland, National Report (Ilkka Heiskanen) (1995), p. 51-52

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

promotion of the arts was made public, that the basis of present day Finland's arts policy began its life. The main idea of the report was to change the emphasis from thinking about "supporting" the arts to "promoting" the arts. This was the time the Arts Council of Finland was set up, as well as several specialist boards or sub councils under it, each dealing with a different art form [64]. It is interesting to note, however, that the Arts Council does not make decisions on grants to larger arts institutions such as orchestras [65]. This is decided not at arm's length, but closer to the political power as will be discussed later. There are similarities here with e.g. the Danish system of distributing funds to music at arm's length, which also excludes orchestras.

The basic system of cultural representation in government in Finland has remained unchanged since the 1960s. New ideas about the economic importance of the arts have however been introduced into the governments' vocabulary in contrast to the very specific definition in the 1965 report of the arts as "fulfilling its social function by being the arts " [66]. The tradition of the "patron state" is still present through the close relationship with the larger arts organisations although the bulk of central government support to individual artists and smaller groups is dealt with at arm's length.

The role of regional and local government in cultural activity is important although the main initiative to form cultural policy is done at national level. The relationships of local arts organisations and regional and local government is by nature closer, especially in a small country where local government units are inhabited by fewer people than in a larger country, where the smallest administrative units are larger and more impersonal, due to the distance from the individual citizen.

General Cultural Policy of Finland

As indicated above the general cultural policy of Finland is based on principles established during the 1960s, emphasising the "promotion of the arts" rather than "support of the arts". The legal framework of this policy are several acts of law aimed at regulating and controlling government's involvement in the arts and the funding thereof. The main legislation consists of the following laws:

Promotion of the Arts Act 1967 [67]
Artists' Grant Act 1969 [68]

---

64 Ibid., p. 54-56
65 Introducing the Arts Council of Finland (1995)
66 Statsrådets kulturpolitiska redogörelse (1993), preface
67 Swedish title: Lag om organisering av konstens främjande (328/67)
68 Swedish title: Lag om konstnärsprofessurer och om statens konstnärsstipendier (734/69)

Promotion of Municipal Cultural Activities Act 1992 [69]
Museum Act 1992 [70]
Theatre and Orchestra Act 1992 [71]
Financing of Educational and Cultural Activity Act 1992 [72]

The principle legislation of interest for the purpose of this study is that relating to the general financing of cultural activity, which is expressed in the Financing of Educational and Cultural Activity Act of 1992, the Theatre and Orchestra Act of 1992 and the Promotion of Municipal Cultural Activities Act of 1992.

Central government's financing of orchestras is regulated by the Financing of Educational and Cultural Activity Act and the Theatre and Orchestra Act. The latter stipulates the conditions which an orchestra has to fulfill if it is to receive a grant from central government. Key elements include the ownership of the orchestra (this has to be owned by a town council or a private organisation whose purpose is to run an orchestra)[73] and that the orchestra consists of professional players performing regularly [74]. The Financing of Educational and Cultural Activity Act of 1992 sets out principles in calculating the actual amount of the grant payable. As an example, a town council that runs an orchestra as a part of their administration, can expect to receive a subsidy from central government of a maximum 40% of a "calculated financial base for orchestras" as determined by the Ministry of Education. This financial base for an orchestra is calculated as the number of full time positions (contracts) per annum (Swedish: årsverk) multiplied by a unit price. This unit price is determined by assessing the average costs for running an orchestra in Finland, excluding the cost of maintaining any real estate. The central government calculated this unit price and used this as a principle when the law was passed in 1992. However, in 1994, special legislation was passed to reduce these formula grants by 3 per cent from 1995 [75].

---

69 Swedish title: Lagen om kommunernas kulturverksamhet (728/92)

70 Swedish title: Museilagen (729/92)

71 Swedish title: Teater- och orkesterlagen (730/92). It is an interesting reflection on the status of the two official languages in Finland that in the Swedish version of the official collection of Finnish laws "Finlands Lag", there is a reference to the Swedish version of the act, but when one tries to find this page, it doesn't exist! The key to the mystery can be found in the preface of the collection where a member of the editorial committee, Stig Palmgren, simply says that those acts of law that cannot be found in this book can be found in the Finnish language version, "Suomen Laki", under a certain reference. Some legislations seem to be of more interests than others to Swedish speakers, the Theatre and Orchestra Act is clearly not amongst them.

72 Swedish title: Lag om finansiering av undervisnings- och kulturverksamhet (705/1992).

73 Paragraph 3 in the Theatre and Orchestra Act 730/1992

74 Ibid.

75 See "Lag om vissa arrangemang för finansiering av undervisnings- och kulturverksamhet 1995 (1444/1994)" English translation: "Act of Certain Arrangements for the Financing of Educational and Cultural Activities 1995 (1444/1994)".

The cultural policy of a country is of course not only derived from legislation but also more generally in policy documents from ministries. The Finnish Cabinet's cultural policy report of 1993 [76] is such a document. It is worth considering a longer quote from this document, as it appears to characterise the Finnish government's current cultural policy:

> The major grounds for providing public support for culture pertain to the building-up of the national culture and providing a basis for the implementation of balanced and sustainable social policy. As a part of this policy, cultural policy is a central instrument for maintaining a society with a diversified value system and mental well-being; it is also a central instrument in developing and utilising the intellectual resources for the nation. Culture will also be the major starting point in building up a future society; it helps us to establish new values, identities, and capacity for intellectual activities, creative problem solving and human interaction. Culture creates and maintains individual and national strategies of survival and success in a modern world of increasing complexity [77] .

The above statement sounds like a clear expression of the main vision of Finnish cultural policy. In the Cabinet report it is, however, buried in the supplement at the back of the report. In other parts of the report there is a more specific listing of the objectives of the cultural policy of the Finnish state:

> 1) to create conditions for the development of the contents and structures of the national cultural policy in its new, increasingly international environment;
> 2) to develop relevant legislation;
> 3) to support creativity;
> 4) to safeguard good conditions for the functioning of national culture institutions;
> 5) to take responsibility for maintaining the system of higher education in the arts
> 6) to take care that general education is worthy of its name, i.e. that it pays attention to and shows respect for the variety of cultural values;
> 7) to take care of the requirements of multilingualism and the cultural needs of special groups and cultural minorities;
> 8) to promote -co-operation with the non-profit and private financing of the culture and all forms of voluntary cultural activities; and
> 9) to maintain ecologically sustainable development in respect to our natural and constructed environment [78] .

The authors of the National Report of Cultural Policy in Finland for the recent Council of Europe evaluation, criticise the Cabinet's report for its apparent

---

76 Statsrådets kulturpolitiska redogörelse till riksdagen, (1993).

77 As quoted (in English) in Cultural Policy in Finland, National Report (Ilkka Heiskanen) (1995), p. 65

78 Ibid.

contradiction between the more intellectual and social vision expressed in the supplement and the more practical realities of the above list [79]. It can justifiably be said that this policy document is somewhat contradictory, but it is however also important to bear in mind the whole picture of national cultural policy in Finland as characterised, not only by a government report, or even the legal framework, but also the reality of government practice. To look at a little more concrete example of how central government in Finland implements its cultural policies, one can consider at some key statistics about central government's spending on culture.

In recent years Finland has on average spent 1.4% of the state budget on culture [80]. This percentage includes all the arts, including state art galleries, museums and heritage, libraries, film archives, all other expenditure on culture. However since the nominal "culture" budget includes all sport and youth activity expenditure as well (in Finland sports come under the cultural budget of the Ministry of Education), the total cultural budget under this definition is 8% of the overall budget of the Ministry of Education.

In 1993 the ministry paid grants to different categories of cultural institutions as follows:

Theatres	153 million markka	(£ 17.5 million approx.)
Orchestras	59 million markka	(£ 6.7 million approx.)
Libraries	644 million markka	(£ 73.3 million approx.)
Museums	89 million markka	(£ 10.1 million approx.)
Contributions to cultural activities at local level	47 million markka	(£ 5.3 million approx.)
Sport and Youth	182 million markka	(£ 20.7 million approx.) [81]

As can be seen from the above, when subsidy to local authorities' cultural activities are discounted, support for orchestras is the smallest category of state subsidy.

In the same year the National Lottery provided 46% of this central government budget for culture: only 54% was in fact taxpayers' money [82].

---

79 Ibid.

80 Statsrådets kulturpolitiska redogörelse (1993), p. 81

81 Ibid., p. 83 The Sterling amounts are approximate, based on the rate of exchange in July 1997.

82 Statsrådets kulturpolitiska redogörelse (1993), p. 82

Cultural Institutions in Finland

Some of the cultural institutions in Finland have already been referred to. The Finnish Arts Council and its subsidiary councils do not deal directly with orchestras (which are grant aided by central and local government) but there are other institutions that deal more directly with the furtherance and promotion of orchestral music on a national level.

The most important organisation is probably the Finnish Broadcasting Service, Ylesradio, that runs its own symphony orchestra as an independent sub section of its "Programme 1" department [83] , and which is probably the orchestra in Finland that is best known outside the country. The YLE is run on licence fees, similar to the BBC.

Another important cultural institution is the Association of Finnish Orchestras (Suomen sinfoniaorkesterit) which looks after the interests of the Finnish symphony orchestras. In 1995 the association had 27 member orchestras, of which 13 are professional and 14 semi-professional [84] .

Orchestral Development in Finland

In 1990 the Association of Finnish Orchestras celebrated the anniversary of 200 years of orchestral activity in Finland [85] . Although this was a formal celebration of orchestral activity in the country, orchestras existed earlier going back as early as the middle of the 16th century, when orchestral music was played at the palace in the then capital of Finland, Turku [86] . Orchestral activity continued to develop at the court and the cathedral in Turku and in 1790 the "Musikaliska Sällskapet i Åbo" (the "Turku Musical Society") was founded [87] . The society started an orchestra which consisted of amateurs, mostly students and professors from the Turku university [88] .

After Turku burned down in 1827 the university moved to the new capital of Helsinki, and with it the orchestra [89] . There was a further development in the 1860s when a professional theatre orchestra was founded, in which many of the

---

83 Association of Finnish Orchestras (1995), p. 8

84 Cultural Policy in Finland, National Report (1995), p. 376

85 Dahlström, Fabian in Symfoniorkestern i Finland i 200 år, p. 9

86 Ibid.

87 Ibid., p. 10. The city of Turku in Finland has two names depending on which language (Finnish or Swedish) is used. The Swedish name for the city is 'Åbo' and both names are used here. The tradition of bilingualism in Finland goes much deeper than just the use of language, most towns have for example two names, one in each language, which are used concurrently.

88 Dahlström, Fabian in Symfoniorkestern i Finland i 200 år, p. 10

89 Ibid., p. 11

musicians had studied in Germany, and which also gave symphonic concerts in addition to its theatre engagements [90]. The Helsinki Orchestral Society was founded by Robert Kajanus in 1882, and later developed into the Helsinki Philharmonic Society. It was about this time that Jean Sibelius was studying composition at the Music Institute (founded 1882, by Martin Wegelius who was Sibelius' composition teacher). The main initiator of professional orchestral activity through this period was Robert Kajanus, who apart from running the Helsinki Orchestral Society also run an orchestral training course within the organisation, and was to develop close cooperation with Sibelius as the years went by [91].

A turning point came in 1914 when the Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra was founded, after some years of instability in the orchestral world. This was the start of a modern funding structure of Finnish orchestras, since the City Council of Helsinki financed the orchestra from the start [92].

Orchestras in other parts of the country were not as stable in their development as the orchestra in Helsinki. The main reason for this was that these were privately financed and could not rely on any continuing source of funding [93]. In 1925 there was therefore only one orchestra in the country, the Helsinki Philharmonic which also served as the orchestra of the Finnish Opera. Through a reorganisation of music education, primarily through the military and in co-operation with the then Helsinki Conservatory (now Sibelius Academy), a number of military orchestras was established. There had been a lack of wind and brass instrument players in the country earlier, but the military orchestras became a source of musicians who later became active in the building of new orchestras towards the end of the 1920s. When the public sector (mostly local government) took over the financing of orchestral activity, a number of orchestras became reality, amongst them the Turku Philharmonic Orchestra (municipalised in 1927)and the Finnish Radio Orchestra in 1927, and orchestras in Viborg 1929 and Tampere in 1930 [94].

The basic funding principle, with participation of government (local and national) was therefore the prerequisite for the orchestral development in Finland, which continuing development until today has remained constant. More orchestras have been founded and are financed with public funds mostly from local government. It was not until 1992 that the central government of Finland regulated the state subsidy through the Theatre- and Orchestra Act although the state had subsidised

---

90 Ibid.

91 Ibid., p. 12

92 Ibid.

93 Ibid., p. 15

94 Ibid., p. 16

orchestras earlier [95].

The Association of Finnish Orchestras was founded in 1965 as a service and political lobby organisation of the orchestras in Finland [96].

2.4. ICELAND

History of Cultural Representation in Government

Having founded the oldest parliament in Europe in 930 AD, the Icelandic Commonwealth went into decline and became a Norwegian dependency in 1262 [97]. Following the establishment of the Kalmar Union (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) in the 14th century, Iceland followed Norway into the Union and when it came apart in 1380, became with Norway a part of the Danish sphere, directly under the Danish Crown [98]. After the Reformation the rule of the Danish monarch was further strengthened and Iceland formally became a part of Denmark, with the status of a county in the Danish kingdom, in 1662 [99].

This state of affairs was to remain the same until the 19th century, when Iceland slowly got home rule, with the resurrection of the Alþing - the parliament - in 1845 and own constitution in 1874 being important milestones [100]. Iceland then became an independent kingdom in a personal union under the Danish king in 1918 [101] and in 1944 broke all ties with Denmark and became a republic [102].

It is obvious that Iceland's system of government and public administration falls firmly under the West Nordic (Danish) tradition after her long union with Denmark [103]. The traces of this tradition can be seen in present day government with Iceland maintaining relatively large ministries that deal with relatively detailed public administration duties [104].

The Icelandic political scientist Gunnar Helgi Kristinsson has named this type of public administration "ministerial administration", which he defines as:

---

95 Theatre and Orchestra Act 1992 [Swedish title: Teater- och orkesterlagen (730/92)] and Repo, Alarik in Symfoniorkestern i Finland i 200 år, p. 40

96 Repo, Alarik in 'Symfoniorkestern i Finland i 200 år', p. 39

97 Kjartansson, Helgi Skúli, in Iceland the Republic (editors: Nordal, Jóhannes and Kristinsson, Valdimar (1996), p.61-70

98 Ibid.

99 Ibid., p. 75-76

100 Ibid., p. 83 and 87

101 Ibid., p. 90

102 Ibid., p. 98

103 Nordic Democracy, Gustaf Petrén (1981), p. 163

104 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p.37-39 and Nordic Democracy, G. Petrén (1981), p.170

> Ministerial administration is defined as a system where ministers sit at the top of a hierarchical civil service. They are the superiors of the civil servants who work in the ministry as well as the institutions that come under it. The ministers can make decisions in each case they wish to or which is put before them within the framework of the law. The civil servants are required to obey the minister as long as they do so within the framework of the law. Everything the ministry does is in fact done on behalf of the minister. To the outside world the civil servants are just that, the minister's silent and faceless servants [105].

Ministerial administration is a heritage from the Danish tradition of government. The minister alone has the political responsibility for his or her actions towards own party, parliament and the general public, as well as the courts of law [106].

In line with this tradition of centralised administration the Ministry of Education also covers cultural issues in a separate department [107]. The ministry is large and divided into departments and sub departments and is the second largest "spending ministry" after the Ministry of Health [108]. There are signs of increased importance of local government in issues until now handled by the ministry, such as the transfer of all elementary and secondary school activity (until age 15) to local government at the beginning of the autumn 1996 [109]. However, the ministry still keeps overall control and there is little sign of it becoming smaller despite recent transfers of activities from central to local government.

The Icelandic ministries have developed during this century from being one (The Ministry of Iceland) [110] to being thirteen in 1996 [111]. The Ministry of Education was first established in 1947 [112]. Before that, education (and culture when mentioned) was dealt with by the Ministry of Justice and Ecclesiastical Affairs [113]. It is only in recent years that a special department of culture has been defined

---

105 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 54. Original version in Icelandic: "Ráðherrastjórnsýsla felur í sér að ráðherrar tróna efstir í embættismannakerfi sem byggt er upp sem stigveldi. Þeir eru yfirmenn þeirra embættismanna sem starfa við ráðuneytin og þeirra stofnana sem þeim tilheyra. Á verksviðum sinna ráðuneyta geta ráðherrar tekið ákvarðanir í sérhverju því máli sem þeir óska eða lagt er fyrir þá innan ramma laganna. Embættismönnum ber jafnframt að hlýða ráðherrum svo fremi sem þeir haldi sig innan ramma laganna. Allt sem ráðuneytið framkvæmir er í raun gert fyrir hönd ráðherra. Út á við eru embættismennirnir þeirra andlislausu og hljóðlátu þjónar."

106 Christensen, J.G. (1989), p. 74

107 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 63 and Kjartansson, Hrólfur and Guðmundsson, Arnór, in Iceland the Republic, (editors: Nordal, Jóhannes and Kristinsson, Valdimar) (1996), p. 242

108 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994, p. 174 and
Statistical Yearbook of Iceland (1995), p. 224-225

109 Morgunblaðið Daily, Thursday 25 July 1996, p. 28-29 and
Thursday August 1, 1996, p. 31

110 Jónsson, Agnar Kl. (1969), p. 14

111 Iceland the Republic, (editors: Nordal, Jóhannes and Kristinsson, Valdimar) (1996), p. 369

112 Jónsson, Agnar Kl. (1969), p. 344

113 Ibid., p. 328

within the ministry. It can also be said, that the idea of the "patron state" [114], has been prevailing in the decisions regarding the funding of the arts. During the early part of this century, parliament was even instrumental in giving grants to individual artists [115]. This practice of parliament, to engage in administrative issues is a tradition that, although this has diminished, still occurs. This is the reason why Gunnar Helgi Kristinsson calls the Icelandic legislative body for "an administrative parliament" also referring there to the parliament's active role in shaping the state budget every year [116].

The idea of an arm's length principle when funding the arts from central government sources has only been established marginally in Iceland. Although a 'cultural council' was established in 1928 to, among other roles, distribute funds, this never functioned as an arm's length body since the council's activities was always heavily influenced by the ruling minister of culture [117]. All larger cultural institutions are regulated by special legislation for each one and it is only in recent years that grants to individual artist have been distributed through a system of art boards, consisting of artists nominated by various artist organisations. This distribution of funds was formerly dealt with by a board appointed directly by the minister and had little links to the artists themselves and/or their organisations.

Iceland is a small country in terms of population and often matters are dealt with on a personal basis, that in a bigger country would have a more formal procedure. This does not, however, change the fact that a lot of the central government's funding of the arts and of culture is regulated by special legislation. This has created practices and processes that has become an activity outside the main sphere of influence of the minister or ministry and lead a more 'independent' life in the system of public administration in Iceland.

General Cultural Policy and Cultural Institutions in Iceland

As in the other Nordic countries, cultural policy is expressed through legislation on various cultural activities and arts institutions. This aspect is perhaps even more important in Iceland with regards to arts policy, than in the other Nordic countries, since government has never in a detailed way expressed their cultural policy in a policy statement. Various governments have however included a cultural section in the policy declarations and culture mentioned in almost a "footnote" style in government reports. Individual arts organisations have been assessed but a comprehensive cultural policy document or evaluation has not been written.

114 Cultural Policy in Finland, National Report (Ilkka Heiskanen)(1995), p. 54-56
115 Viborg, Brynjar (1973)
116 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 79-98
117 Viborg, Brynjar (1973), p. 46

Legislation has been the way an "administrative" parliament [118] could influence the financing of the arts in accordance with its own traditions of government. The first legislation on cultural affairs was passed in 1928 [119] and since then various legislations have been passed, mostly on individual arts organisations. The most important acts of law that affect the arts are:

Act of the Affairs of Films no. 94/1984 [120]
Theatre Act no. 33/1977 [121]
National Theatre Act no. 58/1978 [122]
Artists Stipend Act no. 35/1991 [123]
National Gallery Act no. 58/1988 [124]
The State Decorative Art Fund Act no. 71/1990 [125]
Cultural Fund Act no. 79/1993 [126]
Iceland Symphony Orchestra Act no. 36/1982 [127]

There is furthermore a comprehensive legislation on heritage [128] although a comprehensive legislation on government spending on the arts doesn't exist. The only art form that has a comprehensive legislation is the theatre [129]. One can therefore say that the cultural policy of the Icelandic government is, to the largest extend, expressed in the legislations on individual cultural institutions. With regards to music and orchestras, the Iceland Symphony Orchestra Act of 1982 is the most important one in this context.

Other cultural institutions such as the National Gallery, and National Theatre also have special laws that indicate the policy of the government with regards to the status of these institutions. It is interesting to note, however, that the Icelandic Opera has never had the status of the other major cultural institutions. In the National

118 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 79-98
119 Elíasson, Helgi (1944), p. 5: Lög nr. 53/1928 um Menningarsjóð
(Act no. 53/1928 on the Cultural Fund)
120 Icelandic title: Lög um kvikmyndamál nr. 94/1984, see also Act no. 144/1995
(Lög nr. 144/1995).
121 Icelandic title: Leiklistarlög nr. 33/1977. See also amendment of this act no. 10/1979.
(Breyt. nr. 10/1979)
122 Icelandic title: Lög um Þjóðleikhús nr. 58/1978.
123 Icelandic title: Lög um listamannalaun nr. 35/1991
124 Icelandic title: Lög um Listasafn Íslands nr. 58/1988
125 Icelandic title: Lög um Listskreytingasjóð ríkisins nr. 71/1990,
see also act no. 144/1995 (lög nr. 144/1995).
126 Icelandic title: Lög um menningarsjóð nr. 79/1993
127 Icelandic title: Lög um Sinfóníuhljómsveit Íslands nr. 36/1982
128 National Heritage Act no. 88/1989 (Icelandic title: Þjóðminjalög nr. 88/1989) see also amendments no. 43/1991, 92/1991, 98/1994 and act no. 144/1995.
129 See note 121

Theatre Act the theatre is given the obligation to perform opera. This was, however, never done on a regular basis and in the early 1980s an independent opera company, the Icelandic Opera, was founded. This receives funding from central and local government, but its status has never been formalised by an act of law in the same manner as the Iceland Symphony Orchestra, National Theatre or National Gallery. This company has been run on a low budget and semi professional basis for the most part. It is clear that central government has no plans of establishing the opera company as yet another institution legislated by parliament [130].

Orchestral Development in Iceland

The history of orchestral activity in Iceland is not very long. Or indeed if one looks at the history of music in Iceland, this is dominated by the country's isolation from the middle ages until the end of the 19th century. The Icelandic musical heritage is a middle age one and remained unchanged and uninfluenced by the development of European music tradition until the country started its road to independence in the latter half of the 19th century [131].

The first orchestra to be founded in Iceland was the 'Lúðurþeytarafélag Reykjavíkur' (direct translation 'The Reykjavik Hornblowing Society') in 1876. Previously instrumental music had hardly existed outside the church, even though it was known that some of the 'better citizens' (usually Danes) had instruments and played them for fun.

The first time a brass band was heard in Iceland was during the visit of Jerome Napoleon, Great Napoleon's nephew in 1856. The band from his ship, consisting of 12 musicians, played in the centre of town for about an hour each day of his visit "a great and rare enjoyment for everyone who listened" as the Reykjavík paper *Þjóðólfur* put it on August 14, 1856 [132].

The major incentive for the foundation of the first brass band in Reykjavik in 1876, was the visit of his R.H. King Christian the IX, to Iceland in 1874. It was during this visit that the king brought Iceland her first constitution giving it a special status in the Danish kingdom. This called for widespread celebrations. It was in this atmosphere that a Reykjavik blacksmith Mr. Helgason got the inspiration to travel to

130 see National Theatre Act no. 58/1978 and interview with the Icelandic Minister of Education and Culture, Björn Bjarnason, in *Óperublaðið (The Opera Magazine)*, 10th year, vol. 1, Reykjavík, May 1996

131 Þórarinsson, Jón in Iceland, the Republic (editors Nordal, Jóhannes and Kristinsson, Valdimar)(1996), p. 304

132 The quotation from the weekly *Þjóðólfur* on 13/8/1856 as quoted in 'The History of Icelandic Brass Bands' ('Skært lúðrar hljóma' - saga íslenskra lúðrasveita), editor Atli Magnússon, published by the Federation of Icelandic Brass Bands/ Ísafoldarprentsmidja h.f., Reykjavik 1984, p.21

Denmark and stay there for a year, in order to learn how to play brass instruments. On arrival back in Iceland he founded a brass band, and taught others to play the instruments.

It is interesting to observe from which layers of society the first members of the brass band came. With very few exceptions they were craftsmen: blacksmiths, carpenters, shoemakers etc. It cannot be detected that any of the 'upper' or 'educated' classes of society took part in the in brass band activity in the latter half of the 19th century.

The development of brass bands was the foundation on which all later development of orchestral activity was based. Their growth continued and in 1922 the Reykjavík Brass Band (Lúðrasveit Reykjavíkur) was founded by the merger of two smaller bands, to form a full size one. It proved to be a very active element in the furtherance of orchestral music in Iceland, drawing together keen amateurs and music lovers, who would render support to the efforts to form a symphony orchestra in the decades to come.

The brass bands were almost entirely an all male activity. An interesting exception was the Salvation Army Band, which in 1912 consisted of a majority of women players.

The activities of the brass bands lead to interest in other kinds of orchestral music. During the period 1910-1912, a Swedish violinist, Mr. Oscar Johansen, lead a 'palm court' orchestra in one of Reykjavík's coffee houses. Many of the musicians who had played in brass bands, played in the orchestra together with musicians from abroad. From this environment of music in restaurants, came the first Icelander who trained professionally as a violinist, Mr. Þórarinn Guðmundsson.

Mr. Guðmundsson, graduated from the Royal Danish Conservatory of Music in 1914, and started work in Iceland the same year. He was to become the key person in the development of orchestral music in Iceland during the first decades of the century, as teacher, player, conductor and composer.

Until the early 1920s, orchestral music in Iceland was limited to brass band activity, restaurant music and the occasional event of theatre music, when the Reykjavík Dramatic Society (Leikfélag Reykjavíkur), which had been founded in 1897, required that. It was not until 1921 that the first sign of permanent orchestral activity was seen.

Many things can be said about the destructive influence the Danish Royal House had during the centuries it ruled Iceland. It is however worth recognising that each visit by a Danish King to Iceland during the last decades of the 19th century and the first ones of the 20th, proved to be a powerful incentive for the furtherance of orchestral music. For example in 1921 the Danish monarch King Christian X, came to visit Iceland. The organising committee was interested in showing His Majesty the

cultural self sufficiency of the newly autonomous country, and asked the violinist Mr. Guðmundsson, to put together an orchestra to play at various occasions during the royal visit. The organising committee paid the musicians for their performances, but refused to pay for the special arrangements of the music the conductor had to write [133].

This event led to the formal foundation of the Reykjavik Orchestra (Hljómsveit Reykjavíkur) towards the end of the year 1921. The orchestra gave concerts in Reykjavik all through the 1920s and together with the brass bands, was the main presenter of orchestral music in that period.

The Iceland State Radio was founded in 1930 and started immediately playing an active role in the country's musical life. During the first years of its operation, the radio hired a group of musicians on a contractual permanent basis, who became known as 'The Radio Orchestra'. The orchestra consisted of about 15 to 20 players and broadcasted regularly. The activities of the Radio Orchestra itself was confined to the radio broadcasts, but same players together with other musicians played orchestral concerts during the thirties. This happened as early as 1930, when a temporary full size symphony orchestra was formed with extra players coming from Denmark, to celebrate the 1000th anniversary of the Icelandic parliament, the Alþing.

The year 1932 saw the birth of a substantial number of trade unions in Iceland and at the time the number of musicians who earned their living by playing music, specially in hotels and restaurants, had grown substantially. The Icelandic Musicians' Union (Félag íslenskra hljómlistarmanna or F.Í.H. for short), was founded that same year on the initiative of Icelandic musicians who had worked abroad and had been involved in union activities in other countries.

The biggest issue that faced the union in the beginning (and often since), was to ensure that Icelandic musicians were given priority for work in the hotels and restaurants, jobs that very often were given to foreigners and foreign bands at the time. Iceland was by this time an autonomous country but still had strong ties with Denmark and was still under the Danish monarch through the personal union provisions of the constitution. Danish citizens had the same rights as Icelanders in Iceland, and vice versa, so since most of the visiting bands and foreign musicians were Danish, it was difficult for the F.Í.H. to challenge the status quo.

The union played an active role in the orchestral development in the thirties and forties. The minutes of a union meeting for 26th of September 1939 report that the Philharmonic Society, which had been founded a few years earlier in order to promote concerts and to run a music school, had approached the union and asked them to name a representative for a preparatory committee for starting a

133 Kristjánsson, Ingólfur, p. 216 - 217

symphony orchestra [134], but nothing further is reported about the orchestra project in the union's papers for the next three years. It was not until January 25, 1944 that the union officially founded an orchestra which it named the Icelandic Musicians' Union Symphony Orchestra. There seems to have been some feuding between the union and the Philharmonic Society prior to this date, but an agreement was reached and the orchestra played in concerts organised by the society.

This new orchestra consisted of professional players from the Radio Orchestra, as well as teachers from the Reykjavík School of Music and amateurs. The biggest problem in the operation of the orchestra was that there were certain instruments for which players were not available so often various wind instrument parts in particular had to be played on the piano or harmonium. This enterprise was not long lived: towards the end of the 2nd World War the orchestral activity had seized to exist.

The next 'orchestral experiment' and the last one before the present day Iceland Symphony Orchestra was finally founded, was the 'Reykjavík Symphony Orchestra' (Sinfóníuhljómsveit Reykjavíkur), which was founded in 1947, and consisted of the same body of players as the 1944 venture. One of many short lived music magazines which were published at the time, *Musica* tells its readers about the orchestra and adds that parliament was now debating a proposal to make a substantial grant toward its running costs [135]. Unfortunately the reporter was not quite accurate. It was true, however, that a Bill had been presented in parliament concerning a special tax towards the running of a symphony orchestra, but this bill was aimed at a professional body of players and marks in fact the first concrete steps in the foundation of a professional orchestra which soon was to become reality [136].

The present Iceland Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1950, as a professional orchestra, and gave its first concert on March 9, 1950 [137]. During the first decade of the orchestra its funding and existence was rather insecure, despite public subsidy. In 1961 the orchestra became a department of the Icelandic Broadcasting Service and was to remain such until 1982 when the Icelandic Symphony Orchestra Act was passed, making the orchestra an independent institution with guaranteed financial backing from central government, the City of Reykjavík, the town of Seltjarnarnes (close to Reykjavík) and the Icelandic Broadcasting Service [138]. The orchestra is to this day run according to this act of law with a fixed number of full time contracts for players.

---

134 FíH 50 ára (Icel. Mus.Union - 50th anniversary), editor Hrafn Pálsson, published by the Icelandic Musicians' Union, Reykjavík, 1982, p. 23.

135 *Musica* (Music Magazine) yr.1, issue 1, April 1948, p. 26.

136 Whole section of Orchestral Development in Iceland based on Hannesson (1991), p.29 33

137 Hannesson (1991), p. 38

138 Ibid., p. 38-47

In recent years the number of free lance chamber orchestras and ad hoc symphony orchestras has increased in Iceland. None of these is run on a regular basis, nor employ musicians more than for the individual concert.

2.5. NORWAY

History of Cultural Representation in Government

After Norway had been an independent kingdom from the 9th century AD, she joined, but only in a personal union, Sweden in 1319, the only thing common to the two countries, however, being the king [139]. This situation was to change and Norway's political situation evolved through various changes leading to full independence once more in 1905 [140]. The original union under the Swedish king lead to Norway becoming a part of the Kalmar Union (of Denmark, Norway and Sweden) from 1397 until 1532 [141]. In that year the union was dissolved but Norway was then declared to be part of the Danish kingdom [142]. The Royal Danish Charter of 1536 declared Norway to be no longer a separate realm but a part of Denmark although this was not put fully into effect [143]. In 1660 another major change took place when the Danish monarch was given hereditary and absolute power over the whole kingdom (including Norway and Iceland) [144]. This move marks the beginning of the tradition which developed into the modern day public administration in Norway [145] with a system build up around the absolute monarch assisted by government officials as a royal Cabinet of Advisers [146]. Local affairs were also to be taken care of by the king's appointed representatives and this order was to remain until 1814 [147].

After the Napoleonic wars, where Denmark sided with Napoleon against Great Britain, both Denmark and Norway became participants in the continental blockade by which Napoleon hoped to crush Britain [148]. This, coupled with a war Denmark was fighting with Sweden at the time, lead to Norway being left on its own for the most part, although Norwegian economic life suffered because of the blockade. It was at this time that Sweden lost Finland to Russia, and as a result of Napoleon's defeat

139 Midgaard (1989), p. 44
140 Ibid.
141 Ibid., p. 45
142 Ibid., p. 50
143 Ibid.
144 Ibid., p. 56
145 Lægred and Roness (1983), p. 11
146 Midgaard (1989), p. 56-57
147 Ibid.
148 Ibid., p. 62-63

at the peace of Kiel in January 1814, Denmark was forced to cede Norway to the Swedish king [149]. Norway got a new constitution (after some unrest) and was once again acknowledged as a separate realm, although within the Swedish kingdom [150].

The central government system that started being build in 1814 was in all basic forms based on the Danish-Norwegian tradition of administration as it had developed from 1660 [151]. The main principle was that affairs were divided into categories and that the role of civil servants and experts was an active one. The civil servants were not many in numbers, however, but they got positions in the administration that would give them considerable political power [152].

The origins of Norway's of own central government can be traced to a Norwegian Central Commission still under Denmark in 1807, which in 1814 became 6 ministries, The Ministry of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs, The Ministry of Justice, The Ministry of Police, The Ministry of the Interior, The Ministry of Finance and Customs and The Ministry of War [153]. Other ministries and state institutions came about later and their role became more dependent of the parliament - Stortinget - when this gained more power in 1884 [154].

Norway became fully independent at last in 1905 , but the traditional pattern of government continued. Since the long tradition of West Nordic (Danish) government pattern [155] was firmly rooted, the role of the core ministries was a dominating and important one. This also applied to cultural affairs. The Ministry of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs was until 1982 the highest central government decision maker in public administration when dealing with cultural affairs. The Ministry of Education was finally divided in 1982, and a Ministry of Culture and Science was established [156]. The present day Ministry of Culture is divided into five departments and it is interesting to note that because of its role in science, higher education and in particular the universities come under this ministry not the Ministry of Education [157].

More recently there have been a number of reforms in the Norwegian public administration system and an important development has been the increased weight the local political level has been given in later years [158]. While the number of

149 Ibid., p. 64
150 Ibid., p. 65-71
151 Lægred and Roness (1983), p. 11
152 Ibid.
153 Ibid.
154 Ibid.
155 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 37-39 and
Nordic Democracy, Petrén, G. (1981), p. 170
156 Lægred and Roness (1983), p. 54 and p. 71
157 Ibid., p. 71
158 Mangset (1992), p. 28 and
Fevolden in Skare (ed.) (1984), p. 192

ministries has not changed much since 1945, the number of departments and divisions within these and the budgets have grown considerably [159]. Changes are also seen in the functional differences, by the fact that central administrative agencies outside the ministries have become relatively more important in the implementation of public administration [160]. It is interesting to note, however, that contrary to the general trend towards decentralisation in the case of symphony orchestras central government, in this case the Ministry of Culture, has become more rather than less active at the 'national' level. Though regionally based the Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra and the Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra are for example currently mainly subsidised by central rather than local government funding. This change that happened a few years ago and was regarded as a major policy shift in the relationship of orchestras to central government [161].

The Ministry of Culture (and before 1982 the Ministry of Education) has itself established new institutions with the role of promoting and researching culture. The most important of those, with regards to music, are the Norwegian Arts Council (Norsk kulturråd) started in 1964 and the Norwegian State Concert Agency (Norske rikskonserter) [162]. The role of these agencies will be discussed further below in the context of Norway's cultural policies and cultural institutions.

General Cultural Policy of Norway

The Norwegian government has issued a policy document (in English) where the "basis for a good cultural policy in the 1990s" [163] is described. This basis is summarised as follows:

> The Government believes that cultural policy must be formed in such a way that it embraces the national and the international, the traditional and the innovative. A cultural policy for the 1990s must therefore:
> - be trans-sectoral
> - stimulate quality
> - strengthen our common national culture
> - apply to the whole country
> - benefit as many people as possible [164]

It is interesting to note that in contrast with this very brief statement the summary section on proposals of policy in the matter of sports in the same policy

159 Olsen (1983), p. 89

160 Ibid.

161 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 12 and 19

162 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 18, Beyer, E. in Kultur og kulturpolitikk (1985), p. 11 and Lægred and Roness (1983) p. 139

163 Cultural Policy of the Norwegian Government (1995), p. 19

164 Ibid.

document extends to six pages [165] and includes detailed proposals as to the involvement of central government in that field, whereas the above quotation is the total extent of the government's cultural proposals.

As with the other Scandinavian countries Norway's cultural policy is characterized both by funding policy, the implementation of this into acts of law and other government regulations as well as the issue of policy documents and cultural research. An important aspect in this context is the fact that Norwegian cultural policy can be considered as being highly institutionalised [166]. This means that public support of arts and culture is typically channelled through long term or permanent cultural institutions or permanent support schemes [167]. The legal and regulatory framework surrounding the cultural institutions can be seen as an important control tool for government to regulate (and stimulate) the implementation of cultural policy.

One can trace the start of government involvement in culture to the 19th century. Already by the 1830s state grants were being given to artists [168] and between 1840 and 1900 some important cultural institutions were created, mainly those for the visual arts, heritage and the theatre [169]. After the Second World War an administrative institutional infrastructure of cultural policy has been built up and the period from 1945 to 1975 being marked by the principle that "high culture" should be given "to the people" [170]. This period also saw the birth of several state agencies (a national Travelling Theatre in 1948 [171], a Travelling Art Gallery in 1953 [172] and a State Centre of Nationwide Promotion of Music in 1967 [173] [174]) which all had the role of distributing culture to the masses [175]. This period saw also the founding of the Norwegian Arts Council in 1964 [176].

In 1975, with the introduction of a "new cultural policy" the concept of "culture" was broadened and Norway's very extensive and developed pattern of socio-cultural amateur activities in particular were included in the national cultural

---

165 Ibid., p. 29 - 34

166 Osland and Mangset (1995), p.7

167 Ibid.

168 Ibid., p. 9

169 Ibid.

170 Ibid.

171 Hovdhaugen, in Kultur og kulturpolitikk (1985), p. 31

172 Ibid.

173 Hodne (1994), p. 166, Oftedal, in Kultur og kulturpolitikk (1985), p. 80 and Rikskonsertene, Årsrapport 1995, p. 4

174 Norwegian names of institutions: Riksteatret, Riksgalleriet and Rikskonsertene (Rikskonsertene has also adopted the English name, NorConcert - The Concert Institute of Norway - (see "Rikskonsertene - NorConcert - The Largest Distributor of Live Music in Norway, brochure Oslo 1994))

175 Osland and Mangset (1995), p. 7

176 Gjerde in Kultur og kulturpolitikk (1985), p. 34

policy [177]. The period since 1975 has seen a considerable growth in the number of publicly supported institutions for the performing arts, especially at regional level. A further change in the cultural policy came in a government "White Paper" of 1992 where concern about the major central institutions (such as the symphony orchestras) was expressed [178]. Consequently some cultural institutions were given the status and designation of "national institutions" receiving the major part of their funding from central government [179] and others given a status of "central institutions" primarily funded by regional and local authorities [180]. This lead to a change in the funding structure of the Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra and the Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra, which now became "national institutions" funded wholly by central government while other regional symphony orchestras became "central institutions" only partly funded by central government [181].

If one looks at the legal framework of the cultural life of Norway, it can be seen that legislation has not been used as actively as a tool in cultural affairs within Norwegian public administration system as it has, for example, in Denmark, Finland or Iceland. The control exercised by the Norwegian government in the area of culture and the arts is characterized to a large extent by the control of funding as well as information rather than prescriptive laws [182]. This is where Norway has developed its own traditions in public administration and broken away from the Danish tradition, by using government regulations and financial measures rather than acts of law passed by parliament, to administer [183]. The debate on whether it is necessary to adopt some general "cultural legislation" has been going on in Norway for a number of years, but both government and the parliament have so far not seen the necessity to legislate in that area [184].

To conclude it can be said that Norway has had a similar development of cultural policy as the other Scandinavian countries since the Second World War [185]. There seem however to be differences in the way that this policy is administered, however, with less emphasis on direct legislation. The tendency today is to delegate all direct administrative tasks from the Ministry of Culture to the state cultural institutions as to make the Ministry a more "political" centre (similar to the Swedish

177 Osland and Magnset (1995), p. 10
178 Osland and Magnset (1995), p. 10 and Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 12 and p. 19
179 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 12 and p. 19. The Norwegian concepts used are "nasjonale institusjoner" and "knutepunktinstitusjoner".
180 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 12 and p. 19.
181 Ibid.
182 Ibid., p. 52
183 Ibid., p. 53-54
184 Ibid., p. 53
185 Osland and Magnset (1995), p. 9

system) rather then a directly administrative one [186]. This implies, however, that through giving the status of "national" and "central" cultural institutions, the ministry will be more directly active in the funding of all the major institutions and will also consequently assume more direct control by, for example, appointing the majority of board members of the national institutions [187].

Norway spends about 0,35% of its Gross National Product or 0,7% of the national budget on cultural affairs [188]. In addition at the county level cultural spending amounts to 1-2% of the expenses and at the municipal level about 5% [189].

Cultural Institutions in Norway.

As mentioned earlier several cultural institutions have been founded by central government in order to promote and encourage cultural consumption or regulate funding to cultural activity. The most important of those, with relation to music, are the Norwegian Arts Council (Norsk kulturråd) and the State Centre of Nationwide Promotion of Music (Rikskonserterne).

The Norwegian Arts Council was founded in 1964 [190]. The Councils role is a) to be an advisory body to government in cultural affairs, b) to administrate the Norwegian Cultural Fund (Norsk Kulturfond) and c) take initiatives in the cultural field where the Council feels such initiatives are needed [191]. The Norwegian Cultural Fund is a fund that parliament - Stortinget - annually allocates to the Arts Council in order to enable it to: a) stimulate creativity within the arts and literature, b) preserve Norwegian heritage and c) work for accessibility to culture for the general public [192]. The Norwegian Arts Council operates as a distributing board for this fund and can distribute it as it pleases within this framework [193].

The Council does not however give funds for the ordinary running of cultural institutions nor does it give regular annual contributions to any activity. It does not support festivals, concerts, deficit of cultural activity, teaching material, smaller locally oriented cultural activities, touring or conferences [194]. Over recent years the major part of the funds the Arts Council distributes as a board for the Norwegian Cultural Fund goes to literature under the Purchasing Scheme for Norwegian

186 Osland in Berthelsen (ed.) (1994), p. 154
187 International Arts Manager, November 1995, p. 12
188 Osland and Magnset (1995), p. 11
189 Ibid.
190 Gjerde in Kultur og kulturpolitikk (1985), p. 34
191 Norsk kulturråd (1995), p. 2
192 Ibid., p. 2-3
193 Ibid., p. 3
194 Ibid., p. 15

Literature [195]. Under this the Council buys 1000 copies of virtually all new, Norwegian novels, works of poetry etc., published by so-called "serious" publishers, and offers them - free of charge - to the wide national network of public libraries [196]. The total budget of the Cultural Fund (but not the Arts Council as a whole) in 1994 was 143.6 million Norwegian Kroner out of which 60 million (or 41.8%) was used on literature and 8.1 million (or 5.6 %) for music, though this includes no contributions to the symphony orchestras.

If one looks at the Norwegian Arts Council from a European perspective it can be said that although the Council was probably originally created with the British Arts Council as a model [197] it does not fit into the British oriented arm's length "arts council model". Neither does it fit completely into the strong "ministry of culture" model as practised in France for example [198], but can be placed somewhere in between [199]. The Council's importance to the symphony orchestras in Norway seems, however, to be negligible.

Rikskonsertene - The State Centre of Nationwide Promotion of Music - was founded in 1967 at the initiative of the Norwegian Arts Council [200] and its role is to distribute music to the general public [201]. The organisation co-operates with a large number of musicians and organisations in a wide field of music. Its involvement with the symphony orchestras seems to be limited, except in respect of initiatives for music education projects and introducing new ideas in that field to orchestra management and musicians at seminars and courses [202].

It is impossible to consider Norwegian orchestras without mentioning the role of the Norwegian Broadcasting Service - Norsk rikskringkasting (NRK), which has through the decades been an active financier of the orchestras. In the 1970s for example the NRK covered 40% of the budget of the regional symphony orchestras in Oslo, Bergen, Stavanger and Trondheim, (after 15% self generated income had been deducted)[203]. In return for this the orchestras recorded for the radio and were, in fact, a lot of the time, working directly for the NRK. Although this has changed in later years, the Norwegian Broadcasting Service still does recordings with all the symphony orchestras in Norway and in addition now also runs its own symphony orchestra, which was originally established as a small ensemble in 1927 but was increased to a

195 Osland and Mangset (1995), p. 12
196 Ibid.
197 Ibid.
198 Chartrand and McCaughey (1989),
as quoted in Osland and Magnset (1995), p. 11
199 Osland and Magnset (1995), p. 16
200 Berthelsen (ed.) (1994), p. 37
201 Hodne (1994), p. 166, Oftedal, in Kultur og kulturpolitikk (1985), p. 80 and
Rikskonsertene, Årsrapport 1995, p. 4
202 Concerts for Children (1996), p. 7
203 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 6

symphony orchestra in 1991 [204].

A further other organisation worth mentioning in the context of Norwegian orchestras is the Norwegian Theatre and Orchestra Association (Norsk teater- og orkesterforening), which is an employers association which has the responsibility of centrally negotiating the wages of Norwegian orchestra musicians with the Norwegian Musicians' Union (Norsk Musikerforbund) [205].

Orchestral Development in Norway

Orchestral activity has a considerable history in Norway. A society was set up in Bergen, on Norway's west coast, in 1765, to perform music, and this society started an orchestra for this purpose which still today is a part of Norway's musical life, now called the Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra [206]. In other parts of the country local or regional orchestras were also started, somewhat later however. In Oslo (or Kristiania as it was then called) several attempts to start permanent orchestras were made in the 19th century. There was in fact continuous orchestral activity in Oslo from 1810, with a turning point in 1871 when Edvard Grieg took to initiative in the foundation of "Musikforeningen" (The Music Society) which was to be active for half a century [207].

Towards the end of the second decade of the 20th century, in 1919, the Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra was founded [208], the musicians coming mostly from the recently abolished house orchestra of the National Theatre in Oslo [209]. The Oslo Philharmonic was given a generous grant from the city council as well as public subsidy from the Norwegian state, through their national lottery [210]. The orchestra has therefore had public subsidy from its foundation to this day, with the largest contributor being the City of Oslo through most of the period. However with recent changes primary responsibility has been passed to the Ministry of Culture [211]. The orchestra has grown over the 75 years from being a provincial European city orchestra to being a world class orchestra touring regularly and recording for major labels [212].

In the south western city of Stavanger an orchestral society was set up in 1866 and this date is claimed as the founding date of the current Stavanger Symphony

204 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 6 and Grøndahl (1996), p. 11
205 Stortingsproposition nr. 1 (1995-96), p. 68
206 Reitan, L. in Reitan and Storaas (ed.) (1990), p. 9 and Fasting (1965), p. 50
207 Berckenhoff (1929), p. 10-11
208 Berckenhoff (1929), p.18 and Oslo Filharmonien 75 år (1994), p. 25
209 Oslo Filharmonien 75 år (1994), p. 24-25
210 Berckenhoff (1929), p. 58-61
211 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 12 and p. 19
212 Oslo Filharmonien 75 år (1994), p. 58-61

Orchestra [213]. In fact there were some decades of unstable orchestral activity before the Stavanger Town Orchestra (Stavanger Byorkester) was founded in 1917 [214]. This short-lived orchestra had between 40 - 50 contracted players, but its activities came to a halt in 1924 because of economic difficulties [215]. In 1932 the Stavanger orchestra was started again by initiative of local musicians, but also had to give up its activities five years later [216]. The Norwegian Broadcasting Service (NRK) started its own ensemble of 11 musicians in Stavanger in 1938 and this became the nucleus of the new Stavanger Town Orchestra that started in October 1938 [217]. In 1966 the orchestra changed it name to Stavanger Symphony Orchestra (Symfoniorkestret i Stavanger) and all musicians of the NRK Stavanger Ensemble became members of the symphony orchestra when the Norwegian Broadcasting Service discontinued its own ensemble in Stavanger in 1970 [218]. The Stavanger Symphony Orchestra has since then operated along similar lines to the other orchestras, with a regular recording contract with the NRK [219] and has in recent years been particularly active in seeking new ways of promoting the orchestra's work in schools [220]. The Stavanger orchestra is named as one of the "central cultural institutions" in the government's new cultural policy of 1992 [221].

The Trondheim Symphony Orchestra (Trondheim Symfoniorkester) was founded in 1909 [222]. By 1918 the orchestra consisted of 42 players, professional and amateur, but during the 1920s its activities became less regular. During the 1930s the activity increased again and in 1936 the orchestra's finances were secured with subsidies from the Norwegian state, the local community and the Norwegian Broadcasting Service [223]. The orchestra remained semi-professional, however, though with important steps towards a fully professional orchestra in 1947 and 1961 when players were employed on a full time contract [224]. Today the orchestra consists of 69 professional players [225].

As mentioned earlier the Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra traces its roots

---

213 Alsvik (1988), p. 10
214 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8
215 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8 and Alsvik (1988), p. 23-26
216 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8 and Alsvik (1988), p. 32-37
217 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 9 and Alsvik (1988), p. 38-40
218 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 9
219 Ibid., p. 6
220 Concerts for Children (1996)
221 Kultur i Tiden (1992), p. 12
222 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8
223 Ibid.
224 Ibid.
225 Trondheim symfoniorkester, sesong program 1995/96, p. 1

back to 1765 [226]. The musical association - Musikselskabet "Harmonien" was founded in 1856 [227]. This society became the governing organisation for the orchestra and was strengthened further in 1903 when the society inherited the entire estate of the composer Edvard Grieg and his wife Nina [228]. In 1919 the association, which by now had become synonymous with the orchestra, was reorganised and in 1936 started cooperation with the Norwegian Broadcasting Service, which included regular financing in return for recordings [229]. The Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra has today the status of a "national cultural institution" receiving all its public funding from central government as mentioned earlier [230].

The two latest additions to the publicly supported symphony orchestras in Norway are the Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra in south east Norway and the Tromsø Symphony Orchestra up in the far north of the country. The Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1919 and has received continuous state funding since 1987 [231]. The orchestra numbers around 40 players on permanent contracts (23 full time and the rest part time) [232]. The Tromsø Symphony Orchestra has received public subsidy since 1991 [233]. Both orchestras are named as "central institutions" in the government cultural policy from 1992 [234].

As can be seen from the above, the role of the Norwegian Broadcasting Service has been crucial in the development of orchestras in Norway, with the year 1936 as an important point [235]. This radio and television service (run on licence fees similar to the BBC), in addition to its work with all the other Norwegian symphony orchestras, also has its own symphony orchestra - the Norwegian Radio Orchestra - Kringkastingsorkestret (founded as a small ensemble in 1927), though this was not established as a symphony orchestra with own budget and an independent administration until 1991[236]. Although a radio saloon orchestra had been established in 1945 which went through various stages in its development, the official orchestral policy of the Norwegian Broadcasting Service was to support the four regional orchestras [237]

---

226 Reitan, L. in Reitan and Storaas (ed.) (1990), p. 9, Fasting (1965), p. 71 and NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8

227 Reitan and Storaas (ed.) (1990), p. 35, Fasting (1965), p. 165 and NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8

228 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8

229 Ibid.

230 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 12 and p. 19

231 Kristiansand Symfoniorkester 75 år (1994), p. 16

232 Ibid.

233 Kultur i tiden (1992), p. 19

234 Ibid.

235 NOU 1979:3, Symfoniorkester, p. 8

236 Grøndahl (1996), p. 55

237 The four orchestras were: The Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra, the Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra, the Stavanger Symphony Orchestra and the Trondheim Symphony Orchestra.

instead of establishing its own symphony orchestra [238]. As can be seen from earlier paragraphs in this chapter this support was probably the key to all orchestral development in Norway from the 1930s and onwards.

As the years went by the Norwegian Broadcasting Service wanted to change the policy of subsidising the regional symphony orchestras in this manner from radio and television licence fees, but political pressure was strong to keep things they had been [239]. Thus for 60 years, or from 1930 to 1993 the Norwegian Broadcasting Service's subsidy was a major part of the four professional orchestras' budgets. As an example in 1950 the Norwegian state paid NOK 500,000 to the orchestras, local government NOK 600,000 and the Norwegian Broadcasting Service (NRK) NOK 750,000. In 1967 the NRK covered 44% of the total public subsidy, local government 30% and central government 26% [240]. All this changed with changes in cultural policy in 1993 already discussed in this chapter.

During the concert season 1994-1995 the Norwegian Radio Orchestra had 49 full time musicians employed [241].

2.6. SWEDEN

History of Cultural Representation in Government

Sweden became established as a sovereign state in the Middle Ages (ca. 1000-1300 AD) with a monarch ruling the whole country. She was also christianised and established a ecclesiastical organisation with an archbishop in Uppsala already in 1164 [242]. Sweden became a part of the Kalmar union of Denmark, Norway and Sweden in the fourteenth century but was instrumental in breaking up the union with the uprising lead by the king to be, Gustav Vasa, in 1532 [243]. Although he was himself an elected king, Gustav Vasa changed the law and changed Sweden into a hereditary monarchy in 1544 [244].

Parliament and government were given increased power in 1611 [245] but the biggest change came in 1809 with government reform [246] and in 1810 when the existing ruling royal family was removed from power and a French officer was made

238 Grøndahl (1996), p. 1
239 Ibid., p. 7
240 Grøndahl (1996), p. 7
241 Kringkastingsorkestrets Konsertsesong 1994-95, General Program, booklet, last page
242 Nationalencyklopedin, Volume 17 (1995), p. 526
243 Ibid., p. 527-8
244 Ibid., p. 531
245 Ibid., p. 529
246 Törnblom (1993), p. 14

king [247]. These changes came as a result of Sweden's war with Russia, where Sweden, among other losses, ceded Finland to Russia [248]. The government reforms of 1809 gave the king himself the ruling power [249]. He was to reach decisions in a State Council which he appointed himself and the legislation power was divided between the king and the parliament with equal right for veto for both parties [250]. The parliament assembled every fifth year, but from 1844 it assembled every third year [251]. This was a consequence of the Ministerial reform of 1840 which meant that instead of the nine members of the State Councils who had no connection with either parliament or the civil service, the state secretaries (ministers), who had not had a status in the State Council before, where now made members of the Council [252].

The central public administration in Sweden developed slightly differently than in Denmark during the 19th century and still today has a different profile. While Denmark (as well as Norway and Iceland) developed "ministerial administration" where the minister has the possibility to control the whole of his or her area of operation [253] Sweden developed her public administration into a two tier system, consisting of the Ministries on one level and the central administration institutions on another [254]. The development of this two tier system meant that the king, and later the government, could directly influence a central administration institution without the interference of the minister under whom the institution was placed. Still today the independence of these institutions is stressed and if a minister is thought to unduly exercise his or her influence, this is seen as putting the "independence" of the institution in jeopardy [255].

The representation of culture in central government has followed the general principles of the Swedish public administration system. The roots of cultural representation can be traced back to the 17th century when a government office was set up to care for archives and maintain monuments [256]. Around the same time the first legislation was passed to protect archaeological remains [257]. The involvement of the Crown was considerable and the personal interest of King Gustav III in the 18th century proved to be instrumental in the foundation of key national cultural institutions such as

247 Norden (1989), p. 61
248 Puntila (1974), p. 13
249 Törnblom (1993), p. 14
250 Ibid.
251 Ibid.
252 Grimlund et al. (1993), p. 5 and Törnblom (1993) p. 14
253 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 54
254 Grimlund et al. (1993), p. 31. Swedish terms for the two tiers are: "regeringskansliet" and "de centrala ämbetsverken".
255 Grimlund et al. (1993), p. 31
256 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 12 and Swedish State Cultural Policy, a national report (1990), p. 69
257 Ibid.

the Royal Opera (1771), the Royal Dramatic Theatre (1788) and the national museums (1792) [258]. The effect of this royal involvement and tradition in cultural affairs can be felt through to the present day [259] but there is also another source of cultural interest coming from ambitions of popular movements of the 19th century (in temperance, work and religion) [260].

At the beginning of the 20th century state support of public libraries began and grants to civil theatres were first paid from lottery money in the 1930s [261]. The lotteries were administered by the Department of Trade whereas other historic cultural representation belonged to the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs [262]. A new Department of Cultural Affairs within the Ministry of Education and Culture was set up in 1963 and the responsibilities for culture transferred from the two other ministries [263]. This was the basis on which Sweden's modern public administration of culture rests. Divided into two sub-departments one handled mass media policy (broadcasting, film, publishing and the press); the other dealt with museums, theatres, dance music, visual arts, public libraries, grants to artists (including authors) as well as the cultural heritage [264].

Today cultural affairs are the responsibility of a separate Ministry of Culture that was formally separated from the Ministry of Education and set up on December 1, 1991 [265].

In line with Sweden's 'two tier' tradition in public administration, however, several central administration institutions have been set up to implement the policies of the Ministry of Culture. The most important of these central administration institutions is the National Cultural Council (Kulturrådet). This was formally established in 1969, and had grown out of a more informal group of advisors linked to the Department of Culture from its establishment in 1963 [266]. Other central administration institutions of importance to culture are the Central Board of National Antiquities (Riksantikvarieämbetet) and the National Archives Board (Riksarkivet) [267].

---

258 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 12
259 Council of Europe: Swedish State Cultural Policy, a national report (1990), p. 69 and p. 70
260 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 12
261 Ibid.
262 Ibid.
263 Ibid.
264 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 12
265 Regeringens proposition 1991/92: 100, bilaga 12, p. 3
266 Ny kulturpolitik (1972), p. 31
267 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 19

Cultural Policy and Cultural Institutions in Sweden

The background to Sweden's modern cultural policy can be traced to the early 1960s, when for the first time the Swedish Parliament in 1961 passed comprehensive legislation in the area of cultural affairs aimed mainly at improving conditions for cultural workers [268]. A further development in the implementation of cultural policy was the foundation of the National Institute for Concerts (Rikskonserter) in 1968, after a period of experimental activity since 1963 [269] and the National Exhibitions Service (Riksutställningar) in 1965 [270]. The National Theatre Centre (Riksteatern) had been founded in 1933 as a touring network centred on a Stockholm-based production facility, was changed during the 1960s and the NTC started setting up its own regionally-based touring companies and performances [271].

From the above one can see that an important element in the new cultural policy of the 1960s, was the institutionalisation of the arts through state supported and centrally governed agencies. In a parliamentary proposition from the Swedish government in 1974 a definitions of cultural policy is presented:

> With the concept of cultural policy, one refers to a collective structure for social action in the field of culture [272].

This definition became an important element in the actual development of changes in cultural policy in the 1960s and culminated in a central government cultural policy statement in 1974 which still to this day is the backbone of all cultural involvement by government in Sweden [273].

To describe the main thought behind the 1974 resolution, this states:

> ...that the state and municipalities through their cultural policy measures aim to help people satisfy their needs for experience, expression and contact, and also to help make culture a means of exploring reality and critically appraising society [274].

To implement this new policy the main organisations, the National Cultural Council, the National Antiquities and the National Archives Board were given the task of coordinating, planning and researching the new policy and to a certain extent distribute

---

268 Kommunerna, staten och kulturpolitiken (1985), p. 23-24. The parliamentary propositions in question were: prop 1961:56, SU 1961:121 and rskr 1961:304.

269 Ekqvist (1976), p. 17

270 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 79

271 Kommunerna, staten och kulturpolitiken (1985), p. 24 and Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 71

272 Den statliga kulturpolitiken (1974), p. 23

273 Kommunerna, staten och kulturpolitiken (1985), p. 24

274 Swedish State Cultural Policy, a national report (1990), p. 72

funds [275].

To summarise the objectives of the 1974 state cultural policy is the following quote from the national report (position paper) on Sweden for the Council of Europe's appraisal of Swedish cultural policy, 1988:

> Cultural policy must:
> • help to protect freedom of expression and create real opportunities for the use of that freedom;
> • give people opportunities to engage in creative activities of their own and to promote personal contacts;
> • counteract negative effects of commercialization in the cultural sector
> • promote decentralization of activities and decision-making in the cultural sector;
> • promote a decentralization of activities and decision-making in the cultural sector;
> • make more allowance for the experiences and needs of disadvantaged groups;
> • facilitate artistic and cultural renewal;
> • ensure that culture of earlier times is preserved and revitalized; and
> • promote the interchange of experience and ideas within cultural sectors across linguistic and national boundaries [276].

An important element in the implementing of this policy was to define the respective areas of responsibility of national and local government agencies [277]. According to this, the main responsibilities of the national government were to oversee legislation about culture, to control direct funding to central national cultural institutions, to give state subsidies for cultural activity at local level and to make sure that legislation and other rules and regulation in society, notably in education, should be in line with the policy [278]. The role of the local government was to use culture for the creation of a better environment, but it was left to local government to define how this could be implemented and this was not regulated either at county level or at municipal level [279].

It is interesting to note that legislation is used with as light a touch as possible in the control of cultural policy in Sweden. The following quote from the group of international experts that evaluated national cultural policy in Sweden for the Council of Europe, offers an opinion on the role of legislation in this context:

---

275 Kulturpolitikens inriktning (1995), p. 546

276 Council of Europe: Swedish State Cultural Policy, a national report (1990), p. 72

277 Council of Europe: Swedish State Cultural Policy, a national report (1990 , p. 73 and Kommunerna, staten och kulturpolitiken (1985), p. 29-30

278 Kommunerna, staten och kulturpolitiken (1985), p. 29-30

279 Ibid.

> The degree of development in the Swedish [arts funding] system seems all the more impressive when it is realised that statute has played only a limited role in the process. Legislation has been used primarily with regard to the preservation of the cultural heritage. The current 1988 statute replaced two earlier statutes. Laws on freedom of the press and on copyright are fundamental and legislation it [*sic*] plays a considerable role in regulating broadcasting. Otherwise, persuasion and consensus have been the main methods used to bring about significant developments in the artistic landscape [280].

The authors of the report seem to be impressed with what they call the "light control" of the Swedish public administration when it comes to culture:

> Light control is the hallmark of the Swedish system at all its levels. Direct public management of cultural organisations is largely confined to some local authority museums and the local public library service. Most of the performed [*sic*] arts organisations have adopted a private sector format, either like the Royal Opera, which is a private company wholly owned by the government, or "foundations" (non-profit companies without shares), which are a common organisational form among the regional institutions. The national museums are state agencies, separate from the Ministry, with their own management boards. National government maintains no cultural agencies or offices of its own at the regional or local level, apart from an ancient monuments service. Under a long tradition, the state makes intensive use of voluntary organisations and independent associations, channelling large public resources through, for example, the popular educational associations for cultural programmes and other purposes [281].

In the early 1990s the Swedish government decided to reevaluate its cultural policy and published an investigative report of 688 pages in 1995 [282]. At the time some political changes happened with a right wing coalision government taking over after the 1991 parliamentary elections from the social democrats. The social democrats, however, came back to power in 1994. In September 1996 the government put forward a proposition for a new cultural policy which does not in any fundamental way change the principles of any earlier policy, neither in basic structure of administration or division between areas of responsibility between national and local government.

The main cultural institutions in Sweden have already been mentioned, but with regards to orchestras it also appropriate to mention an employers' organisation for theatres and orchestras - Teatrarnas riksförbund (founded 1944) - which acts as a collective representative for the orchestras in Sweden in for example pay negotiations with unions and liaison to government, but does not assume a role beyond

---

280 Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden, experts' report (1990), p. 21

281 Ibid.

282 Title of report: *Kulturpolitikens inriktning* - Kulturutredningens slutbetänkande, Statens offentliga utredningar 1995, nr. 84, Kulturdepartimentet, Stockholm 1995

that[283].

Orchestral Development in Sweden

The beginning of orchestral development in Sweden is, like much of the development for all the arts, traceable to the Royal Court. In 1526 the Court established an orchestra - Kungliga hovkapellet (The Royal Orchestra)[284]. Prior to that time musicians had been employed by the kings of Sweden, but do not appear regularly on the list of court personnel until that year[285]. The orchestra does not seem to have gained a steady structure initially and until the beginning of the 17th century the trumpeters were the highest paid musicians in the orchestra[286]. This changed however, and under the reign of Gustav II Adolf in 1622, the string instruments were made the nucleus of the ensemble with the trumpeters as a special group that was not subordinate to the leader/conductor (kapellmästare)[287]. This orchestra still operates to this day as the orchestra of the Royal Opera House (Kungliga teatern) in Stockholm, though with a modern opera orchestra structure.

A further important step in the development of musical institutions in Sweden was the the foundation of the Royal Musical Academy (Kungliga musikaliska akademien) in 1771 and of the Royal Opera in Stockholm (Kungliga teatern) on a permanent basis in 1773[288]. One of the main purposes of the Musical Academy was to educate musicians and its form was based on similar Italian academies of the 18th century[289]. In the first chapter of the Academy's Statutes its purpose is listed as follows: "The Academy's area of operation is musical science, composition, performance and poetry as well as vocal music"[290].

The development of other regular professional orchestras in Sweden, with the exception of the Royal Orchestra, was slow until the 19th century, although sporadic ensembles performed during the latter half of the 18th century in various cities in Sweden[291]. The increased strength of the middle classes as well as the founding of various workers associations, brought a new wave of concert giving and

283 Nationalencyklopedin, Volume 18 (1995), p. 130
284 Norling and Trobäck (1926), p. 7
285 Ibid.
286 Walin (1949), p. 20
287 Ibid.
288 Morales and Norlind (1921), p. 9 and Walin (1949), p. 29
289 Morales and Norlind (1921), p. 9
290 Original Swedish version: "Hvad til Musicaliske Vetenskapen hörer, så väl Composition, som Execution, tillika med Skaldekonsten, såsom til Vocal Musique nödig. . . blifva ämnen till Academiens göromål" (author's translation in the main text);
Morales and Norlind (1921), p. 9
291 Walin (1949), p. 33-43

musical activity in the latter half of the 19th century, particularly in Stockholm [292]

All of the professional orchestras that still operate today (other than the Opera House orchestra), and which are the object of this study, were founded during the first three decades of this century; the Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra in 1902 (1914), the Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra was established on a permanent basis in 1905 [293], the Gävle Symphony Orchestra in 1912, the Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra in 1912, the Norrköping Symphony Orchestra in 1913, the Malmö Symphony Orchestra in 1925 [294] and the Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra originally in 1936 [295].

The Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra was founded in 1902, as a part of an "Orchestra-Concert-Society" in Stockholm and the first concert took place on October 21, 1902 [296]. After a few years of instability in the number of concerts and number of musicians, 60-70 musicians were contracted to the orchestra in December 1913 [297]. An important stepping stone in the history of the orchestra was the building of a new concert hall in central Stockholm, which was ready in 1926 and has been the orchestra's home ever since [298]. The orchestra's main funder today is Stockholm County (not the City of Stockholm or the Swedish State) [299], and the number of permanent players in the orchestra today is around 100 [300].

The Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra was established formally in April 1905, when the Gothenburg Orchestral Society was founded [301]. The year before a company, limited by guarantee, was founded to build a concert hall which was ready in 1905 and was Gothenburg's main concert venue until it burned down in 1928 [302]. A new concert hall was built on the same site and in October 1935 the orchestra played its first concert there and is to this day responsible for running this hall [303]. In recent years the orchestra has had considerable artistic growth following the appointment of a new chief conductor, Neeme Järvi, in 1982 [304]. The number of musicians in the orchestra has been increased to 105 [305] made possible through private sponsorship from the locally-based car manufacturer Volvo for a five year

292 Rothschild (1995), p. 5
293 Ibid., p. 18
294 Ibid., p. 3
295 Wallin (1977), p. 138
296 Rothschild (1995), p. 7-8
297 Ibid., p. 11
298 Ibid., p. 14
299 Teater, dans och musik (1992), p. 68
300 Ibid., p. 71
301 Rothschild (1995), p. 18
302 Ibid.
303 Ibid., p. 27
304 Ibid., p. 28
305 Teater, dans och musik (1992), p. 71

period [306].

The Malmö Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1925, but the origin of orchestral activity in the city of Malmö can be traced back to 1825, when the Musical Society of Malmö (Musikaliska Sällskapet i Malmö) was founded [307]. Various short lived orchestral enterprises preceded the foundation of a stable orchestra of 51 musicians in 1925 [308]. After spending several decades in a theatre as a main concert venue, in 1985 the orchestra got its own concert hall, the result of an initiative of private entrepreneurs. Apart from a concert hall the building includes a hotel, restaurants, banks and a conference centre [309]. At the beginning of the 1990s the orchestra has increased to number over 80 musicians [310].

The Gävle Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1912, and received from the start financing from public sources; the Swedish state and the city councils of the city of Gävle and the city of Söderhamn [311]. The orchestra has been operating in the city of Gävle and the county of Gävleborg since then. The orchestras main funder changed at the beginning of 1996 from the county of Gävleborg to being City of Gävle [312], and the orchestra then changed its name from "Gävleborg Symphony Orchestra" to "Gävle Symphony Orchestra" [313]. The number of contracted musicians for the 1996/97 season is 53 [314].

The Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1912 after a state subsidy and a matching subsidy from the city of Helsingborg had been secured for the orchestra's operation [315]. The orchestras main financier through the decades has been the city of Helsingborg [316] and the number of musicians at the beginning of the 1990s was 50 [317].

The Norrköping Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1913 and received a subsidy in a similar fashion to the orchestras in Gävle and Helsingborg [318]. The orchestra has recently moved into a new concert hall and the number of musicians increased to 87 contracted players on a full time basis [319].

The three orchestras in Gävle, Norrköping and Helsingborg were made

306 Rothschild (1995), p. 28
307 Ibid., p. 29
308 Ibid., p. 32-33
309 Ibid., p. 38
310 Teater, dans och musik (1992), p. 72
311 Rothschild (1995), p. 47
312 Gävle Symfoni Orkester (1996), p. 3
313 Ibid.
314 Ibid., p. 16
315 Rothschild (1995), p. 52 and Öhrström (1978), p. 4-5
316 Öhrström (1978), p. 24
317 Teater, dans och musik (1992), p. 72
318 Rothschild (1995), p. 62
319 Louis de Geer konsert och kongress (1996), p. 22

permanent ensembles in the beginning through a parliamentary decision in 1911 to increase accessibility to music [320]. Under this the state was pledged to give the orchestra half of its operational costs and in return the orchestras were obliged to give concerts within defined areas of the country [321]. A political decision in 1911 has therefore been directly responsible for the existence and development of these three orchestras.

The Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra can trace its origins to 1936 when a small ensemble was contracted to the Swedish Radio Service [322]. The orchestra was successively enlarged and in 1965 was given its present name and had then reached the size of a full symphony orchestra with over one hundred musicians [323]. The orchestra is financed through the Swedish Broadcasting Service [324], a public radio station funded by licence fees and today numbers 106 contracted musicians [325].

2.7. UNITED KINGDOM

Cultural Representation in Government

The development of parliamentary procedure in Britain has roots that go back to 1236 when the term 'parliament' was first officially used, then to describe the gathering of feudal barons and representatives of counties and towns summoned by the king [326]. By the 15th century Parliament had acquired the right to make laws [327]. Through the centuries Parliament acquired independence from the crown although the monarch remained at the centre of executive power until 1714 when he ceased to attend Cabinet meetings [328]. The cabinet had been set up as a link between the executive and the legislature, (king and parliament) and although Cabinet ministers were appointed by the monarch they had to have sufficient support in the House of Commons to enable them to persuade Parliament to pass legislation and vote for taxation [329].

The development of parliamentary democracy slowly shifted the centre of power from the Crown and the House of Lords to the House of Commons. An important

320 Rothschild (1995), p. 41 and p. 73
321 Ibid.
322 Wallin (1977), p. 138
323 Sveriges Radios Symfoniorkester - P2:s konsertsäsong 1995-1996, p. 59 and Wallin (1977), p. 138
324 Wallin (1977), p. 137
325 Sveriges Radios Symfoniorkester - P2:s konsertsäsong 1995-1996, p. 60-61
326 (The) British System of Government (1994), p. 2
327 Ibid., p. 2 and p. 14
328 Ibid., p. 3
329 Ibid.

stepping stone in this development was The Reform Act of 1832 [330]. This act reformed the system of parliamentary representation and also standardised the qualifications for the right to vote [331]. By the end of the century successive extensions of the right to vote to all adult males (by secret ballot from 1871), lead to direct popular control over the House of Commons. Having said that, however, women did not receive full suffrage in parliamentary elections until the late 1920s [332].

Another feature of British government is the absence of a written constitution [333]. Commonly the British constitution is defined as a mixture of statue law, common law and conventions [334]. In his book "The Five Thousand", Charles Arnold-Baker on the other hand, defines the British constitution in the following manner:

> The United Kingdom has been and still is a constitutional State with a ruling group which I have called 'The Five Thousand', partly because its number is something of that order and partly because, for reasons which will appear, it is necessary to use a neutral term. The British Constitution consists of these Five Thousand ....., the rules and habits by which they conduct their business with each other, especially the factors determining the speed at which they work and the instruments which they employ.....Any substantial change in any of these major features is a constitutional amendment, and as it happens some such changes can be made by processes so informal that the public never hears of them [335].

Although the British constitution is not written down in any one document, the concept of a constitution is commonly used when addressing the framework of parliamentary democracy and traditions in public administration in Britain. When it comes to executive power, this has also gone through development characterised by successive submission of power from the monarch to the Cabinet as has been discussed earlier. It has to be pointed out however that almost all international relations and a number of other important state functions are still administered by "Royal Prerogative" exercised by the Prime Minister and the Cabinet and do not require the approval of parliament.

In this context it is interesting to compare the concept of the model of "ministerial administration" [336] as practised in Denmark, Norway and Iceland, where everything a ministry does is in fact done on behalf of the minister who has the responsibility and the power of decision-making in his ministry to the legislator.

---

330 (The) British System of Government (1994), p. 4 and Birch (1993) p. 33-34

331 Ibid.

332 Ibid.

333 Arnold-Baker (1986), p. xiii-xiv and (The) British System of Government (1994), p. 4

334 (The) British System of Government (1994), p. 4

335 Arnold-Baker (1986), p. xiii-xiv

336 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 54; see also section 2.4. on Iceland, p. 37

When it comes to culture and the representation of culture in government at national level, Britain can be characterized as historically giving low priority to this area. In post Civil War Britain (from the mid 17th century) there was little tradition of patronage of the arts from royal or government sources compared with that of France or Germany: even the British Museum was only established by means of a mid-18th century lottery. The Royal Opera and the Royal National Theatre, to give two other examples, are both post-Second World War creations. In Victorian times, central government support to the cultural sphere remained limited, but major municipal initiatives came about after the 1836 municipal reforms, particularly in the form of museums (and later art galleries) and the building of public halls in for example Birmingham, Liverpool and Bristol (though these were originally used more for political and similar meetings and rallies than for cultural events). One of the explanations why there was so little tradition of patronage of the arts in Britain is the traditional centralisation of Government in London, and then the early arrival of the industrial revolution in Britain; in contrast with for example Germany where the tradition of patronage was maintained by the plethora of often small local principalities and dukedoms[337]. It can be said, however, that a Department of Practical Arts, which in the 1850s was to join the Department of Science and Art, had begun giving state aid to art schools during the 1850s [338]. Such state support for culture as was provided came mainly through the Treasury until the Labour Government set up an Arts Sub-Ministry (within the Department of Education and Science in 1965). The previous Labour Government had established the 'arms length principle' for e.g. funding in a semi-independent (though ministerially appointed) Arts Council of Great Britain in 1946, though still through a Treasury Cabinet Minister [339].

This changed with the appointment of a special Minister of the Arts in Harold Wilson's government of 1964 [340]. A number of new ministerial posts were created in this government [341] and it was Jenny Lee who was to remain on this post until 1970; at first with the status of Under Secretary, but from 1967-1970 with the status of Minister of State [342]. This was a Junior Ministerial post under the Minister of Education the office of whom had been established in 1959, by the merging of the Education and Science Ministries into the Department of Education and Science [343]. Though presented at the time as a major break-through for the Arts this was in many ways a down-grading of the representation of the the arts in government since the Minister of Arts was not a member of the Cabinet unlike the Treasury cabinet minister

337 Jenkins (1979), p. 35
338 Sinclair (1995), p. 17
339 Hewison (1995), p. 17
340 Butler and Butler (1986), p. 47 and Jenkins (1979) p. 52
341 Sked and Cook (1986), p. 200-201
342 Butler and Butler (1986), p. 47
343 Fry (1981), p. 96

who had been, up until then, responsible for the arts [344]. In practice Jenny Lee's undoubted success was in large measure due to her direct access to, and strong support for, the Prime Minister, Harold Wilson. The status of this ministerial post changed back and forth during the period 1964-1992 fluctuating between being that of Under Secretary to being Minister of State, though for the first 3 years from 1979 Norman St. John Stevas held the Arts portfolio within the Cabinet jointly with his position as Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons [345]. In their publication of 1986 *British Political Facts,* Butler and Butler list the position of the "Minister responsible for the Arts" in the 1979 Thatcher government as a non Cabinet one, but not attached to a ministry thus indicating a higher status of the office [346].

In 1992 there was a change in cultural representation in government when the Department of National Heritage was established (renamed Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)by the new Labour Government in July 1997) [347]. The Ministry is headed by a Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, originally two but recently increased to three Parliamentary Under Secretaries of State and one Permanent Secretary. It is interesting to note that the DCMS is not a a Ministry of Culture for the whole of the UK, but purely an English territorial ministry, except for issues dealing with broadcasting and the press and for cultural relations with the European Union and the Council of Europe. (Illogically, this English ministry has responsibility for the Welsh television channel, S4C.) Culture in other parts of the United Kingdom, is represented in government by other "territorial" ministries; the Scottish Office, the Welsh Office and the Northern Ireland Office. Other UK wide ministries have substantial responsibility for certain aspects of cultural policy and activity including for example:

- The Department for Education and Employment (e.g. arts education in schools, the national conservatories and over one hundred university museums and galleries);
- Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (e.g. Royal Botanic Gardens and Botanical Museum, Kew and standards affecting catering facilities of cultural facilities);
- Foreign and Commonwealth Office (e.g. International cultural policies and relations (except those with the European Union and Council of Europe), BBC World Service, British Council (part - "Cultural Diplomacy" role);
- Department of Trade and Industry (e.g. copyright and Intellectual Property Law); Ministry of Defence (e.g. Military bands and orchestras and nearly 200 armed services museums);
- Department of International Development (British Council, Commonwealth Insitute (London), relations with UNESCO, Overseas Aid and Cooperation (devel. countries);
- Department of Health (Medical museums and museums of the history of medicine);

344 Butler and Butler (1986), p. 47

345 Butler and Butler (1986), p. 47-64 and Jenkins (1979), p. 6

346 Butler and Butler (1986), p. 63

347 Osland and Mangset (1995), p.17

• The Treasury (e.g. taxation, expenditure policy, Civil Service Management and Pay, Bank of England Museum [348].

The Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport is a cabinet post but the minister's responsibilities do not, as said earlier, cover the whole of the UK in cultural representation [349]. This is an interesting development when compared to the former status of cultural representation in government when for example the arts were either represented by a cabinet minister (Treasury) or by a part time arts minister who sometimes was a cabinet minister with other responsibilities, (such as Norman St. John Stevas in the conservative government from 1979-83 as previously noted[350].)

It is difficult to say if the changes from 1992 can be seen as an indication of increased central government power over the arts [351], thus challenging the 'arm's length' principle in regards to government's relationships to the arts. It can be argued, however, that since the Department of National Heritage does not have a UK wide role, its power is less than the previous "Office of Arts and Libraries" under Cabinet Office (i.e. the Prime Minister), which did have responsibility for the Arts and Heritage in Scotland and Wales as well as England. (Education and culture have been fully devolved in the case of Northern Ireland since the 1920s - so in fact at no time has any arts/heritage minister had a truly *national* remit.) It is furthermore difficult to say if the May 1997 change of government in the U.K., which, as noted above, has entailed that the Department of National Heritage changed its name to The Department for Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS), will in any real terms alter the role of the this Department although the new Secretary of State has moved the affairs of the recording industry over from the Department of Trade and Industry to his renamed Department [352].

One cannot leave the subject of cultural representation in British government without mentioning briefly the role of local government. In the past local authorities have been active in promoting the arts and often run and/or subside theatres, concert halls and arts centre [353] and are still a very important factor in the promotion of the arts. Local government still spends at least 1,5 times as much on culture as all UK ministries on DCMS sector and probably twice that of the DCMS in England [354].

---

348 Boylan, Patrick and City University (October 1996) http://www.city.ac.uk/artspol/culture.html

349 Ibid.

350 Butler and Butler (1986), p. 47

351 Osland and Mangset (1995), p.17

352 *Arts news* Summer 1997, Issue 44, p. 5. The arm's length principle will be discussed in the following section on Cultural policy.

353 Local Authorities, Entertainment and the Arts, p. 5. As an example the net expenditure of local government to the arts in 1989/90 was broadly similar to that incurred by the Arts Council of Great Britain.

354 Prof. Patrick Boylan, City University, London, personal comment

Cultural Policy

The concept of 'cultural policy' in the political debate in Britain has taken several forms. After Jenny Lee's period as Arts Minister in the sixties, one of few if not the only statement of an arts minister that contained a reference to 'cultural policy' are the reported remarks of minister Timothy Renton in a closed and officially unreported European Economic Community Cultural Council meeting in 1991 that the only cultural policy of the UK, is that it has never had, and must never have a cultural policy! [355]

When approaching British cultural policy in the context of the political and public administration tradition, however, politicians have come to the conclusion that executive activities should be hived-off to semi-autonomous bodies [356]. True also about industries that have been taken into public ownership, the purpose of this was to free them from "those undesirable pressures associated with both public and private, Parliamentary strategy, political lobbying and electoral 'blackmail'" [357].

Given this background, the administration of government funds for the cultural sector in Britain is characterised by a so called 'arm's length' principle, which indicates that the policy making, mainly through the distribution of funds to the arts, is 'hived-off' to (supposedly) independent bodies such as the Arts Councils (which originally were one organisational unit - the Arts Council of Great Britain), Craft Council, British Film Institute, the Regional Arts Boards, the national museums and art galleries as well as the British Library [358]. The Arts Council members were originally appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and then from the 1965 reforms by the Prime Minister, in both cases upon the advice of the Minister of Education and the Secretary for Scotland. Today members of the Arts Council of England, and similar bodies are - in effect - the personal choice of the Minister of Culture [359]. The Council in turn appoints expert panels on music, drama and other areas, though these are usually chaired by a ministerially appointed full member of the Arts Council [360].

The intention of this administrative process was originally to remove the distribution of public funds from the political sphere to a body where grants are decided on by peers, thereby ensuring as low a level of political involvement in the

355 Ibid.
356 Brown and Steel (1979), p. 305
357 Fulton Report, Vol. 1, p. 102 (reservation by Lord Simey), as quoted in Brown and Steel (1979), p. 305-306
358 Minihan (1977), p. 227-231
359 Minihan (1977), p. 230 and (The) Arts Council of England, (1994) p. 1
360 Ibid.

decision making process as possible and making artistic and cultural arguments the prerequisites for the cultural policy exercised through the distribution of funds to the arts. In practice there have been widespread reports of some ministers taking a very direct interest in the allocation of funds to different areas of the arts or even to specific Art's Council "clients". For example the Arts Council's education, training, race relations, gender and international units were all closed down in 1994 following ministerial pressure. Despite this process the U.K.'s Arts Council model has to be considered a part of government's public policy making and administration.

In their book *The Administrative Process in Britain* Brown and Steel, maintain that such bodies as the Arts Council are semi-autonomous performing important governmental functions [361] . An arts council in such a model can therefore be seen as a part of the government's cultural policy although, as Brown and Steel quote:

> .....its semi-autonomous status not only frees its activities from direct parliamentary intervention but may also increase the likelihood of decisions being accepted, by bringing those who are affected formally into the decision-making process [362] .

Brown and Steel go on, however, to say that although the establishment of a semi-autonomous body insulates a particular activity from the full force of ministerial and parliamentary control, such 'hiving-off' is not only advocated in order to avoid the direct effects of political interference; it is also seen as a means of escaping from many of the features of departmental organisation which are closely related to the system of political accountability [363] .

Is it then so that the 'arts council' model in Britain is an excuse for politicians to get away from political accountability, but at the same time exercise their influence on cultural policy? Some doubts have been raised in the last ten years whether the model really ensures the absence of political influence on for example politically motivated appointments by or even overt pressure on Arts Councils by ministers. Since the ministers are effectively shielded from facing official political accountability through devolving the 'official' power to the semi-autonomous bodies, (unlike the case is in countries where the system of "ministerial administration" [364] is used (e.g. in Denmark, Norway and Iceland) where the minister is accountable for all decisions that come under his or her ministry), they do not have to publicly account for their actions of this nature. If one is to believe the official version of the 'arts council'

---

361 Brown and Steel (1979), p. 306

362 Dunnett, Sir James 'The Civil Service: Seven Years after Fulton', *Public Administration* Vol. 54 (1976), p. 376; as quoted in Brown and Steel (1979), p. 307

363 Brown and Steel (1979), p. 309

364 Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi (1994), p. 54; see also section 2.4. on Iceland, p. 37

model, however, decentralisation is the main theme and has worked in keeping the policy 'at arm's length' as originally intended.

There are signs, however, after recent devolution to regional arts boards and the establishment of a stronger cultural ministry, that the central power of arts policy making, through the distribution of funds, has effectively been removed from a central arm's length body (the Arts Council of Great Britain) and given to a politically elected minister of the central government as well as 'territorial' ministers outside England.

Cultural Institutions

As discussed earlier the most important cultural institution in Britain is the Arts Council of Great Britain, and/or it successors The Arts Council of England, the Scottish Arts Council and the Arts Council of Wales [365].

The Arts Council of Great Britain was originally constituted on August 9, 1946, as a Body Corporate under Royal Charter following an announcement by the recently appointed Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons on June 12, 1945 [366]. A new Royal Charter was granted to the council in 1967 [367]. On 1 April 1994 the functions and responsibilities of the Arts Council of Great Britain were transferred to three new bodies: the Arts Council of England, the Scottish Arts Council and the Arts Council of Wales [368]. In England power to distribute grants in many areas of arts activity was further devolved to ten Regional Arts Boards (RAB) which distribute thirty percent of the Art Council of England's overall grant [369]. From April 1997 all RAB chairmen were made members of the Arts Council and in that capacity participate fully in all decisions taken by the Council (Between 1994 and 1997 around half of the RAB chairmen were members) [370]. The Council employs a staff of officers responsible for different fields of the arts. This group is coordinated by the Chief Officers' Group, chaired by the Arts Council's Secretary General [371]. There is furthermore a structure of advisory panels, selected by the Council, which assist the Council and its officers in developing policy and in making funding decisions. The RABs parallel this structure [372]. The advisory panels have no executive authority but are intended to provide the council with advice from the 'arts constituency', although there are no democratic or consultative elements in their work, and they meet in secret [373].

365 (The) Arts Council of England, (1994) p. 1
366 (The) Arts Council of Great Britain (1967), p. 5
367 Ibid.
368 (The) Arts Council of England, (1994) p. 1
369 (The) Arts Council of England and how it works (1996), p. 3
370 Ibid., p. 4
371 Ibid.
372 Ibid.
373 Ibid., p. 14

Another important function of the Arts Council is responsibility for distributing funds from the new National Lottery (established in 1994) to arts, crafts and film projects in England [374]. The National Lottery was introduced by the British government to create extra funds for five areas. These are: the arts; sport; heritage; charities; and projects to mark the beginning of the new millennium [375]. All council members of the Arts Council of England are appointed by the Minister of Culture [376], those for Scotland and Wales by the respective Secretaries of State [377].

Another cultural institution of great significance to the arts and particularly to orchestras is the British Broadcasting Corporation, the BBC. The BBC was formed in October 1922 after coordination of many smaller broadcasting companies [378]. From the beginning music was an important part of the broadcasting and as early as December 1922 a group of musicians had been employed to provide regular broadcasts of music [379]. In 1930 the BBC established its own symphony orchestra [380] and was later to establish more orchestras around the country. The BBC's role in bringing music to the masses through broadcasting as well as running orchestras is of fundamental importance to the development of the orchestral scene as it is today in Britain. The BBC was the original 'public service' broadcasting service, run on licence fees and did therefore not compete with independent broadcasting companies over advertising revenue. This model of 'public service broadcasting' as defined in the UK, was in sharp contrast to the US system of public service broadcasting, where commercial imperatives have dominated the system since the 1920s [381]. This UK definition of public service broadcasting, which entailed offering a wide range of services and programmes to meet the needs of the population as a whole as well as defining the major source income as that of licence fees, proved to be a model soon copied by other broadcasting companies in Europe [382]. For orchestras, public radio has been an extremely important element in their existence and development, and in some countries a key element [383].

Another cultural institution of importance to orchestras in Great Britain is the Association of British Orchestras (ABO). The ABO was founded in 1947 as an orchestral employers' union [384]. The association has developed from being an

374 Ibid., p. 11
375 Ibid.
376 (The) Arts Council of England, (1994) p. 1
377 Boylan, Patrick and City University (October 1996), 2:1-3
378 Kenyon (1981), p. 2
379 Ibid., p. 4
380 Ibid., p. 49
381 O'Malley (1994), p. X
382 Ibid.
383 See for example section 2.5. on Norway, p. 45
384 Association of British Orchestras: The Missing Rungs, Report (1994), p. 2

employer's union to becoming a full service organisation for orchestras, covering not only negotiations with the Musicians' Union, but also management training of administrative staff of orchestras as well as research and lobbying.

Orchestral Development in Britain

When describing British orchestral development in summarised form, it is inevitable that many details are left out. It is not the purpose of this study, however, to give an analysis of detailed historical nature, rather to give a general background of the environment and important 'stepping stones' in the development of the orchestras, especially symphony orchestras in Great Britain.

In the recent BBC/Arts Councils Review of National Orchestral Provision from October 1994, the following summary is given as background to the development of the orchestra in Britain:

> For 300 years, orchestras have been created to serve the whims of patrons, the political ambitions of monarchs, the demands of concert audiences and the artistic aims of the musicians themselves. The first great British musical historian, Dr. Charles Burney, believed that the orchestra began in 1607 when Claudio Monteverdi assembled 33 instruments for his opera *Orfeo.* More recently, scholars have concluded that the concept of an 'orchestra' really dates from the second half of the 17th century, with the institutions of the French court, the *petite bande* and *the grande bande* that played the music of Lully.
>
> While the story of the orchestra is the story of the music written for it, it is also the story of institutions. The 24 violins of the English Restoration Court, the Philharmonic Society in London, the concert-giving organisations out of which the Vienna Philharmonic developed, the great orchestras founded by entrepreneurial individuals - all those have been the primary means through which the institution of the orchestra has developed. Some British orchestras are now over a century old ..... [385]

As is indicated from the above quotation, the concept of an 'orchestra' , and therefore of orchestral development, only goes back a few centuries. In order to look at this development in summarised form, it is useful to divide the pre 20th century orchestral history in Britain into periods, like for example the historian Reginald Nettel did in his book, The Orchestra in England, from 1946.

Using Nettel's definition, the pre 20th century orchestral development can be described as follows:

- The Pre-Classical and Classical Orchestras until 1813. This period in

385 BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994), p. 10

England entails Handel's arrival in the country in 1712 [386] as well as other non British composers' involvement in British musical life such as Haydn [387] and J.C. Bach [388].

- The Philharmonic Period, starting with the foundation of the Philharmonic Society in London in 1813 until approximately 1860. The society was active organising concerts during this period, both orchestral, chamber music and solos, as well as commissioning works. The Society amongst other things commissioned a symphony from Beethoven, the Ninth, which had its first London premier in 1825 [389]. This period also saw the founding of other concert societies that were later to become orchestras, such as the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra in 1840 and towards the end of the period, the Hallé in 1858 [390].
- The Nationalist Period from approximately 1860 to beginning of the 20th century. In this period orchestras such as the Royal Scottish National Orchestra (1891 as the Scottish Orchestra) [391] and the predecessor to today's Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra and Bournemouth Sinfonietta in 1893 [392].

In general Nettel maintains that before the 20th century the orchestra as an institution was not given support by the British population as a whole. Although much money was spent on attracting foreign artists to the country the great majority of the lower and lower-middle classes were unfamiliar and uninterested in orchestral music and would not give support towards its establishment. And Nettel goes on to say:

> The story of the symphony orchestra in England is, therefore, a story of foreign instrumentalists visiting our land and striving to establish their art under the peculiar economic and social conditions obtaining here, while British taste, striving at first to resist their influence, failed utterly, and only after two hundred years of foreign domination came to understand that within the framework of this foreign style of music it was possible to make a distinctive contribution, forming as useful an indication of our national character as the effects of our seafaring and colonization do in the scheme of world affairs [393].

Whether or not Nettel's assessment of the situation is correct, it is not until the 20th century that the major permanent orchestras that still exist today in Britain were founded. It would be far too elaborate a process to list every single

386 Nettel (1946), p. 44
387 Ibid., p. 84
388 Ibid., p. 73-75
389 Ibid., p. 133
390 Kennedy (1982), p. 5
391 BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994), p. 87
392 Street and Carpenter (1993), p. 10
393 Nettel (1946), p. 17

orchestra in Britain in this context. It is, however, interesting to look at the different models by which British orchestras today are run, and in that context look briefly at a few examples of orchestras that fit into each category.

Today British orchestras have three principal methods of engaging orchestral musicians:

a) Contracted employment
b) Self-government
c) Freelance engagement [394]

The contracted employment model is currently applied by the regional symphony orchestras as well as all BBC orchestras and the two English regional chamber orchestras (also orchestras of the principal opera companies). This format is based on offering players a year round employment on regular contracted salaries [395]. This system offers the advantages of planning a consistent pattern of work and is also the most common employment model of orchestras in many other countries. All the orchestras in Scandinavia, covered in this study for example, apply this model. The BBC, as a major employer of orchestral musicians, has always taken the view that employing musicians on a contractual basis is the best way of ensuring long-term artistic development, a commitment to new work, and adequate rehearsal time for the extensive repertoire needed for broadcasting [396]. This has been the BBC's policy from the beginning, for example when the BBC Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1930 it was the first time in Britain that players were offered a contract covering fifty two weeks a year [397].

The self government model dates from the foundation of the London Symphony Orchestra in 1904, when forty players left Henry Wood's orchestra to establish this new one [398]. Apart from the LSO the other three big London orchestras the London Philharmonic (founded in 1932 [399]), the Royal Philharmonic (founded in 1946 [400]) and the Philharmonia Orchestra (founded in 1945 primarily as a recording orchestra [401]) are today all run as self governing orchestras, although they were initially created by individuals; the LPO and the RPO by Sir Thomas Beecham and the

394 BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994), p. 19
395 Ibid.
396 Ibid.
397 Kenyon (1981), p. 44
398 Pearton (1974), p. 27-30 and BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994), p. 20
399 Moore (1982), p. 4
400 BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994), p. 88
401 Pettitt (1985), p. 25-26

Philharmonia by Walter Legge [402] . These orchestras are all administered as limited liability companies, which have charitable status by special arrangement with the Charity Commissioners and all have a majority of players as company directors, although the boards now include directors from outside the orchestra. Since 1957, all the self governing orchestras' players have been freelance, paid on a sessional basis, but with the first refusal on any work offered [403] .

The freelance model, engaging players on a one-off basis is a common form of orchestral engagement in Britain and a large number of orchestras use it. This can range from one or two projects per annum to an orchestra where the musicians earn the majority of their annual earnings from the same freelance source (examples of this are the Scottish Chamber Orchestra and the English Chamber Orchestra) [404] . This model, as well as that of self governing orchestras, relies on the ready availability of high quality freelance players.

On the whole the British orchestral scene is characterized by different models that fit into the economic environment in which they operate as well as the 'labour market' for the orchestral work force. In London, where there is a large pool of high quality players, orchestras can be run on a self government or freelance basis. A prerequisite for being able to run an orchestra on this model is the availability of a 'labour market' for orchestral services and this market is larger in London than in other regions of Britain. Regional orchestras would probably find it difficult to use the self government or freelance model for running their orchestras. This is in particular true when competing for the best musicians who can only be attracted to orchestras outside London with prospect of secure stable income, based on contracted employment, since the market for extra freelance work is limited.

As said earlier, it is also felt by many that there are artistic considerations namely that the long term stability and forward planning required for adequate rehearsal time leading to high quality performance, can only be assured by a stable and consistent body of players in the orchestra.

402 BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994), p. 20
403 Ibid.
404 Ibid., p. 21

Chapter 3 - The Survey

3.1. Introduction

The main subject of this thesis are Scandinavian and British orchestras and their relationship to the environment in which they operate, particularly the public sector and political sphere. Embarking on such a project which encompasses a large number of arts organisations with such international profile as symphony orchestras are, it soon became evident that a mere desk study of the problem was in no way adequate in order to establish conclusions based on empirical data. There are various reasons for this.

Firstly, the published material concerning Scandinavian symphony orchestras tends to be incoherent and not accurate enough for the purpose of serious academic research. A lot of the published material is basically promotion literature or in report form, aimed mainly at funding bodies, which in most cases consist of politically elected governments at various levels and their civil services. Such material is also used for image building, aimed at the general public. Often the underlying current is that the orchestra, by publishing this material, is striving to strengthen its position in society and creating a more positive image for serious music, old and new.

Secondly, since the subject of this study is not only Scandinavian orchestras but also a comparison with those in the United Kingdom, it was necessary to create a common empirical database. Only with identical sets of source material can there be an accurate and valid comparison taking into account the international nature of the study.

Thirdly, the available major reports and other publications on the orchestras may often date from different years or even decades. This can make contemporary comparisons impossible due to the changing social reality and attitudes prevailing with regards to the running of a symphony orchestra at different times. Although there is a consistency within most of the Scandinavian countries when it comes to the development of policy towards the role of the symphony orchestra as a national cultural institution, this policy like any other is subject to the overriding changes in national and local politics as well as the changing economic realities each decade presents.

In the course of this research it therefore soon became apparent that in order to be able to draw credible conclusions on the activities of symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and to compare these to the orchestral reality in the United Kingdom, it

was necessary to design and carry out a survey to establish a common database based on comparable issues.

But what is a survey or a poll?

> There is no precise distinction between the terms poll and survey. Both refer to systematic data collection about a sample drawn from a larger population [1].

What constitutes a survey in the context of this project if Bradburn and Sudman's definition from above is used as a prerequisite? One answer can be that it is a reflection of the reality of symphony orchestras in Scandinavia as seen by the people running them. The Scandinavian sample is drawn from a larger population of symphony orchestras worldwide, although it is not meant to be representative of the whole world "population" of symphony orchestras. The data collection reflects the opinions of the people in charge of running the orchestras, the chief executive officers, and the version of this reality as it appears to them. By the concept "reality" in this context, the writer is referring to all the external and internal factors that influence and determine the environment of the orchestra, be it financial, political, artistic or social.

Another way of looking at this subject would be to ask the people who play in the orchestras what their perception of this reality is [2]. Still another approach would be to go to other groups and ask them the same questions. Such groups could include; the audience, local and national politicians or even the general public, both concert goers and/or non-concert goers.

For the purpose of this study it is important to keep firmly focused on one of the main research questions i.e. "how does the environment in which Scandinavian symphony orchestras operate affect the arts management professional who works for them?" It is therefore outside the scope of this study to record the attitudes and views of audiences, orchestra members and the general public. The attitudes of politically elected representatives would be of interest, though it would however in effect reverse the original research question to "how do politicians view arts managers?". Although this question in itself is of some considerable interest when addressing the nature of interaction between politically elected authorities and arts organisations, the author has, within the context of this study, chosen not to include such cross arguments because of the the increased complexity in research such approach would entail and to

---

1 Bradburn & Sudman (1988), p. 2

2 See Allmendinger, Hackman, Lehman (1994). In this study of East and West German, British and American orchestras, the research team from the Department of Psychology at Harvard University, focused mainly on surveying the attitudes of orchestral players of these orchestras, thus approaching the subject from a different angle than done in this author's study. Several cross references to the Harvard study have, however, been done in the survey insofar as asking some questions in a similar fashion, for the purpose of being able to provide some internal comparisons and cross-checks with another international study.

keep the research project within a manageable scale. Furthermore such approach in fact opens up a whole new area of arts management studies, an area that, with reference to the original research questions, is not to be covered by this study.

The present survey was therefore limited to chief executives of Scandinavian and British symphony orchestras and the results based primarily on their responses to the postal survey. It is worth noting however that this survey is not the only source drawn on when approaching the subject of Scandinavian and British symphony orchestras in later parts of this study. In Chapter 4 and 5, there are comparisons between the findings of this survey of attitudes and impressions with the more objective results of annual accounts of the orchestras and other statistical sources, testing whether the subjective reality of findings from the survey corresponds with the orchestras' economic reality as characterized by economic facts. All this data is therefore the basis of the concluding discussion in later chapters.

3. 2. The Paradox of the Survey

3.2.1. Survey as Science

Before proceeding any further it is of interest to examine concept of "the survey" as an entity before applying it to the purpose of academic research. The survey can be based on different prerequisites. It can ask about opinions or facts but reflects at all times the subjective reality of the person answering it and, to a certain point anyway (although this factor should be minimised), the subjective reality of the "surveyor". Taking into account that everyone involved is a fallible human being furthermore increases the possibility of a substantial bias in the findings of a survey.

On the other hand it can also be argued that if the survey is designed, tested and executed in a proper fashion, biasing factors due to human error or inaccuracy should not weigh too heavily in the results, which and therefore give a complete and reliable picture of the reality which is being reflected by the survey. Surveys cannot, however, be completely freed from this paradox of complete scientific accuracy vs. the human factors biasing this accuracy. It can indeed be said that this paradox is somewhat intrinsic in the concept of a survey.

> Surveys rest on a paradox. Although the individual respondents are asked questions about their own behaviour or beliefs, survey researchers are not interested in the respondents as individuals. They are interested in them only insofar as their answers, when combined with others, allow the surveyors to make statements about the population as a whole or significant subgroups of the population [3].

[3] Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 4-5

One can ask whether this paradox deprives surveys of their scientific value Or indeed whether it is appropriate to use the term "science" about surveys and the term "scientific data" about their results. The meaning of the word science is somewhat pluralistic and one of its common meanings is "a body of generally accepted laws" [4] Miller continues in his definition of science and points out that it is the definition of the scientific method and the execution thereof rather than the nature of the knowledge in question that counts:

> But equally common, and more appropriate here, is the definition which focuses on the way in which knowledge is acquired, rather than on the content of the knowledge itself. Knowledge acquired by rigorous, quantified observation; propositions derived inductively from a study of observed data, or tested against it, can quite properly be termed scientific. The scope of the generalisations may be limited, but it would be absurd to require universal applicability before using the term 'science' [5] .

As stated earlier the knowledge approached by surveys is more often than not a subjective one. Due to this fact is it necessary to take great care in designing a survey and testing it properly before going on to gather the knowledge. Belson [6] warns against the pitfalls of surveys, such as generalising from samples too small. The whole issue of paradox linked to a survey can therefore be dependent on the scientific method or the proper methodology applied in all stages of the survey, from first idea to the last presentation of data.

The scientific method itself cannot, however, be completely freed from all paradox. The hypotheses which the method is supposed to support can be proved to be wrong in the long run although the methodology was strictly scientific. Schumann and Presser comment:

> Because we have often found our hypotheses to be wrong and our conclusions in need of amendment, we are well aware that some of the findings and interpretations offered here may turn out to need more than minor adjustment. But data analysis, like psychoanalysis, can go on forever, and it came time to report what we think we have learned thus far [7] .

The perfectly executed survey can therefore not be labelled scientific only because all steps were taken in order to ensure that the scientific process was fault free once the survey was started. A wrong or far fetched hypothesis can also be biasing, it is however more likely than not that faults in the original thinking process behind

---

4 Miller (1983), p. 63

5 Ibid.

6 Belson (1981), p. 3-5

7 Schumann and Presser (1981) Preface, p. X.

the hypothesis are revealed by the scientific process of the survey, as Schuman and Presser (1981) assert. One can indeed say that one of the roles of the scientific process, in this case the survey methodology, is to prove right a hypothesis or more importantly have the intrinsic qualities so that the survey findings can prove the hypothesis to be wrong!

3. 2. 2. Validity

This brings us to the concept of validity of surveys. This can be approached from various angles. Do surveys have any value at all because of their somewhat paradoxical nature in terms of scientific demands or is this not really an issue when looking at the useful source of information they gather? In trying to answer this question one can look at a survey as a whole or at various components of it, such as questions, construction, samples etc. Quality must be a strong factor when looking for answers for this question, regardless of whether one is looking for validity in part or whole.

The following definition of validity by Sudman and Bradburn offers a starting point for this concept:

> Since questionnaires are designed to elicit information from respondents, one of the criteria for the quality of a question is the degree to which it elicits the information that the researcher desires. This criterion is called *validity.* For many types of questions, it is impossible; indeed, for some types of questions, the meaning of the concept of validity is problematic [8] .

There is an distinct difference in the validity of a question that asks for a fact and a question that ask for an opinion. For attitudes the intuitive meaning of validity is not clear [9] and the elasticity in response behaviour that a survey can characterise can certainly be the cause of concern for validity. The fact that respondents (and surveyors) are human beings cannot be overlooked and this factor will always be biasing in the world of surveys. It can however be said that careful design of a questionnaire as well as selection of questions increases the validity of the survey, provided that the surveyor has a clear idea of what information he or she is really looking for.

With reference to the above would it be fair to say that the faults of surveys outweighs their strengths? Although one can quite clearly state that surveys have many faults, it is a most effective way of establishing an overall view of a situation. This can be seen especially in the surveys of élites, under which category this writer's survey on symphony orchestras can be categorised. In these kind of surveys the respondents

---

8 Sudman and Bradburn (1982), p.17

9 Sudman and Bradburn (1982), p. 17; and Goyer (1987), p. 5

have revealed their social origins, in this case they answer the survey in their capacity of C.E.O. of a symphony orchestra. In order to gain maximum results of such a group the sample has to be well selected to make the groups' responses representative

> When élite studies fail to meet the minimum requirements of a sample survey, it is often because they include only a small number of respondents and a non-systematically selected subset of the particular élite population [10].

In this survey all chief executives of symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain, have been included to bypass this problem. This, coupled with a high return of replies furthermore increases the credibility of the survey. These issues will be discussed further under the sub section *Sample* (3.4.) in this chapter.

Having taken into account all of the above arguments the writer argues that the survey, in this case anyway, is a useful measuring tool taking into account the methodology used and population in question. This is in no way meant to generalise about the use of surveys it is however a proper method for research of this nature, hopefully giving data on which the general picture of the reality experienced by chief executives of symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and Great Britain.

3. 2. 3. Confidentiality and Anonymity

A central issue in any survey is the degree of confidentiality and anonymity that the responder experiences. People have often seen the growth in surveys as part of a drift towards an authoritarian information society in which privacy and confidentiality mean nothing [11]. This is no recent view. Ever since the Doomsday Book, William of Normandy's survey of property and produce, presumably to establish a base for taxation, which is reputed to have symbolised a bitterly resented onset of bureaucratic feudal rule [12] and the defeat by the British Parliament of a bill authorising a census [13], surveys have had a reputation of being an authority's way of controlling. Others have simply seen it as a nusance [14].

When describing a group of professionals, or other groups that because of their education or otherwise defined special features can be described as not representing the general public as a whole, it is common in the survey theory literature to use the concept "élite". Using the word élite in this context, carries no subjective value judgment, it is simply used to describe a group of people with special

---

10 Miller (1983), p. 66

11 Goyer (1987), p. 4

12 Norton (1986) as quoted in Goyer (1987) p 4-5

13 Glass (1973), p 17, as quoted in Goyer (1987) p 4-5

14 Goyer (1987) p 4-5

features in the survey context. This author as chosen to use this definition and will describe the chief executives as an élite, simply to be able to relate the discussion of this survey to other literature on surveys by using similar terminology.

In surveys of professional élites one can state that the group's professional integrity is tested as the group is asked about things in their working environment and asked to be honest in their answers. The issue of anonymity and confidentiality is central here as the answers can in many ways be used against the person, specially if the élite is small and people within the sample know each other on a personal basis. The respondent has to feel confident about his anonymity being protected when answering the survey if his answers are not to be biased by discomfort.

Another issue here, especially in a relatively small group of élites, is the issue of "political correctness". If the group is not clearly secure about the confidentiality of the surveyor when handling their replies and, more importantly, keeping their identity anonymous, the trend to express the "correct" view could become a biasing factor in the survey. Is it for example "politically correct" for a chief executive of a Scandinavian symphony orchestra to state that his orchestra could manage without public money? Having operated in an environment where the political norm for national and local government is to support the arts as a part of their ideological basis [15] it can be very difficult for the person in question to express "politically incorrect" views of this nature, if he or she is not secure in feeling that the answers will be treated confidentially.

Despite confidentiality and anonymity however, it is clear that an élite will often not bother to respond to surveys due to conscientious objections. Examples of this are protest letters and notes written to those conducting surveys, as indeed happened during the course of the work for this writer's survey. An indication of the strength of feeling that surveys can cause are the protest letters from would be respondents which have exceeded the mere odd growl and have grown into books. This is particularly interesting in the survey of élites and indeed presupposed that a person who bothers to go to this extent in answering a survey must indeed be a member of an élite. It is questionable whether the non intellectually stimulated respondent would bother with a more radical reaction than throwing a mail survey in the bin or slamming the phone down on a telephone surveyor.

To characterize further this kind of reaction is the following quote from a 712 page book by the American mathematician Serge Lange, which grew out of a protest letter to a questionnaire he had been sent.

---

[15] See for example in Kulturpolitikens inriktning (1995), p. 13 - 18, Council of Europe: National Cultural Policy in Sweden (1990) and Council of Europe: Swedish State Cultural Policy (1990)

> Is there any place in your questionnaire.....to express the opinion that the idea of the questionnaire is stupid....(t)o express the opinion that we have better things to do than answer questionnaires...[16]

Finally, on the same theme, surveys have also occasionally appeared as themes in literature in satirical context. It is a fitting finish to this section on the paradox of the survey to quote an early example of reactions to surveys. As early as 1926 the satirist Stephen Leacock wrote:

> Everybody who manages an office or carries on a profession or teaches in a college is getting to be familiar with the thing called 'questionnaire.' It is a sheet of questions or inquiries sent round broadcast and supposed to deal with some kind of social investigation. Some of these questions come direct from the insane asylums, but others purport to come from students, investigators, and social workers. But whatever they come from, they are rapidly developing into a first class national nuisance [17] .

3. 3. Types of Surveys

Surveys come in various forms. All forms have the common purpose of establishing in one way or another, direct contact with an individual who in an interview, person to person, or over the telephone, or by filling in a postal questionnaire, answers a set of questions. On the other hand the results of different survey methods are hotly debated amongst theroriticians. In the following sections the intention is to look at various forms of surveys and debate how these fit the original research questions of this study and why the option of a postal survey was chosen as a preferred method in collecting data about Scandinavian and British symphony orchestras.

3. 3. 1. Telephone Surveys

Telephone surveys are probably the most common surveys nowadays. Their popularity has amongst other issues depended on the relatively short time it takes between collecting data and presenting results [18] . Since modern society demands speed of information this method is useful when answers are needed for a current issue that would influence an opinion of politicians or decisions made by producers of a certain product, who are testing reactions in order to be able to decide on future policy. The telephone is an effective tool in this data collection, although the design and execution of a telephone questionnaire requires a strict observation of the limitations of such a survey. These limitations are in the first instance the cost of the survey as well as

16 Lang (1981), p. 67, as quoted in Goyer (1987), p. 23

17 Leacock (1926), p.260, as quoted in Goyer (1987), p. 25

18 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p.103

respondents cooperation when receiving a phone call from a perfect stranger asking him or her a bunch of questions in the middle of an exciting television programme or alike. The information collected in telephone interviews furthermore can differ substantially from information collected by other methods, as has been noted by for example Erods and Morgan:

> In a survey conducted on TV viewing, radio listening, newspaper reading, and magazine reading, both mail survey and telephone interview methods were tested. The results agreed about the number of respondents who read, listened to, or watched these media, but there were many more programs, newspapers, and magazines listed on the mail questionnaires than on the phone interviews [19] .

With reference to the above it is clear that telephone surveys have disadvantages when dealing with quantity of data. Researchers claim, however, that the difference in validity of data obtained by telephone interviewing appears not to be consistent or important [20] .

The relevance of a telephone survey for the purpose of this present study is however negligible. Reaching chief executive officers of symphony orchestras on the telephone and perhaps interview them for twenty minutes, not only would have entailed considerable cost, international telephone charges alone, certainly a cost beyond the means of this researcher, but would most certainly have been treated as an unacceptable nuisance in a busy working day for an extremely busy person. Such disturbance by a telephone interviewer would have created a more hostile reaction to the whole survey, potentially jeopardising the set of data collected at the end. One can argue that telephone interviewing is not an appropriate method when doing a survey on an élite such as C.E.O.'s of international symphony orchestras, as these people see time as one of their major assets and rigorously guard this and want to keep control over it at all times. An "intrusion" such as the one described above was therefore judged by the surveyor of this study to be inappropriate.

3. 3. 2. Interview Surveys

> Face-to-face interviewing, despite its cost, is still the method of choice for certain types of studies: studies that require complex reports of behaviour; studies that require interviewers to make an inventory of purchases or an evaluation of housing or neighborhood conditions; and studies that require respondents to see materials as part of the data collection process, or to consult records, or to compare their records with previously reported data. All these studies require face-to face interviews, although in some cases advance contact can be made by mail or telephone [21] .

[19] Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 9-10

[20] Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 102-103

[21] Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 102

With reference to the above it can be stated that face-to-face interviewing is often needed if the study absolutely requires it. It has the advantage of a personal contact and the interviewer is able to question the responder in depth about complex issues. The design of the questionnaire furthermore can cover questions that require the observation of the interviewer rather than by direct answer from the respondent. Complex behaviour and alike can therefore be approached with relative ease, as Bradburn and Sudman [22] discuss.

On the other hand there can also be disadvantages with an interview survey. These are based on the environment in which the survey takes place and the type of persons that take part in the survey either as interviewers or respondents.

One of the problems facing an interview survey is the interview bias and the effects of truthfulness of replies. Poor interviewers and interview cheating can be a problem [23]. Even a well trained group of honest interviewers can even cause problems [24]. The problem of anonymity is perhaps the most relevant here. Anonymity cannot be assured by an interview survey and the respondents' replies can be influenced by the mere presence of another person [25].

The overriding problem however is the issue of cost [26]. Interview surveys either require a group of people interviewing or one person working and travelling extensively for the same purpose, if the sample is small. The time factor here could be biasing also. If the survey is being undertaken by one person, as is the case with this study, the gathering of information could take a long time unless the financial circumstances of the surveyor allowed a quick collection of data. It was however not practical in the context of this survey to apply interviews, although this was considered by its surveyor. The principal reasons for this were the high costs of such interview method as well as the questionable accuracy of data collected by such means. Also, taking into account that the chief executives value the control of their time more than most, it was the considered opinion of the surveyor that it would serve the research no good to jeopardise contacts with the group due to discomfort in the data collection process. It was therefore decided that the interview method would only be applied as a follow up when needed, to supplement findings from the postal survey.

---

22 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 102

23 Evans (1961), as quoted in Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 7-9

24 Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 7-9 also Deming (1944), p. 363, as quoted in Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 7-9

25 Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 7-9

26 See e.g. Goyer (1987), p. 13

3. 3. 3. Postal Surveys

When approaching the subject of surveying an élite the most common method for such type of survey is the postal questionnaire [27]. The successful use of this approach presupposes that the élite in question is sufficiently motivated to answer the questionnaire so a high percentage of returned filled in questionnaires will be returned [28]. Several theoreticians and authorities have spoken out in favour of postal surveys, others however have criticised their use.

Let us first look at some of the advantages of a postal survey. Erods and Morgan list the following advantages of mail surveys:

> .....There are ten major advantages of mail surveys over surveys using other methods of data -gathering:
>
> 1. Wider distribution
> 2. Less distribution bias in connection with the neighborhood
> 3. Less distribution bias in connection with the type of family
> 4. Less distribution bias in connection with the individual
> 5. No interviewer bias
> 6. Better chance of truthful reply
> 7. Better chance of thoughtful reply
> 8. Centralized control
> 10. Cost-saving, resulting in more flexibility per dollar spent [29]

Further to the above, positive remarks of postal surveys has come from authorities for example the United States Department of Commerce:

> Between 1960 and 1965, the Bureau made additional trial runs using the mail approach in four cities of varying sizes and a major metropolitan area.... Results were gratifying. As a result of these pre-tests, the bureau concluded that a census by mail was practical for most parts of the country and that the use of this method in the 1970 Census would result in a better census than one taken by traditional methods, and including the non-recurring cost of developing the new system, would cost less than the 1960 Census when allowances were made for price and workload increases [30].

The postal questionnaire is however only seen as an effective tool of data collection by most researchers if the respondents have had experience in dealing with written material and above-average motivation to participate in the survey [31]. The design and look of the questionnaire is also of importance. A postal questionnaire that

---

27 Kavanagh (1970), as quoted in Miller (1983), p. 35

28 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 103

29 Erods & Morgan (1970), p. 5

30 U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Planning Notes for 1970 Decennial Census," no. 1, p. 2, Mar 17, 1966, as quoted in Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 4

31 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 103

for example is too long will cause problems in response rate [32].

The biggest criticism of postal surveys is however the low response rate they generate. According to Belson it is common to have response rates of the order of 30% or less, (though the response rate may on rare occasions and for some kinds of subject matter be as high as 90%). Belson raises the question of validity here [33]. It can certainly be said that if postal surveys are used for the general public one has to take into account the possibility of a low response rate, simply because the nature of postal surveys rests on a certain volunteer initiative. Although this can be a potentially biasing factor [34] it can also be argued that the accuracy of data offered voluntarily is more likely to give the survey a more in depth understanding of the respondents' replies [35].

It is however a fact that postal surveys, like any other surveys have limitations. The following is a list of limitations as seen by Erdos and Morgan:

1. No mailing list is available
2. The available mailing list is incomplete
3. The available mailing list is biased
4. Subject requires a specially trained interviewer
5. The questionnaire cannot be structured
6. The questionnaire is too long
7. The questionnaire is too difficult
8. The information required is confidential
9. The respondent is not the addressee
10. The available budget is inadequate
11. The available time is insufficient [36]

Bringing this discussion into context of this study of symphony orchestras however, it is important to observe a few issues which make the postal survey the favoured option, despite its limitations.

a. Costs.

Having looked at the issue of costs it it clear that the postal survey is by far the cheapest when doing a survey of an élite that doesn't consist of such a large group of people. (Size of group will be discussed in section 3.4.). Furthermore since the surveyor has no access to the finance needed for a telephone or an interview survey the choice was quite natural. It can however be said that the cost was not the only factor in deciding on this survey method.

---

32 Dillman (1978)
33 Belson (1981), p. 535-536
34 Belson (1981), p. 535
35 Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 8
36 Erods & Morgan (1970), p. 11

b. Nature of Research.

This survey requires anonymity as a bases for truthful answers, because of the size and interaction within the group surveyed. A postal survey is the only form that can offer such anonymity.

c. Time.

All the respondents are very busy top level management executives who value the use of their time more than most other aspect in their working lives. It was therefore a carefully considered opinion that a postal survey would give the respondents freedom to answer it at their own leisure, thereby not risking diminishing the potential good-will of the survey.

d. Motivation.

The surveyor of this study wanted to test his hypothesis that the group in question was a highly motivated group of professionals who would answer the questionnaire, provided that consideration and careful planning, aiming at maximising response ,was taken. This seems to have worked if the high return rate is observed (see later sections of this chapter).

e. Time Span of Survey.

The postal survey form made it possible, taking other circumstances into considerations as described above, to define the reality of the orchestras within a relatively short period of time. The questionnaires were all sent out at the same time, also the follow up mailings. The findings of the survey are therefore a reflection of reality within a tangible period of time.

f. Accessibility.

The way the questionnaire was designed (see section 3.5.) took into account all the above criterion, specially the time needed to fill it in. The surveyor was however careful to ensure that the validity of questions [37] was intact, that is would give the information needed. Questionnaires that are too long can be ineffective as they reduce the response rate and contribute to a potential bias of the survey findings [38].

It has to be kept in mind at all times that this study is dealing with an élite, which although is highly motivated, also is difficult in approaching. For the purposes of truthful replies [39] it was necessary to choose the postal survey, as any other method in approaching this élite would be potentially biasing, even taking into account a potential biasing factor such as political correctness.

[37] Sudman and Bradburn (1982), p. 17

[38] Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 11 and Dillman (1978)

[39] Erods and Morgan (1970)

It is therefore the considered conclusion of the surveyor of this study that a postal questionnaire was the most desirable option when deciding on a research method for the study of Scandinavian and British orchestras.

3. 4. Sample

3.4.1. Sample Selection

When looking at the concept of a survey one of the most important issues in that context is the sample. As discussed earlier the term survey or a poll refer to a systematic data collection about a sample drawn from a larger population [40] . The sample is therefore an important component in the survey work.

One of the pitfalls of surveys is to generalise from very small samples [41] . By taking the views expressed by the respondents of the sample, the whole population's opinions are defined although the definition of the particular sample was to begin with ineffective and/or faulty. Selecting a sample in large surveys that are meant to give a picture of the behaviour or views of a very large population, is a process that requires rigorous routines. Such methodology is however not really relevant in the context of this study. There are several reasons for this.

First of all it is debatable to which extent this study of symphony orchestras is a sample survey at all. As Bradburn and Sudman (1988) point out, a survey is about data collection of a sample from a larger population. In the context of this study, the symphony orchestras of the world would be the largest population available and the sample of Scandinavian and British symphony orchestras could be used to generalise about this population. That is however not the purpose of this study and would produce faulty results anyway, as a group of orchestras in one part of the world can not be used as a sample to generalise about the whole world due to the difference in national and continental external conditions that the orchestras have. Although the symphony orchestra as an entity in itself differs only in small details from one country to the next, a totally different criterion of sample selection is needed if the sample is to be representative of the whole population of symphony orchestras in the world. Furthermore there are different approaches to the orchestras' reality, this study only deals with the attitudes of chief executives which is a subjective reality. Although this approach could be the subject of a survey generalising about symphony orchestras worldwide, it still needs a different criterion for the selection of a sample, if the purpose was a generalisation of the world population of symphony orchestras.

---

[40] Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 2

[41] Belson (1981), p. 3

Selecting the symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and Great Britain was therefore not meant to be a representative sample for the whole world. The purpose was to examine the orchestras within those countries and compare them with each other, noting specially a comparison between the Scandinavian countries as well as Scandinavia as a whole to Britain. No sample of symphony orchestras was selected but all orchestras who met a certain pre-identified criterion were contacted. The selection of the sample was thus not done out of a group of similar organisations, rather all organisations of a certain kind were involved in the survey.

The main criterion in the sample selection was therefore the type of orchestra in a defined geographic area and the findings are not meant to reflect anything else than the existence and environment of these particular organisations. Going even further narrowing down the criterion for the sample is reflecting the original research questions: "Does the direct political involvement local and central governments in the Nordic countries have in the affairs of Nordic symphony orchestras create a healthy cultural policy, in which symphony orchestras can achieve their artistic goals as well as being an important part of the community? Is a high level of government funding necessarily beneficial for the arts management professional in his or her quest to achieve these goals as an orchestra manager and/or policy maker in the Nordic area?"

The author considered it an interesting addition to the comparison within Scandinavia to add the comparative element of British orchestras. The main reason for this is the different environment of financial and political reality that British orchestras have when compared to Scandinavia. One can say that although the five Scandinavian countries are indeed at least five different nations, speaking at least five different languages, the history of social values and attitudes to government has great similarities. The social structure, based on common cultural values, is furthermore more synonymous within Scandinavia and these common perceptions of values are further strengthened through the close cultural and political cooperation between the countries through the Nordic Council and Nordic Council of Ministers [42]. Therefore by including British orchestras in the survey, the author hoped to be able to introduce a comparative element within the scope of this study that would represent a society with a different history of attitudes towards public funding of the arts which makes the reality faced by British orchestras today a different one from most Scandinavian orchestras.

3.4.2. Definition of a "Symphony Orchestra" in The Context of This Study

Giving the prerequisite that the sample of orchestras in question really consists of all the symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain the next question

[42] See Chapter 2

would be what is defined as "a symphony orchestra" within the scope of this study.

The author has chosen this definition:

"A symphony orchestra in this study constitutes a professional orchestra that has a minimum body of around 40 players, who are contracted on fixed period or permanent basis (in Scandinavia) or contracted or part of a free-lance type cooperative (in Britain) and whose main activity is giving public performances of symphonic repertoire, new or traditional and/or recording for radio, television and/or phonograms."

It is therefore a conscious choice to exclude opera orchestras from this sample.

Comparing this definition to other international research of symphony orchestras, there are similarities, as for example with the Harvard research programme:

> ....professional symphony orchestras,.....we defined as ensembles whose primary mission is public performance of those orchestral works generally considered to fall within the standard symphonic repertoire, and whose members are compensated non-trivially for their services [43] .

The author's definition of a symphony orchestra is to a large extent synonymous with Allmendinger, Hackman and Lehman (1994). His definition however is narrower in order to to define more clearly the scope of the research. There are no contradictions in the two definitions, one is simply narrower than the other.

3.4.3. Selection of Orchestras

The definition of the research object has not been problematic so far, but what about the actual selection of orchestras both in Scandinavia and in Britain?

In the five Nordic countries the selection of orchestras according to this criterion was relatively easy. In Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden the orchestras who call themselves symphony orchestras do so quite distinctly. Other orchestras and or ensembles or institutions can be expanded to the size of a symphony orchestra, but the nucleus of their regular activity is not based on the common working routine of a

---

[43] Allmendinger, Hackman and Lehman (1994), p. 1

traditional symphony orchestra [44] . Furthermore the definition of a symphony orchestra is stipulated by the entries in the NOMUS catalogue [45] , where orchestras are given options to register under a special section called "symphony orchestras".

There is therefore no "identity crisis" with symphony orchestras in the four above mentioned countries. In Finland, however, this definition is somewhat more difficult. The concept "town orchestras" or "city orchestras" (Finnish: kaupunginorkesteri) has been used in Finland for a long time and covers both a traditional symphony orchestra as well as ensembles that better fit the definition of the Norwegian and Swedish County Music system. The selection of orchestras in this study however was based on the criteria set forward as a definition of a symphony orchestra, which made the selection of orchestras easier. This selection of Finnish symphony orchestras is furthermore supported by opinions expressed by the Association of Finnish Orchestras [46] .

With reference to the above the following orchestras in the Nordic countries were selected for the purpose of this study:

DENMARK, 6 orchestras:

Aalborg Symfoniorkester - The Aalborg Symphony Orchestra

Aarhus Symfoniorkester - Aarhus Symphony Orchestra

Odense Symfoniorkester - Odense Symphony Orchestra

Radiosymfoniorkestret - The Danish National Radio Symphony Orchestra

Sjællands Symfoniorkester - The Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra

Sønderjyllands Symfoniorkester - Symphony Orchestra of South Jutland

---

[44] In at least two of the Nordic countries, Norway and Sweden, there are musical institutions that overlap with the activity of symphony orchestras and have been set up following initiative by central government. In Sweden this is called "Länsmusiken" (Engl. translation: "County Music") and in Norway "Fylkesmusikken" (Engls. translation: "County Music"). They are in the form of independent foundations that operate in each county. The purpose of these institutions is to increase accessibility to music. Their activities span everything from solo concerts, education work, to symphonic concerts. They do not however hire a group of professional musicians large enough to form a symphony orchestra on a permanent basis, usually they hire a small nucleus of professional musicians and expand occasionally with semi-professionals or amateurs up to a full symphony orchestra size. The non permanence of these ensembles is a criteria that excludes them from this study. (See further in list of references, Regional musikpolitik (1981), Symfonierna och samhället (1989), Musik i försvaret (1981), Ut med musiken (1988), Regionala Musikstiftelser (1991), Länsmusiken 1994 (1995), Regionalt samspel (1979), Musikpolitisk utredning (1986), Bäckström (1992), Musikreformen längst i Norr (1989), Musik för miljoner (1994) and Rapport från Statens Kulturråd (1994).)

[45] The NOMUS catalogue is a catalogue of music organizations in the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, the three autonomous regions Åland (Fin), the Faro Islands (DK) and Greenland (DK), and the three Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The catalogue is published by NOMUS, the Nordic Music Committee, which is a government organisation with representatives appointed by the governments of the five Nordic countries. The representatives are not politicians but active in the musical life in the respective countries. The catalogue is published annually.

[46] See "Symphony Orchestras in Finland"

FINLAND, 12 orchestras [47]:

Helsingin Kaupunginorkesteri/Helsingfors stadsorkester
- The Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra

Joensuun kaupunginorkesteri/Joensuu stadsorkester
- The Joensuu City Orchestra

Jyväskylän Orkester Oy/Jyväskylä Orkester AB
- The Jyväskylä Symphony Orchestra

Kuopion Kaupunginorkesteri/Kuopio Stadsorkester
- The Kuopio City Orchestra

Lahden Kaupunginorkesteri/Lahtis stadsorkester
- Sinfonia Lahti

Oulun Kaupunginorkesteri/Uleåborgs Stadsorkester
- The Oulu City Orchestra

Porin kaupunginorkesteri/Björneborgs stadsorkester
- The Pori City Orchestra

Radion Sinfoniaorkesteri/Radions Symfoniorkester
- The Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra

Tampereen Kaupunginorkesteri/Tammerfors Stadsorkester
- The Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra

Tapiola Sinfonietta/Esbo Stadsorkester
- The Espoo City Orchestra

Turun Kaupunginorkesteri/Åbo Stadsorkester
- The Turku Philharmonic Orchestra

Vaasan Kaupunginorkesteri/Vasa Stadsorkester
- The Vaasa City Orchestra

ICELAND, one orchestra:

Sinfóníuhljómsveit Íslands - Iceland Symphony Orchestra

NORWAY, 6 orchestras:

Bergen Filharmoniske Orkester - Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra

Kringkastningsorkestret - Norwegian Radio Orchestra

Kristiansand Symfoniorkester - Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra

Oslo Filharmoniske Orkester - Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra

Stavanger Symfoniorkester - Stavanger Symphony Orchestra

Trondheim Symfoniorkester - The Trondheim Symphony Orchestra

---

[47] Since Finland is a bilingual country, where both Finnish and Swedish are official languages the names of the orchestras will be written in alphabetic order according to their names in Finnish, with the official Swedish name afterwards followed by an English translation

SWEDEN, 7 orchestras:

Gävle Symfoniorkester - Gävle Symphony Orchestra
Göteborgs Symfoniker - Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra
Helsingborgs Symfoniorkester - Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra
Kungliga Filharmoniska Orkestern
- Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra
Malmö Symfoniorkester - Malmö Symphony Orchestra
Norrköpings Symfoniorkester - Norrköping Symphony Orchestra
Sveriges Radios Symfoniorkester - Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra

The total number of orchestras in the five Nordic countries is therefore 32. Further information about each of the Nordic orchestras, the population of the countries, cities and towns where they operate, and an outline of their formal organisational structures can be seen in Appendix 6.

Although the selection of the Nordic orchestras was relatively straight forward, the selection of British orchestras studied presented slightly different challenges. In order to establish a contact list of orchestras the Association of British Orchestras provided a list of their full member orchestras. The association does not have distinct division between "symphony orchestras" and "chamber orchestras" although the ABO has a special category of membership called OMTF (Opera and Music Theatre Forum) as well as other categories such as associate membership and affiliate membership [48]. By comparison the American Symphony Orchestra League, on the other

48 The Association of British Orchestras has in recent years developed from being a pure employers' organisation to also being more of a service organisation for the British orchestras and their employees, offering for example training courses for administrative personnel as well as networking different groups within the orchestras' administrative structure (such as by organising regular meetings for e.g. education officers, marketing managers etc.)

hand, divides orchestras into categories according to sizes of budgets [49] . .

It was therefore quite difficult to determine which orchestras were indeed chamber orchestras and which were symphony orchestras. Or more precisely, which orchestras identified themselves as symphony orchestras and which ones identified themselves as chamber orchestras? Taking into consideration the original definition of a symphony orchestra earlier on in this chapter, the case of British orchestras presented a problem. It was necessary for comparison with the Scandinavian sample to use the size of around 40 players as a distinct feature, due to the definition the Scandinavian orchestras use for themselves. When relating to British orchestral environment it is however not at all a given fact that an orchestra of 40 players would call itself a "symphony orchestra". The term "chamber orchestra" would probably be more common.

As an example of a British definition of "an orchestra" it can be pointed out that the Arts Council of England when funding the Eastern Orchestral Association (supporting orchestral concerts through Eastern and East Midlands regions which have no resident orchestras) defines an "orchestral" concert as being one with 24 players or more on the concert platform [50] . This however, does not make the definition of a symphony orchestra vs. chamber orchestra any easier.

Having taken all this into consideration the author decided to include all full members orchestras of the Association of the British Orchestras who otherwise met the criterion of the sample definition. Because the questionnaire form (see Appendix 1) distinctly mentions the concept "symphony orchestra" the author hoped that the chief executives who identified their orchestra as something else would notify this in their replies. This prediction proved to be right. Many of the returned questionnaires indicated that the chief executives in question indeed had crossed out the words

---

[49] American Symphony Orchestra League divides their membership for orchestras into categories according to the size of the orchestras' budgets:

U.S. orchestras:

Total Expenses	League Dues
up to $25,000	$ 124
$25,001-$50,000	$ 217
$50,001-$125,000	$ 310
$125,000-$4,125,000	.00248 times total expenses, not to exceed $5,115
over $4,125,001	.00124 times total expenses, not to exceed $20,500

Canadian Orchestras	1/3 of the above, but not less than US$ 124
International Orchestras	US$124

(source: American Symphony Orchestra League Administration, fax to author from Monica Buffington, March 22, 1996).

[50] Criteria agreed with Arts Council for grants to local authorities in the region in support of their orchestral concert promotions: personal communication, Patrick Boylan (local authority member representative 1985 - 1990)

"symphony orchestra" and put in "chamber orchestra" instead. The questionnaires identified in this manner were not included in the final statistical analysis.

Nevertheless, this situation stilll has the possibility for a slight bias with the questionnaires that where returned from chamber orchestras who didn't identify themselves as such. This bias is however negligible, mainly due to the fact that the chamber orchestras usually have less contact with politically elected government and one would expect them to answer the questionnaire in a manner that would indicate that. Looking at the replies for each question later in this chapter, however, one can see that the level of replies for all the orchestras in question does not differ radically for any of the orchestras or any of the questions. Statistically the answers from any group of orchestras will therefore hardly influence the outcome of the overall effect. The potential bias has furthermore been diminished by excluding the answers from the self identified chamber orchestras.

The list of British orchestras to which the survey was sent is as follows (further information about each of the British orchestras: the population of the cities and towns where they operate, and an outline of their formal organisational structures can be seen in Appendix 6):

1. Academy of London
2. Academy of St. Martin in the Fields, London
3. BBC National Orchestra of Wales, Cardiff
4. BBC Philharmonic, Manchester
5. BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra, Glasgow
6. BBC Symphony Orchestra, London
7. BT Scottish Ensemble, Glasgow
8. Birmingham Contemporary Music Group
9. Bournemouth Orchestras, Bristol and Bournemouth
10. Brandenburg Consort, Bath
11. Britten Sinfonia, Cambridge
12. City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra
13. City of London Sinfonia
14. City of Oxford Orchestra
15. Corydon Orchestra, London
16. East of England Orchestra, Nottingham
17. English Camerata, Leeds
18. English Classical Players, London
19. English Northern Philharmonia, Leeds
20. English Sinfonia, Bedfordshire
21. English String Orchestra, Worcestershire

22. Guildford Philharmonic Orchestra
23. Halle Concerts Society (i.e. Hallé Orchestra), Manchester
24. London Handel Orchestra
25. London Jupiter Orchestra
26. London Mozart Players
27. London Sinfonietta
28. London Soloists Chamber Orchestra
29. London Symphony Orchestra
30. Manchester Camerata
31. Milton Keynes City Orchestra
33. Mozart Orchestra Sinfonia, Coventry
34. New London Orchestra
35. New Queens Hall Orchestra, London
36. Northern Sinfonia, Newcastle
37. Orchestra da Camera, London
38. Orchestra of St John's Smith Square, London
39. Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment, London
40. Philharmonia Orchestra, London
41. Philomusica of London
42. Regent Sinfonia of London
43. Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Society
44. Royal Philharmonic Orchestra, London
45. Royal Scottish National Orchestra, Glasgow
46. Scottish Chamber Orchestra, Edinburgh
47. Sinfonia 21, London
48. The London Philharmonic
49. The Orchestra of the Golden Age, Cheshire
50. Ulster Orchestra, Belfast
51. Wren Orchestra of London

Using this researcher's definition, the sample of British orchestras consisted of 51 orchestras, bringing the total number of orchestras in this study to 83.

It has to be kept in mind, with reference to survey methodology, that the orchestras where only approached through the chief executive and the answers to the questionnaire are only his or her reflection of the orchestral reality. One can however presume that the respondent in this case is an educated highly motivated professional whose curiosity was aroused by the survey and with their participation in the survey must have had some sort of professional satisfaction [51] . Due to the pressure on the

[51] Institute For Social Research (1969), p.1-3, as quoted in Goyer (1987), p. 13-14

chief executive in his or her daily routine, the author would like to think that this curiosity was the reason for the high response rate rather than factors based only on 'education' of the respondent by the surveyor informing about the importance of the survey [52] .

3. 5. Design of Questionnaire

3.5.1. Prerequisites

When starting to create a data base for a research of this nature it is desirable for the researcher to gather as much information as possible from a large number of subjects (i.e. orchestras in this case) in many countries for the purpose of supporting and defining any conclusions reached. It is however necessary in this context to take into account the practical and above all financial limitations that are presented to the researcher forcing him to choose his priorities methodologically in a very careful manner. It was evident within the context of this research that it was necessary to make a choice of this nature. It was necessary to limit the volume of information and use a method that would 'extract' the data from the participating orchestra managers guaranteeing a high level of response. It was therefore a conscious choice to present the survey in the form it was presented, emphasising features in the methodology structure designed with the objective of ensuring a high response. Some of these features are characterized below:

a) the questionnaire was easy to fill in
b) it took a short time to fill in
c) a stamped addressed envelope was enclosed for the return of the filled in survey, both to show the serious intention of the surveyor in gathering the responses as well as ensuring that the time saving factor would be maximised and managers would not see the time spent writing of envelopes and sticking stamps on them as a barrier to completing the survey.

Before setting out to design the questionnaire, the above three factors were kept strongly in mind. Among the other important factors were language, and question selection.

---

[52] Barnette (1950), p.398, as quoted in Goyer (1987), p.13-14

3.5.2. Language

The sample covered by this study crosses several language communities. The languages in question are English, Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish. The author considered carefully whether to translate the survey into each one of those languages before sending them to the chief executives to be answered. He decided against that in the end for the following reasons:

a) in any translation there is always a risk for a slight differentiation in the 'texture' of a question. The risk for a semantic misunderstanding of even the simplest of statements is always present in a translation. Taking into account that the questionnaire would have to be translated into five languages apart from English increases this risk. Although the author has command of five of these six languages, he would have had to rely on outside help for the Finnish translation thereby loosing the over all control effect, which is one of the big advantages of postal surveys [53] .

b) there was considerable risk that 'language bias' would have arisen from the problems set forth in (a) thereby affecting the nature of the outcome of the survey.

c) although English is the second language of the chief executives of the Scandinavian orchestras, prior personal experience confirmed that they are used to communicating in English on an everyday basis. The questions in the questionnaire were not linguistically complicated, thereby not causing risk for misunderstandings. Having the questionnaire in English might even have encouraged some of the chief executives to answer, or as one Scandinavian arts manager said to the author in a personal interview: "A survey coming from the outside, in English, will probably be more interesting than a local one and generate more replies"[54] . The final decision was therefore to send the questionnaires in one language only, English.

3.5.3. Question Form: Open/closed questions, Questions vs. assertions

As outlined previously it was the conscious decision of the author to present the questions in the form of assertions or statements, as this form had the advantages needed for this particular research. There are however other possibilities of asking questions in such a survey and it is fitting that some of these possibilities are also presented in the general discussion of the design of the questionnaire.

The main distinctions in presentation of questions in questionnaires are

---

53 Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 5

54 Ros-Mari Djupsund, Manager of the Association of Finnish Orchestras, in a personal interview with the author in March 1995, private papers.

questions that are open and questions that are closed. Open questions are ones that respondents are allowed to answer in their own words; the responses are later turned into categories that can be quantified through a process of coding. Closed or precoded questions are those that constrain the respondents' answers by giving the response categories from which they choose an answer - for example, "agree strongly, agree, disagree, disagree strongly." [55]

Theoreticians do not agree which form of questions is better suited for surveys. Bradburn and Sudman [56] claim that they have not found any overall superiority for either open or closed questions but go on to say that other experienced researchers believe that closed questions produce more relevant and comparable responses. There are however researchers who say that although they do not endorse one category above the other, open and closed questions elicit quite different responses [57]. For the purpose of this study the choice was closed questions. The argument for that is mainly that, as mentioned earlier, the time factor in answering the questionnaire had to be taken into serious consideration when eliciting a large response rate. By this it is meant that the chief executives use their time efficiently and are more likely to reply to a survey that has a set of closed questions and takes a short time to fill in rather than to write answers themselves.

As an example of this a previous Italian questionnaire containing open questions only, requiring quite a bit of information, was quoted. The orchestral chief executive referring to it put it aside, "to do later" as he said to the author, but in the end never got around to doing it. It was simply too time consuming, the chief executive confessed, adding that in contrast he had returned the questionnaire of this author's study because of ease with which it could be filled in and the limited time required [58].

The other argument in favour of choosing closed questions is that the statistical processing will be easier and this will produce more comparable sets of answers rather than categories of answers. Since the aim of this study is to compare the same cultural entity (i.e. a symphony orchestra) internationally it was further considered necessary to have as close a basis of comparison as possible in order to highlight the difference that may be due to national policy or similar cultural factors.

The choice of the closed question for the purpose of this research is therefore a natural one. Although there are probably ways to conduct this survey otherwise this option has the most favourable odds when taking the whole picture of the survey environment into account.

---

55 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 147-148

56 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 147

57 Schumann and Presser (1981), as quoted in Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 147-148

58 Klas Mossling C.E.O. of the Gävle Symphony Orchestra, Sweden, in an interview with the author in August 1995, private papers.

3.5.4. Testing and Piloting of the Questionnaire

Before sending the questionnaire as will be described in 3.5 8. the author tested the questionnaire in a pilot sample survey, and at this point it is appropriate to look into what those two concepts, testing and piloting, mean in the context of survey technique.

Above all "testing the questionnaire" refers to testing if the questions are likely to be misunderstood or misinterpreted [59] . Piloting a questionnaire means that the surveyor delivers the questionnaire to a small sample of people of the sort the questionnaire was designed for, noting their reaction to the questionnaire and trying to focus any difficulties that potentially arise from the questionnaire design in the reply process [60] .

The first version of the questionnaire of this study was sent to a number of people for testing. These involved, the author's then university supervisor, chief executives at organisations such as NOMUS (the Nordic Music Committee , Swedish Theatre Association (an employers' organisation which also covers orchestras the Association of British Orchestras as well as colleagues working on similar research at Harvard University. The testing process proved to be extremely useful and all the people in question offered their opinions and remarks. The main criticism of the early version of the questionnaire was that it demanded too much information and hence that it would take too much time for the chief executives to fill in, jeopardising the response rate of the survey. The author took this criticism seriously and simplified the questionnaire, although keeping in mind the validity issue, in other words which information he wanted to elicit from the survey. The author furthermore changed the form of many questions from open to close and adjusted the code for answers to a set of numbers from 1 to 7 ranging from the answer "Very inaccurate" 1 to "Very accurate" (7) [61] . After redesigning the questionnaire the author tested it again with some of the same people and got a few comments concerning questions that required minor adjustments.

The questionnaire was piloted with a small group of orchestra chief executives and no difficulty reported in the reply procedure.

3.5.5. Question selection

When choosing questions for a questionnaire of this nature the first criteria the surveyor has to ask himself is that of validity [62] . In other words do the questions

[59] Belson (1986), p. 29

[60] Belson (1986), p. 26

[61] see Allmendinger et al. (1994)

[62] Sudman and Bradburn (1982), p. 17

elicit the information that the surveyor wants? Another issue in selecting the questions is their form. The author decided in the end not to present the individual questions in interrogative form but to write them as assertions to which the respondent could answer by writing a number from 1-7. This form of closed question/assertion format has already been discussed in the chapter (3.5.3.). The reason for selecting this form was primarily to match similar research comparing various aspects of orchestras in other international research of orchestras [63] as well as ensuring easy access for the respondent thereby increasing possibilities for a high response rate. Researchers into survey methodology furthermore support the view that there is little or no difference in results from identical surveys presented either in interrogative form or in the form of assertions [64].

At the same time it has been said that almost every survey question is a subject to criticism [65]. If questions are to achieve their purpose however, it is necessary to start out by presenting them as statements, as to specify the class of information wanted out of them [66]. Since this form of a statement/assertion, even in the final form, has not proved to be biasing in the results of surveys (Schumann and Presser 1981) this initial form of the question in the question design procedure was also chosen as final form due to the advantages described above.

Going back to discussing the question selection in the purpose of validity it is necessary to look briefly at the questions as to establish the thought behind their selection. The questionnaire in its final form can be seen as Appendix 1.

It was decide to present in the questionnaire a number of assertions, and to invite the respondents to grade their response to each assertion in terms of agreement or disagreement with it on a standard seven point scale as detailed below:

1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.
2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.
3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.
4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.
5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their

63 Allmendinger, Hackman and Lehman (1994). This study used a scale of graded answers ranging from 1 to 7 ("Very Inaccurate" (1) to ""Very Accurate"(2)) in Section One of their survey. The questions of this survey, however, are more directed towards the inner workings of a symphony orchestra rather than the orchestra as unit in society.

64 Schumann and Presser (1981), p. 226-229

65 e.g. Schumann and Presser (1981), p. 12-13

66 Belson (1986), p. 23

support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

21. My orchestra could do better musically.

22. My orchestra could do better financially.

23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.
26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).
27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.
28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.
29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.
30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.
31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.
32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.
33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.
34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

To these questions the respondents where given the option of putting numbers as answers, indicating the strength of feeling towards each of the assertions. The scale is as follows:

1 Very Inaccurate
2 Mostly Inaccurate
3 Slightly Inaccurate
4 Uncertain
5 Slightly Accurate
6 Mostly Accurate
7 Very Accurate

Looking at the questions as a whole they are intended to discern the

attitudes of orchestral chief executives in a number of key areas, especially the financial status and the artistic quality of the orchestra as well as the local community support, media coverage, administrative structure, musicians, politicians, communication with authorities, local and national and national cultural policy as presented by national governments. Other objectives were to ascertain attitudes towards funding mix, and their job satisfaction and their attitudes towards and evaluation of the civil service bodies and individuals with whom they have professional relationships.

The range of questions/assertions were carefully selected to elicit an overall view of the orchestra's and the chief executive's reality, both as reflected inward as well as compared with the environment of operation, covering the local and national community as well as government factors. The wording of the questions and the possible biasing effect this may have will be discussed in sub-section 3.6. together with other effects that might affect the outcome of the survey.

The researcher's final selection of questions attempts to reflect the objectives set out in the original research questions, and was intended also to constitute a basis for further discussion (examined in later chapters). These may not cover everything one would like to know about the orchestras. It is however important to keep in mind at all times the scope of the survey and focusing on getting a high response rate thereby having an overall view of the whole survey from beginning to end.

3.5.6. Look of Questionnaire

The look of postal questionnaires are a factor influencing the response rate they generate. Older research suggests that the rule of thumb is: The fewer the pages, the higher the percentage of return [67]. Other researchers point out that paradoxically, short questionnaires yield lower response than long ones, in their tests, stating however that this was only as a zero-order (bivariate) effect related to other inputs [68]. All researchers seem to agree that other factors come into question here such as importance of topic [69].

The questionnaire of this study was four pages long, printed with rather large print and made to look appealing for the eye by not having the lines too close together. The four page questionnaire is by Erdos and Morgan [70] considered to be the upper limit of questionnaire length.

These authors also warn against using the booklet format of a questionnaire and claim that a letter size questionnaire will do better than the booklet, which they say

---

67 Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 39-40

68 Goyer (1987), p. 37

69 Goyer (1987) and Erods and Morgan (1970)

70 Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 39-40

looks less personal and more commercial than flat pages [71]. Other researchers however recommend the use of the booklet form, ."...for ease in reading and turning pages and to prevent lost pages" [72].

With all the printed material that comes through the letter boxes of modern homes and offices, most of which is labelled 'junk mail', the author came to the conclusion that a simple clear four page questionnaire on A4 size paper would be most effective in this context and would not be lost in the mountain of beautifully printed brochures that arrive at the chief executives' offices, be they junk mail or not.

3.5.7. Procedure

In this study, when sending out the questionnaire the procedure was as follows:

1. An introductory letter (Appendix 2), (in Britain) a letter of support from the Association of British Orchestras (Appendix 3) and the four page questionnaire [73] (Appendix 1), was sent to all the orchestras on Friday May 26, 1995. Included in the package was a stamped addressed envelope for the return of the questionnaire.

2. The first follow up letter (Appendix 4) was sent to all the orchestras on the 28th of June 1995.

3. The second follow up letter (Appendix 5) was sent on the 20th of August 1995, together with a new copy of the questionnaire (21) and a further stamped addressed envelope.

The returned answers will be discussed in section 3.8. of this chapter.

3. 6. Errors and Biases

When approaching a research topic through a survey, the risk of errors and biases must be considered. Surveys are by nature paradoxical (as discussed earlier in section 3.2.) and their findings can be manipulated and misused. In order to take full advantage of the survey as a research tool, it is necessary for the user of survey data to understand the sources of error and the limitations that such errors may put on the

[71] Erods and Morgan (1970), p. 39-40

[72] Sudman and Bradburn (1982), p. 230

[73] The questionnaires were not numbered or otherwise uniquely marked as the chief executives were promised anonymity. The only distinguishing factors were in the upper left hand corner, saying which country they where going to, and whether it was the first or second mailing of the questionnaire (the second mailing was marked with a •).

interpretations of the data [74]. Although it is rarely, if ever, possible to make an error-free measurement (even in the so-called exact sciences), it is the understanding of these potential errors and biases that can potentially help steer clear of 'dangerous' pitfalls during the course of the survey.

In relation to this research the following possible sources of error and bias were considered in some detail, and are discussed in the following sections:

1. sample bias
2. agree/disagree bias
3. question wording effects
4. question order effects
5. accuracy of data: behavioural vs. opinion data
6. non-responses: how do they affect the results?
7. primacy effects in replies
8. interviewer bias

3.6.1. Sample Bias

Bias can arise when the samples are not selected by appropriate sampling rules (whether random or pre-determined) and/or when there is failure to obtain data from some members of the selected sample [75]. In other words when the criteria for selecting the sample is defective or produces an inadequate proportion of responses the data obtained will be suspect and less valuable. Examples include a survey where the respondents select themselves as participants in a survey rather than being selected by an impersonal method (as with the increasingly common phone-in "opinion" poll in response to particular press or television broadcast or campaigns). In some cases there is a very real possibility that the respondents' views on particular topics will affect significantly their decision to participate or not and that such a correlation between them will seriously distort the distribution of the responses [76].

In the context of this study the possibility of such a sample bias has to be taken seriously. Since the target sample chosen was that of chief executives of orchestras there was a real possibility that this group could be strongly influenced in their attitudes as to the reality of their own orchestra's inner and outer reality. On the other hand, however, as discussed in section 3.4., the selection of the sample of chief executives of symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain was only intended to represent the views of that particular group. The sample was not meant to be more

74 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p.179

75 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 183-184

76 Bradburn and Sudman (1988) p. 184

generally representative of either all symphony orchestras in the world, of all views within a possibly quite diverse organisation or any other universal reality of the orchestra world more generally.

In this respect, the author is confident that such sample bias factor has been kept to a minimum, bearing in mind that it is primarily self-perceptions of orchestra chief executives that is being analysed in the study.

3.6.2. Agreeing-Response Bias

Agreeing-response bias, or acquiescence (or yea-saying), refers to a presumed tendency for respondents to agree with attitude statements presented to them [77]. It is known that in surveys this bias can be considerable, most typically as a reflection of what the respondent sees as socially acceptable behaviour.

In the context of this study there is certainly danger of this biasing effect. When looking for example at questions no. 10 ("The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work") and no. 23 ("The musicians are an undisciplined lot"), one could expect acquiescence to happen. On the other hand, since the respondents are given seven possible levels of response, not only to agree or disagree, the acquiescence effect ought to be minimised. Also previous research has noted that the risk of such acquiescence increases with lower education standards and even for certain groups in society such as ethnic minorities [78]. On the whole although the acquiescence factor cannot be written off completely as a potential bias in this survey, it is considered to be highly unlikely that it will be a significant factor given the education and status of the sample in question as well as the rating scale used.

3.6.3. Question Wording Effects

The wording of a question can be a very significant source of bias. Some researchers go as far as saying that question wording effects can be the greatest single source of bias in surveys [79]. It is true that the wording of a question is the key to understanding what sort of information is wanted from the respondent by the surveyor. Again researchers into survey technique consider that this effect is stronger when less

---

77 Schumann and Presser (1981), p. 203

78 Lenski and Legget (1960), as quoted in Schumann and Presser (1981), p. 206-207

79 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 186

3.6.5. Primacy Effects in Replies

Primacy effects in replies occur at times in surveys when the respondent has a tendency to agree with the first set answer in a close question format set of answers [86]. Research into several surveys showed that this effect was also present, even though the order of the set answers was reversed. Furthermore no interaction with education, age or sex were discovered [87].

When relating the possibilities of primacy effects in the replies to this survey, these effects cannot be ruled out totally. It is however worth looking at the general design of the questionnaire which could counteract the potential for primacy effects.

The set answers to the questions are not presented in such way that the respondent starts off by reading the top line and then goes on towards other possibilities (see Appendix 1). All the possible answers (1-7) are written at the top of the page, from left to right, and although it could possibly be argued that primacy effects occur because one reads the page from left to right, one could equally argue that when the page is divided into squares, like has been done with the answers in this study, the eye would tend to start gravitating towards the middle of the scale, rather than to the left. Although primacy effects cannot be ruled out, one can state however, that through the visual presentation of the answers on the page such as has been done in this study, diminishes the possibility of the occurrence of such bias.

3.6.6. Accuracy of Data: Behavioural vs. Opinion Data

In the field of survey research, opinions have been expressed claiming that although one can check the accuracy of behavioural data one cannot do so with respect to opinion data. This is relevant in the context of this survey as the results from the questionnaire reflect opinions and not the behaviour of the respondents. Recent research on survey technique is unsympathetic to this view [88], though it is stressed, that opportunity should be taken to check the results of a survey against any available direct criterion of 'truth' [89].

This has been an important point in the methodology adopted for this study. The survey forms only a part of the research and its results are compared against a more objective 'truth' - i.e. the economic status of the orchestras as presented in the end of year accounts and other sources (see Chapter 4). The accuracy of the survey data is therefore supplemented by an objective measurement, thereby giving the opinions

86 Quinn and Belson (1969), as quoted in Schumann and Presser (1981), p. 73
87 Schuman and Presser (1981), p. 73
88 Belson (1986), p. 22
89 Belson (1986), p. 33

expressed in the survey results a more concrete reflection. Since all the chief executives are presumed to be interested in and motivated by their working environment one can expect them to have answered the questions accordingly. The biasing effect of "do not know" answers should therefore be minimal (although not completely absent, see later in this chapter). This bias is only strong however if the respondents do not know much about the subject or are not interested in it [90]. That cannot be said about the group of chief executives in question.

3.6.7. Non-Responses: How do they affect the results?

Non responses in a survey can be a biasing factor. Alhough most survey studies are based on an assumed reality of a maximum of 65 % return rate, the response rate can be higher: up to 100% if the financial and methodological means exist in the context of the survey [91]. The multi-dimensional nature of survey non-response helps counteract such bias, however, so that one component of non-response at times can help nullify another [92]. The nature of non-response has been tested by many researchers and the general conclusion has been that two factors, education and interest in (or familiarity with) the topic under investigation, are among the most important influences in the return of mail questionnaires [93].

In the context of this study the non-responses are a factor worth taking into account, though the percentage is low, and looking at the similarities in the replies one would not expect the non-respondents to answer the questionnaire much differently than the respondents. With reference to the education and status of the élite in question, once again this factor should help counteract the effects of any such bias. Furthermore, referring to the sample selection arguments, the non-response effect, on the whole appears to be low.

One cannot ignore the possibility that non-response to individual questions in the survey is likely to be a factor of influence. However, the questions to which some respondents left no answers or wrote "not applicable" had mainly to do with board structure and board personalities. Most such replies came from radio orchestras most of which don't have special orchestral boards as such. These orchestras do not have to interact with government on a political level, be it nationally or locally, but also are a part of an internal political structure of radio stations, organisations often so large and complicated that one could state that this reality had it own set of prerequisites

---

90 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 8

91 Goyer (1987), p. 6-7

92 Goyer (1987), p. 187

93 Suchman and McCandless (1940 and 1947) and Donald (1960), as quoted in Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 146

Furthermore, since many of the radio stations in question are run on licence fee, according to the 'BBC model', one can furthermore argue that their whole existence should be approached separately and that they have little in common with other orchestras. However, that public service radio stations come under the influence of the government and its policies in the countries in question and are therefore not immune to the power and influence of politically elected government, is also a fact worth noting in this context.

3.6.8. Interviewer Bias.

Although interviewer bias is hardly relevant in the context of this survey, it is interesting to look briefly at its significance.

The human factor in survey technique cannot be avoided. Although a postal survey bypasses this bias completely, interviewer bias can be a serious problem in surveys based on face to face or even telephone interviews. The causes can be various, including poor interviewers or interviewer cheating, but even a well trained group of honest interviewers can cause bias [94]. As Deming (1944) puts it:

> Variation attributable to the interviewer arises from many factors: the political, religious, and social beliefs of the interviewer; his economic status, environment and education. Also, perhaps, most interviewers can not help being swayed in the direction of their employers' interest [95].

Other factors such as the clothing, tone of voice, urgency, and manners of an interviewer may also influence the answers [96]. Furthermore there is a better chance of a truthful reply in a postal survey, since the respondent is not under pressure to conform to the interviewer in any way. His or her anonymity is also protected in a postal survey, so fear of exposure or 'political correctness' is therefore not a biasing factor if the interviewer role is non-existent.

Consequently this kind bias does not occur in the context of this particular kind of study. Further arguments for choosing a postal questionnaire as the primary research method have already been discussed in this chapter (3.3.3.).

---

94 Evans (1961) and Deming (1944), as quoted in Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 7-9

95 Deming (1944), as quoted in Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 7-9

96 Erdos and Morgan (1970), p. 8

3.6.9. Errors and Biases: A Summing Up

Belsons's statement (1986), that:

> ....accuracy from survey questions or measuring instruments cannot be taken for granted [97] .

is quite worrying. It implies that at all times knowledge of potential errors is the key to a successful survey. Belson continues by saying that 'accuracy is an achievement', sometimes even against the odds.

It is clear that as with most if not all other research methods surveys can never represent a universal truth. It is therefore necessary to map out the possible pitfalls, the potential errors and biases, and to try to steer clear of these as much as possible right from the very start of a survey, taking into account all aspects of the survey, sample, design and other aspects of the survey work.

It can also be said however that if carefully administered surveys can give valuable information about a given subject, be it a survey based on facts, behaviour or opinions. The fear of errors must not be so great that one abandons the survey as a method altogether. Bradburn and Sudman (1988) are reassuring on this:

> Even though we have discussed a number of sources of error, the reader should not conclude that surveys are so hopelessly error prone that we can learn nothing form them. Many sources of error work in opposite directions and tend to cancel out one another. Many of the error types contribute to decreased precision of estimates but do not contribute importantly to overall bias [98] .

It was considered necessary in this study to analyse in detail the possible error and biasing effects in the context of this study, as much as it was to evaluate the whole questionnaire design process and the execution of the survey. It is however the author's considered view that with reference to the considerations examined in this chapter the survey of perceptions of Scandinavian and British orchestras as reflected by the orchestras' chief executives have given valuable information on the status of the orchestras in these countries and is useful a measurement tool in the continuing discussion in the subsequent chapters.

---

97 Belson (1986), p. 20

98 Bradburn and Sudman (1988), p. 192

3.7. The Returned Questionnaires - Answers

In the following sections the intention is to examine in detail statistics derived from the returned questionnaires, and later to draw conclusions from them. The presentation here is a simple one: the replies to each question is given as an average of the scale 1-7 responses, for each country (as well as a grouping of the Scandinavian countries together in one average score for comparison with Britain). The findings from the survey will be used further in more detail both on their own and together with information from other sources, and analysed in order to develop arguments for the final discussion and conclusions of this thesis.

3.7.1. Return of Answered Questionnaires

The following table shows the number of orchestras and number of replies received from each country as well as percentages of returned replies out of the whole sample.

Table 3.1. Returned replies from survey

	No. of orchestras surveyed	Replied by January 19, 1996	Percentages of replies
Britain	51	40	70.4 %
Nordic countries as a whole	32	29	87.9 %
Denmark	6	5	83.3 %
Finland	12	11	92.0 %
Iceland	1	1	100 %
Norway	6	6	100 %
Sweden	7	6	85.7 %

Out of received replies three were returned completely blank: two orchestras from Britain and one orchestra from Denmark returned the questionnaire without filling it in.

One reply too many came from Norway, but since only six original surveys were sent out and the extra one could be identified as a second mailing questionnaire, it was easy to exclude that from the final statistics. Since the questionnaire was anonymous it was not possible to identify individual orchestras that had not replied.

The distribution of the questionnaire and receipt of replies took place as follows:

*26/5/95	Questionnaire posted to all orchestras
30/5/95	First reply, from Sweden
2/6/95	5 replies from the UK
	4 replies from Scandinavia: 1 Fin, 1 N, 2 S
6/6/95	3 replies from the UK
	2 replies from Scandinavia: 1 S, 1 N
7/6/95	4 replies from the UK
	2 replies from Scandinavia: 2 Fin
8/6/95	5 replies from the UK
9/6/95	2 replies from the UK
12/6/95	2 replies from Scandinavia: 1 N, 1 DK
14/6/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 Fin
15/6/95	1 reply from the UK
25/6/95	2 replies from the UK
	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 Fin
26/6/95	1 reply from the UK
28/6/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 Fin
*28/6/95	1st reminder sent to all orchestras
3/7/95	1 reply from the UK
21/7/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 DK
6/8/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 DK
8/8/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 FIN
10/8/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 S
*20/8/95	2nd reminder sent out together with a stamped addressed envelope and a new copy of the questionnaire (specially marked as follow up copy).
29/8/95	6 replies from the UK
30/8/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 N
1/9/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 N
4/9/95	1 reply from the UK
5/9/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 S
7/9/95	1 reply from the UK
	1 reply from Scandinavia 1 FIN

8/9/95	1 reply from the UK
	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 FIN
11/9/95	1 reply from the UK
12/9/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 IS
18/9/95	1 reply from the UK
7/10/95	1 reply from Scandinavia: 1 FIN
12/10/95	2 replies from Scandinavia: 1 N, 1 FIN
14/10/95	1 reply from the UK
30/10/95	1 reply from the UK

3.7.2. Scoring

The results of the answered questionnaires are presented here as an average of the numerical replies received. As said all respondents answered each question with a number ranging from 1 to 7. The numbers are a key to the replies in the following manner:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Mostly Inaccurate	Slightly Inaccurate	Uncertain	Slightly Accurate	Mostly Accurate	Very Accurate

The respondents were given instructions on how to answer the questions in the following manner (see also Appendix 1):

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphony orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

\- - -

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Mostly Inaccurate	Slightly Inaccurate	Uncertain	Slightly Accurate	Mostly Accurate	Very Accurate

The answers are therefore shown as numbers. In the final conclusions of the questionnaire these are presented as an average of all answers received. This average

is presented in three ways: a) as an average of all answers received, b) broken down into average of answers from Britain vs. answers from the Nordic countries and c) broken down into average of answers from each of the Nordic countries, as the following example shows:

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

Britain: 4.2 Nordic countries: 4.5 All countries: 4.5

Denmark	4.5
Finland	4.4
Iceland	4.0
Norway	5.2
Sweden	4.4

The example of question four shows that the general average of answers is around the same level, in other words the chief executive felt uncertain if the statement was true, although there were differences in replies ranging from Iceland's answer which was clearly uncertain about this statement to Norway's that felt that this was a little more than slightly accurate.

The answers to individual questions are listed here in the same order as they came in the questionnaire. After each question is a short comment/analysis clarifying what the answer means and, in some cases, how it relates to other parts of the questionnaire.

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

Britain: 3.2 Nordic countries: 2.9 All countries: 3.0

Denmark	4.3
Finland	2.9
Iceland	2.0
Norway	3.8
Sweden	1.5

Analysis: The answers indicate that the chief executives feel that this is generally slightly inaccurate statement. Interesting range of answers however, from Sweden's 1.5 (Mostly to Very Inaccurate) to Denmark's 4.3 (Uncertain).

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

(question no. 2, cont.)

Britain: 5.9 Nordic countries: 6.3 All countries: 6.2

Denmark	5.5
Finland	6.1
Iceland	7.0
Norway	6.5
Sweden	6.3

Analysis: There seems to be a general agreement here that the chief executives have faith in the musical ability and growth of the orchestras, which answers ranging from 5.5 (Slightly Accurate +) to 7.0 (Very Accurate).

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

Britain: 5.3 Nordic countries: 5.9 All countries: 5.8

Denmark	5.8
Finland	4.9
Iceland	6.0
Norway	6.6
Sweden	6.0

Analysis: All orchestras seem to be relatively happy with the response of the local community, as answers are mostly around the figure 6 (Mostly Accurate).

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

Britain: 4.2 Nordic countries: 4.5 All countries: 4.5

Denmark	4.5
Finland	4.4
Iceland	4.0
Norway	5.2
Sweden	4.4

Analysis: When it comes to local politicians the orchestra chief executives are less happy than in the case of the local community response. Answers ranging from 4.0 (Uncertain) to the highest score of 5.2 (Slightly Accurate +) indicate a rather neutral attitude towards the local politicians.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

Britain: 3.8 Nordic countries: 4.2 All countries: 4.1

Denmark	4.5
Finland	3.7
Iceland	4.1
Norway	4.6
Sweden	4.2

Analysis: Although a slightly lower score on this question on national politicians (ranging from 3.7 (close Uncertain) to 4.6 (Uncertain-Slightly Accurate)) than on the previous one about local politicians, the chief executives seem to have a neutral attitude to the national politicians. The wording of the question could have influenced a more negative response, but despite that it seems, that the attitudes to politicians at national level remain neutral.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

Britain: 5.0 Nordic countries: 4.5 All countries: 4.6

Denmark	4.8
Finland	5.3
Iceland	2.0
Norway	5.3
Sweden	5.3

Analysis: Although there is an average of 4.6 (Uncertain to Slightly Accurate) in answers to this statement the answers range from 2.0 (Mostly Inaccurate) to 5.3 (Slightly Accurate). This seems to indicate that the chief executives think that the system of administrative decision making could be better, in some cases, much better.

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

Britain: 5.7 Nordic countries: 5.8 All countries: 5.8

Denmark	5.6
Finland	5.4
Iceland	6.0
Norway	6.5
Sweden	5.6

(question no. 7, cont.)

Analysis: Unconditional support of the board of directors is apparently not felt by the chief executives as answers range from 5.4 (Slightly Accurate +) to 6.0 (Mostly Accurate). The average, however, indicates that there is, according to this survey, no general feeling of antagonism between boards and management. If that was the case, the wording of this question as put here, would probably induce answers that indicate a lower level of satisfaction.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

Britain:	5.0	Nordic countries:	4.8	All countries:	3.9
		Denmark	5.0		
		Finland	4.4		
		Iceland	6.0		
		Norway	5.6		
		Sweden	3.2		

Analysis: This question is of a slightly different nature compared with the preceding one (no. 7). Question no. 7 aimed to examine the relationship between board and management while question no. 8 is a direct assessment of board individuals and their work by their chief executives. It is notable that the chief executive's opinion is somewhat lower of the individuals on boards and their work. This differs from attitudes to board - management relations in general as indicated in question 7. There is also a wider range of answers from 3.2 (Slightly Inaccurate+) to 6.0 (Mostly accurate), indicating a different situation in different countries.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

Britain:	6.0	Nordic countries:	6.0	All countries:	6.0
		Denmark	5.8		
		Finland	5.9		
		Iceland	6.0		
		Norway	6.2		
		Sweden	6.2		

Analysis: When looking into the organisation, the chief executives seem to have similar level of attitude as in the questions relating to the board of directors. There is less difference between countries, however, with replies around 6.0 (Mostly Accurate).

_____ 10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

Britain:	6.3	Nordic countries:	5.8	All countries:	5.9
		Denmark	5.3		
		Finland	6.3		
		Iceland	5.0		
		Norway	6.0		
		Sweden	6.2		

Analysis: Answers here are fairly similar to a corresponding question about administrative staff (no. 9). The range of answers is slightly wider however from 5.3 Slightly Accurate +) to 6.3 (Mostly Accurate +. There are interesting differences in the replies of questions 9 and 10 between individual countries. Most of the countries rate the professionalism of administrative staff higher than that of the musicians, with the exception of Britain and Finland.

_____ 11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

Britain:	6.2	Nordic countries:	5.3	All countries:	5.4
		Denmark	5.0		
		Finland	5.0		
		Iceland	6.0		
		Norway	5.2		
		Sweden	5.2		

Analysis: This question resembles question no. 9 and could to an extend be interpreted as a control question. The difference between these two questions however is that no. 11 is asking about education and background and no. 9 about work performance. For this reason it is the author's opinion that the questions should be interpreted separately. The replies range from 5.2 (Slightly Accurate +) to 6.2 Mostly Accurate +) indicating similar attitudes about the education of administrative staff, with the exception of Britain and Iceland who score higher on this question.

__ 12. The decisions made by politicians (local and or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

Britain	3.7	Nordic countries	2.9	All countries	3.0

(question no. 12, cont.)

Denmark	2.5
Finland	4.1
Iceland	2.0
Norway	3.0
Sweden	2.8

Analysis: Since the score is low in general on this question, the indication is that the civil service is not seen as a serious obstacle in the opinion of the chief executives. Ranging from a low of 2.0 (Mostly Inaccurate) to a high of 4.1 (Uncertain +) most countries seem to have a positive to neutral attitude to the civil service. See also question 13.

_____ 13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

Britain: 3.4 Nordic countries: 3.7 All countries: 3.7

Denmark	3.8
Finland	3.4
Iceland	4.0
Norway	3.8
Sweden	3.5

Analysis: The neutral attitude towards the civil service seems further indicated here. Whereas the chief executives are neutral about the bad effects of the civil service, as indicated in question 12, they don't seem to be overtly confident about its positive influence either. Answers ranging from 3.4 (Slightly Accurate +) to 4.0 (Uncertain) give no indication of strong feeling towards the civil service.

_____ 14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

Britain: 3.2 Nordic countries: 4.2 All countries: 4.1

Denmark	3.5
Finland	3.5
Iceland	6.0
Norway	4.7
Sweden	3.5

Analysis: There is an interesting divergence of opinion here ranging from 3.5 (Slightly Inaccurate - Uncertain) to 6.0 (Mostly accurate). There is a difference between countries with Iceland showing notable dissatisfaction about decision

(question no. 14, cont.)

making process within the organisation. Britain, Denmark, Finland and Sweden are happier with their internal decision making process. Norway is slightly unhappier about this process scoring 4.7 (Uncertain-Slightly Accurate).

_____ 15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

Britain: 3.0 Nordic countries: 2.3 All countries: 2.4

Denmark	2.3
Finland	2.5
Iceland	2.0
Norway	2.8
Sweden	2.0

Analysis: The chief executives seem to agree in all the countries that the musicians' unions are not a threat to the organisation as a whole. The answers range from 2.0 (Mostly Inaccurate) to 3.0 (Slightly Inaccurate) with most of the countries at the lower end. Although British chief executives seem to feel a little stronger about the musician's union's negative influences here the score for Britain is not that much higher than that of the rest and does not signify any notable difference.

_____ 16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

Britain: 1.6 Nordic countries: 1.5 All countries: 1.5

Denmark	2.3
Finland	1.7
Iceland	1.0
Norway	1.3
Sweden	1.2

Analysis: It is clear from the scoring of this question, ranging from 1.0 (Very Inaccurate) to 2.3 (Mostly Inaccurate +), that the chief executives think that musicians are definitely not overpaid.

_____ 17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

Britain:	1.7	Nordic countries:	1.6	All countries:	1.6
		Denmark	1.8		
		Finland	1.5		
		Iceland	1.0		
		Norway	1.7		
		Sweden	2.0		

Analysis: The answers to this question seem to correspond closely to answers to the previous question (no. 16).

_____ 18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

Britain:	2.5	Nordic countries:	3.2	All countries:	3.1
		Denmark	3.3		
		Finland	3.2		
		Iceland	4.0		
		Norway	2.0		
		Sweden	3.6		

Analysis: The chief executives are rather neutral in their response to this question. An average of 3.2 (Slightly Inaccurate +) in the Nordic countries and 2.5 (Slightly to Mostly Inaccurate) in Britain gives the signal that politically elected authorities are not seen as having undue influence over the running of the orchestras. The difference between Britain and most of the Nordic countries, however, is noteworthy.

_____ 19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

Britain:	5.2	Nordic countries:	5.5	All countries:	5.5
		Denmark	5.5		
		Finland	5.5		
		Iceland	5.0		
		Norway	5.8		
		Sweden	5.8		

Analysis: The scoring ranges from 5.0 (Slightly Accurate) to 5.8 (almost Mostly Accurate). The chief executives seem to feel that in most cases the local media is positive to the orchestras. It is interesting to compare the scoring of this question to that of question no. 3, which asked about local community reaction in general. The scoring is not dissimilar, perhaps a little higher on local community positive attitudes

than that of the local media.

_____ 20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

Britain:	6.1	Nordic countries:	6.0	All countries:	6.1
		Denmark	5.8		
		Finland	6.2		
		Iceland	6.0		
		Norway	5.7		
		Sweden	6.5		

Analysis: The chief executives mostly agreed with this statement. Scoring around 6.0 (Mostly Accurate). It is interesting to compare this to question no. 2, (which could in a manner of speaking be treated as a control question) and note that the answers of no. 2 and no. 20 are fairly consistent.

_____ 21. My orchestra could do better musically.

Britain:	4.6	Nordic countries:	5.5	All countries:	5.4
		Denmark	5.3		
		Finland	5.0		
		Iceland	7.0		
		Norway	5.8		
		Sweden	4.5		

Analysis: Answers to this question had a wide range of scores. Some of the chief executives added a comment after the statement - "always!", interpreting the statement as a general policy issue in the running of a symphony orchestra. Answers running from 4.5 (Uncertain +) to 7.0 (Very Accurate) show the diversity in understanding this statement. It is questionable that replies to this question can be interpreted in such manner as to show less satisfaction of the orchestras' musical achievement when answered by chief executives in countries which scored lower, since there is a possibility of too wide an interpretation of the statement.

_____ 22. My orchestra could do better financially.

Britain:	6.3	Nordic countries:	6.3	All countries:	6.3

(question no. 22, cont.)

Denmark	5.7
Finland	6.3
Iceland	7.0
Norway	6.2
Sweden	6.5

Analysis: There is an agreement here that the orchestras could be doing better financially. Denmark scores slightly lower on this 5.7 (Slightly to Mostly Accurate) indicating the biggest satisfaction with the financial situation and Iceland is strongly dissatisfied with the financial situation. It is interesting to note, however, that there is no difference in answers to this question between British and Scandinavian orchestras despite different funding systems and more public funding in the Nordic countries.

_____ 23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

Britain: 1.9 Nordic countries: 2.0 All countries: 2.0

Denmark	1.8
Finland	2.4
Iceland	2.0
Norway	2.3
Sweden	1.6

Analysis: Contrary to many popular representations and myths this is a statement that the chief executives definitely do not agree with. There is very little difference between the various countries here.

_____ 24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

Britain: 5.2 Nordic countries: 5.1 All countries: 5.1

Denmark	4.3
Finland	5.5
Iceland	4.0
Norway	5.0
Sweden	6.5

Analysis: When it comes to job satisfaction there is very little difference between the average scoring of the Nordic countries and that of Britain. Both are around 5 (Slightly Accurate). Judging from the scoring the chief executives do not seem overtly satisfied in their jobs, but on the other hand no country average is under 4.0 (Uncertain), which indicates that the level of job satisfaction ranges from neutral to fairly positive and is in none of the answers expressed negatively.

_____ 25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

Britain: 3.2 Nordic countries: 3.3 All countries: 3.2

Denmark	3.8
Finland	4.8
Iceland	1.0
Norway	3.6
Sweden	3.3

Analysis: The chief executives are neutral or directly negative in response to this statement. Ranging from 1.0 (Very Inaccurate) to 4.8 (almost Slightly Accurate) the replies are an indication of how the chief executives feel about politicians helping the orchestra. In Iceland no such help is apparently experienced, which in contrast to Finland where the politicians are seen as doing more for the orchestras. It is interesting to note that Britain, with a very different funding system and much lower public subsidies, scores 3.2 (Slightly Inaccurate) while the perceptions within the five Nordic countries which have a similar public policy on subsidies to the arts, are more extreme.

_____ 26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

Britain: 1.3 Nordic countries: 2.7 All countries: 2.5

Denmark	3.3
Finland	4.1
Iceland	1.0
Norway	3.0
Sweden	2.3

Analysis: This question triggered off an interesting range of answers. Ranging from a low of 1.0 (Very Inaccurate) to a high of 4.1 (Uncertain), this margin is somewhat wider than could be expected if one takes into account the constant discussion concerning the lack of funds symphony orchestras in general seem to have. Iceland and Britain express the greatest dissatisfaction with the level of public funding while Finland is more neutral to expressing dissatisfaction. It has to be said, on the other hand, that no country agrees with this statement.

_____ 27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

(question no. 27, cont.)

Britain: 3.5 Nordic countries: 3.8 All countries: 3.8

Denmark	4.5
Finland	3.5
Iceland	4.0
Norway	3.4
Sweden	3.8

Analysis: The feeling amongst the chief executives towards the attitudes of politicians when asked for help, seems to be rather neutral with a very small margin. Ranging from 3.4 (Slightly Inaccurate to Uncertain) to 4.5 (Uncertain to Slightly Accurate) the attitudes do not differ much between different countries.

_____ 28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

Britain: 5.7 Nordic countries: 6.8 All countries: 6.7

Denmark	7.0
Finland	6.6
Iceland	7.0
Norway	6.8
Sweden	6.8

Analysis: There is a strong agreement that public subsidy is needed in order to function at all in all of the Nordic countries. Scoring is around 7.0 (Very Accurate) in the five countries. The strength of feeling towards public subsidy as a prerequisite for existence is lower in Britain, 5.7 (Slightly to Mostly Accurate) and indicates that the chief executives have different ideas about the basic funding mix of an orchestra in Britain than their colleagues in Scandinavia, and are perhaps slightly more optimistic about their chances of survival under a less generous funding regime.

_____ 29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

Britain: 1.8 Nordic countries: 1.3 All countries: 1.4

Denmark	1.3
Finland	1.3
Iceland	1.0
Norway	1.8
Sweden	1.0

(question no. 29, cont.)

Analysis: There is a consistent pattern in the answer to this question as compared with question no. 29, although the margin is slightly smaller. The Nordic countries average is 1.3 (Very Inaccurate) whereas the British scoring is 1.8 (closer to Mostly Inaccurate), which seems to indicate that British orchestra chief executives have a slightly more positive attitude to this statement. It is however clear that the margin is very small and all countries express their strong view that public subsidy is needed for orchestras to function financially.

_____ 30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

Britain: 2.5 Nordic countries: 1.9 All countries: 2.0

Denmark	1.8
Finland	2.9
Iceland	1.0
Norway	1.2
Sweden	2.7

Analysis: The interesting thing about the scoring here is that many of the Nordic countries feel the presence of politicians and civil servants less in their work than in Britain, despite the higher level of public funds that orchestras in Scandinavia have. In other words higher public funding does not mean increased interference from politically elected authorities or civil service. Indeed it is almost the other way around. Having said that, however, it is also important to note that all countries disagree with the statement and that the level of disagreement is at a very similar level ranging from 1.0 (Very Inaccurate) to 2.9 (Slightly Inaccurate). Finland and Sweden seem to be the countries where the influence of politicians is most strongly felt.

_____ 31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

Britain: 3.6 Nordic countries: 2.3 All countries: 2.5

Denmark	2.0
Finland	3.7
Iceland	1.0
Norway	2.0
Sweden	2.8

Analysis: When receiving the answers to this question, it has to be said that the author

(question no. 31, cont.)

recognised a certain unintended ambiguity in the wording of the question, which might trigger off a question wording effect affecting the final scoring. The wording of the question could be taken to imply that the authorities already "interfere" with the day to day running of the orchestras and this perception did in some cases provoke write-in comments and misunderstanding from those replying. The scoring indicates that the orchestras' chief executives do not agree with the statement as put forward in question no. 31, but it is questionable if the results can be taken at face value. (The answers range from 1.0 (Very Inaccurate) to 3.7 (almost Uncertain)).

_____ 32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

Britain:	3.6	Nordic countries:	3.9	All countries:	3.9
		Denmark	4.3		
		Finland	4.5		
		Iceland	2.0		
		Norway	5.8		
		Sweden	3.0		

Analysis: This question sparkled off some interesting scoring. Norway agrees strongly with this statement (5.8 - almost Mostly Accurate) whereas Iceland disagrees, reckons that this is only merits a 2.0 (Mostly Inaccurate). Other countries, including Britain, are more uncertain to the truth of this statement. It is interesting to note that different funding models and level of public funding in Britain vs. the Nordic countries does not seem to be a dividing factor in the attitude of chief executives to positive influence of politically elected authorities on the orchestras.

_____ 33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

Britain:	2.9	Nordic countries:	3.8	All countries:	3.6
		Denmark	4.8		
		Finland	3.6		
		Iceland	2.0		
		Norway	6.0		
		Sweden	2.7		

(question no. 33, cont.)

Analysis: None of their countries feel strongly secure about the future funding stability of the orchestras, with the notable exception of Norway. Norway scores a 6.0 (Mostly Accurate). This indicates that the orchestras there have been given a stronger hope for stability of funding. This must reflect recent changes in the funding structure of orchestras in Norway (see Chapter 2) as well as the healthy state of the Norwegian economy at the moment. All other countries are notably low on this, feeling Uncertain to Slightly Accurate (4.8 - Denmark) to a low score of 2.7 (almost Slightly Inaccurate), surprisingly not coming from Britain, but from Sweden.

_____ 34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Britain: 1.5 Nordic countries: 3.9 All countries: 3.5

Denmark	4.0
Finland	4.0
Iceland	3.0
Norway	5.2
Sweden	3.2

Analysis: A similar pattern is repeated here as in question no. 33. Norway again, expressed a higher score of 5.2 (Slightly Accurate) indicating that the orchestra chief executives there are relatively happy with the national government's cultural polity. The other Nordic countries are more neutral and while the British respondents show a definite discontent with their government's cultural policy.

In part two of the questionnaire some background information was asked for as to indicate some of the characteristics of the group of chief executives polled. The two questions asked dealt only with gender and age of respondents and the scores are as follows:

Part Two

Background information

1. Gender of Chief Executives:

Male Britain: 32 (86%) Nordic countries: 17 (59%)
All countries: 49 (74%)

(question no. 33, cont.)

Analysis: None of their countries feel strongly secure about the future funding stability of the orchestras, with the notable exception of Norway. Norway scores a 6.0 (Mostly Accurate). This indicates that the orchestras there have been given a stronger hope for stability of funding. This must reflect recent changes in the funding structure of orchestras in Norway (see Chapter 2) as well as the healthy state of the Norwegian economy at the moment. All other countries are notably low on this, feeling Uncertain to Slightly Accurate (4.8 - Denmark) to a low score of 2.7 (almost Slightly Inaccurate), surprisingly not coming from Britain, but from Sweden.

_____ 34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Britain: 1.5 Nordic countries: 3.9 All countries: 3.5

Denmark	4.0
Finland	4.0
Iceland	3.0
Norway	5.2
Sweden	3.2

Analysis: A similar pattern is repeated here as in question no. 33. Norway again, expressed a higher score of 5.2 (Slightly Accurate) indicating that the orchestra chief executives there are relatively happy with the national government's cultural polity. The other Nordic countries are more neutral and while the British respondents show a definite discontent with their government's cultural policy.

In part two of the questionnaire some background information was asked for as to indicate some of the characteristics of the group of chief executives polled. The two questions asked dealt only with gender and age of respondents and the scores are as follows:

Part Two

Background information

1. Gender of Chief Executives:

Male Britain: 32 (86%) Nordic countries: 17 (59%)
All countries: 49 (74%)

(question no. 1, part 2, cont.)

Denmark	4	(80%)
Finland	2	(18%)
Iceland	1	(100%)
Norway	5	(83%)
Sweden	5	(83%)

Female Britain: 5 (14%) Nordic countries: 12 (41.0%)
All countries: 17 (26%)

Denmark	1	(20%)
Finland	9	(82%)
Iceland	0	(0%)
Norway	1	(17%)
Sweden	1	(17%)

No answer Britain: 3 Nordic countries: 0

Denmark	0
Finland	0
Iceland	0
Norway	0
Sweden	0

;

Analysis: The number of male chief executives of the whole sample, not taking into account the three returned questionnaires from Britain that did not answer this question, is that out of 66 chief executives, 49 (or 74 %) were male. This job is clearly male dominated although female chief executives are almost a quarter of the whole sample in all the countries. There is quite a difference, however, between Britain and the Nordic countries in this context. An interesting example of a different picture is the case of Finland where there is a female domination in this field, with 82% of the chief executives female.

---

2. Age: _____ years

Britain: 42.1 years Nordic countries: 43.4 years
All countries: 43.2 years

Denmark	46.3 years
Finland	42.5 years
Iceland	36.0 years
Norway	44.7 years
Sweden	47.6 years

Analysis: The age is presented as an average of the whole group. Only one chief executive of the whole sample was over 60 years of age. The two youngest chief executives responding where both 31 years old.

Chapter 4 - Orchestras' Finances

4.1. Introduction

In Chapter 1, when describing the context of this study, it was stated that in addition to the general cultural background and orchestral development, covered in Chapter 2, and the survey amongst the orchestras' chief executives, covered in Chapter 3, a separate chapter would analyse the finances of the Scandinavian and British orchestras that are the subject of this study. There are two reasons for including such a chapter even though the primary purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between the orchestras and government policy.

The first is that the financial statistics of the orchestras may reflect an objective reference to their status, something that can be compared relatively accurately between orchestras as well as between countries. It was considered necessary to include such an element in this study, rather than to rely solely on responses to the survey, described in Chapter 3, which in all cases reflects the subjective interpretation of the individuals in charge of running the orchestras in question.

The second reason is that by including these statistics, the role of government funding in the orchestras' funding mix can be established. Government funding is perhaps more than anything an indication of government's direct or indirect involvement the arts. In this case using a symphony orchestra, which as an arts organisation has relatively similar artistic functions irrespective of operating environment or country, as a near-constant (in quasi-mathematical terms) can national similarities or differences in policy and support be brought out.

These two prerequisites, the survey results and the finances, as the latter will be analysed in this chapter, will then form some of the basis for the discussions on arts policy and its role and effect on orchestras in the following chapters 5 and 6.

In this chapter, however, the finances of the majority of the Scandinavian orchestras that participated in the survey (described in Chapter 3) as well as a sample of orchestras from the UK, as a comparison, will be presented. This will be mainly in table form, focusing on different aspects of the orchestras' statement of income and

expenditure for the year 1995, or the nearest available fiscal year around that period.

There are basically four types of tables, dealing with the finances of the orchestras as follows:

Type 1: Income, dealing with total income as well as how that is divided between self generated (earned) income and income from public sources.

Type 2: Income from public sources, dealing with how this income is divided between national, regional and local sources.

Type 3: Self generated income, dealing with division of income from ticket sales, sales of other goods and services, sponsorship and patronage as well as other unspecified sources

Type 4: Expenditure, dealing with total expenditure and how that is divided between wages of regular staff (musicians and administration) and other costs. Tables of this model will also include a calculated figure of total costs pr. musician of each orchestra, based on the same figures. This figure, however, is not an indication of how much a musician actually "costs" in an orchestra, but rather a figure that can give a better indication of budget sizes taking into account the varying number of musicians in the orchestras. This makes comparison of orchestras between different countries easier since this figure reflects a overall cost of an orchestra not necessarily the cost of labour only.

All tables show the amounts in the local currency as well as in Pounds Sterling. The rate of exchange used to translate the local Scandinavian currencies, is the average rate of exchange of Pound Sterling vs. the local currency in each country

for the year 1995 [1] . Each country's figures will be presented in separate sub sections and at the end of the chapter some comparisons will be made between countries. A special chapter, Chapter 5, will discuss and present further financial comparison between the U.K. on one hand and the five Nordic countries as a whole on the other. In addition to the tables in this chapter an overall view of the figures presented in the chapter are incorporated in comprehensive form as Appendices 7a and 7b, at the end.

Before going further, however, it is necessary to look at some of the principles used when presenting the figures. The sources for all the figures are the orchestras' annual accounts for 1995 (or relevant fiscal year), more specifically their statement of income and expenditure for this period [2] . This information was made available to the author through the kind cooperation of the orchestras. The principles applied, are as follows:

1) In all the cases, the financial revenues of the orchestras [3] are included in the calculation of total income, together with revenue income.

2) Financial expenses are also included in the calculations, but depreciation is not [4] and neither are price level changes that are calculated in some of the Scandinavian countries (notably Iceland), by permission in local tax laws.

3) The figures reflect only the orchestras' statement of Income and

---

[1] For each of the currencies, i.e. the rate of One Pound Sterling, this is as follows:

Denmark	Danish Krone (DKK)	8.8461	Source: Danmarks Nationalbank (Central Bank of Denmark), Information Service, 22 July 1997.
Finland	Finnish Markka (FIM)	6.891	Source: Suomen Pankki (Central Bank of Finland), Information Service, 22 July 1997, quoting the bank's "Statistical Review / Banko Bulletin".
Iceland	Icelandic Króna (ISK)	100.78	Source: Statistical Yearbook of Iceland 1996, p. 198
Norway	Norwegian Krone (NOK)	10.04	Source: Norges Bank (Central Bank of Norway), World Wide Web Pages (July 1997): Terminkurser månedlige [Monthly Rates of Exchange]; http://www. norges-bank.no/stat/terminkurser/kurs_mtn.html
Sweden	Swedish Krona (SEK)	11.2644	Source: Sveriges Riksbank (Central Bank of Sweden), Information Service, 22 July 1997.

[2] References to these sources can be found in the bibliography at the end of the thesis. They are listed under the name of each orchestra (in English translation, together with the name in the original language). In some cases the information for British orchestras is supplemented with data from Arts Council reports (see footnote no. 8 on page 164 in this chapter).

[3] In most cases this income is interests, that do not amount to any significant figures, but could possibly swing percentages somewhat. Therefore included.

[4] The primary reason for not including depreciation is that different rules apply in each country and can therefore affect the comparative value of the figures.

Expenditure for 1995 (or comparable fiscal year). The orchestras' general financial status at the end of the period, as indicated in their balance sheets, is not a part of this comparison.

4) When analysing Self Generated Income (or Earned Income) of the orchestras, the income from sponsorship and/or patronage (or donations) is included in this figure and, as much as possible, shown separately in the table. This is however abbreviated to "Sponsorship" in the heading of the tables for space purposes.

5) The heading "Wages" reflect, as closely as possible, the payments to the regular staff of the orchestra, musicians and administrative personnel, as well as extra musicians' wages. Fees for conductors, soloists and alike are not included in this figure. It should be said however that this division is not always clear in the financial records available to the author, and consequently entries under this heading might be slightly inaccurate in the case of a few orchestras.

6) The source of the number of musicians in Nordic orchestras is also The NOMUS Catalogue 1995-96 [5].

7) Some of the orchestras include income and expenditure from running a concert hall. For the purpose of fairer comparison, such orchestras will be indicated in relevant sections on each country. They are not, however, many in numbers, especially not in Scandinavia.

4.2. Denmark

Tables 4.1-4.4. on pages 140-143 describe the finances of the Danish orchestras.

The income and expenditure levels of the Danish regional orchestras looks very much alike for all of the orchestras. The Danish Radio Symphony orchestra is somewhat different not only in budget size, but also in the number of players employed, with a much larger operation than the regional orchestras. The level of public funding is high, on average 88.5%. In addition to the regular funding from various levels of government, the Ministry of Culture has established special funds (puljer) to distribute to the orchestras for special projects. Contributions from these funds are calculated with the income from national public sources in the tables, as much as these are specified in the orchestras' accounts. The ratio of self generated, or earned income, is fairly varied for the Danish orchestras ranging from 4.6 % of turnover to 28.2 % for the Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra. This orchestra, however, receives a

[5] NOMUS Catalogue 95/96, p. 21-22, 52-53, 73, 84-85, 110

contribution from the Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen, which in this analysis has been calculated as earned income, since the orchestra plays daily concerts all summer in the amusement park and it is reasonable to assume this payment as a fee for services rendered.

On the expenditure site the regional orchestras are again similar. The largest part of their expenditure are payments to musicians and administrative staff, ranging from 69.4% to 89.0 %. The Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra is slightly lower here. This orchestra is a part of the Danish National Broadcasting Service and doesn't produce separate accounts. The information for the tables was given to the author by the orchestra's financial administrator Ms. Jette Bruzek in a private interview. The figures are for the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra only and do not, as far as the author is aware, include figures for the light music orchestra also run by the Danish National Broadcasting Service. As with other radio orchestras it is, however, difficult to ascertain exact figures for the running of the orchestra, since cost of various aspects of the orchestra budget normally covered by an orchestra itself, is included in the overall figures for the mother company rather than specifically in those of the orchestra itself.

Table 4.1. Denmark - Orchestras' Income 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Total Income		Public Sources			Self Generated Income		
	DKK	GB£	DKK	GB£	% of total	DKK	GB£	% of total
Aalborg Symphony Orchestra	30,981,427	3,502,270	29,314,795	3,313,867	94.6	1,666,632	188,403	5.4
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra	33,506,794	3,787,748	30,026,558	3,394,327	89.6	3,480,236	393,420	10.4
Dan sh Natıonal Radio Symphony Orchestra	57,717,000	6,524,570	49,917,000	5,642,826	86.5	7,800,000	881,744	13.5
Copenhagen Ph harmon c Orchestra	33,772,074	3,817,736	24,256,463	2,742,052	71.8	9,515,611	1,075,684	28.2
Odense Symphony Orchestra	32,414,621	3,664,284	30,220,669	3,416,270	93.2	2,193,952	248,014	6.8
Symphony Orchestra of South Jut and	30,173,027	3,410,885	28,781,086	3,253,534	95.4	1,391,941	157,351	4.6

Table 4.2. Denmark - Orchestras' Income 1995 from Public Sources

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL fr. Public Sources		National			County			Municipality		
	DKK	GB£	DKK	GB£	% of public sources	DKK	GB£	% of public sources	DKK	GB£	% of public sources
Aalborg Symphony Orchestra	29,314,795	3,313,867	14,544,935	1,644,220	49.6	103,533	11,704	0.4	14,666,327	1,657,943	50.0
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra	30,026,558	3,394,327	15,199,588	1,718,225	50.6	40,000	4,522	0.1	14,787,000	1,671,584	49.2
Danish National Radio Symphony Orch.	49,917,000	5,642,826	49,917,000	5,642,826	100.0			0.0			0.0
Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra	24,256,463	2,742,052	12,141,142	1,372,485	50.1	12,115,321	1,369,566	49.9			0.0
Odense Symphony Orchestra	30,220,669	3,416,270	15,046,215	1,700,887	49.8			0.0	15,174,454	1,715,384	50.2
Symphony Orchestra of South Jutland	28,781,086	3,253,534	21,443,517	2,424,065	74.5	5,678,571	641,929	19.7	1,658,998	187,540	5.8

Table 4.3. Denmark - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL Self Gen. Income		Ticket Sales			Sale of other goods & serv.			Other Income			Sponsorship		
	DKK	GB£	DKK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	DKK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	DKK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	DKK	GB£	% of S.G.I
Aalborg Symphony Orchestra	1,666,632	188,403	1,030,487	116,491	61.8	385,094	43,533	23.1	251,051	28,380	15.1			0.0
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra	3,480,236	393,420	2,905,684	328,471	83.5	395,902	44,754	11.4	178,650	20,195	5.1			0.0
Danish National Radio Symph. Orch.	7,800,000	881,744	2,900,000	327,828	37.2	1,600,000	180,871	20.5			0.0	3,300,000	373,046	42.3
Copenhagen Philharmonic Orch.	9,515,611	1,075,684	893,843	101,044	9.4	7,888,446	891,743	82.9	733,322	82,898	7.7			0.0
Odense Symphony Orchestra	2,193,952	248,014	1,472,263	166,431	67.1	573,624	64,845	26.1	148,065	16,738	6.8			0.0
Symphony Orch. of South Jutland	1,391,941	157,351	537,226	60,730	38.6	92,457	10,452	6.6	762,258	86,169	54.8			0.0

Table 4.4. Denmark - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure		Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)			Other Costs			Cost pr. musician	
		DKK	GB£	DKK	GB£	% of total expenditure	DKK	GB£	% of total expenditure	DKK	GB£
Aalborg Symphony Orchestra	63	30,968,216	3,500,776	22,773,914	2,574,458	73.5	8,194,302	926,318	26.5	491,559	55,568
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra	68	34,077,222	3,852,231	25,337,624	2,864,271	74.4	8,739,598	987,961	25.6	501,136	56,650
Danish National Radio Symphony Orchestra	98	57,717,000	6,524,570	36,807,000	4,160,817	63.8	20,910,000	2,363,754	36.2	588,949	66,577
Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra	74	33,772,074	3,817,736	23,426,649	2,648,246	69.4	10,345,425	1,169,490	30.6	456,379	51,591
Odense Symphony Orchestra	72	32,414,621	3,664,284	28,835,243	3,259,656	89.0	8,579,378	969,849	26.5	450,203	50,893
Symphony Orchestra of South Jutland	63	30,580,778	3,456,979	23,194,140	2,621,962	75.8	7,386,638	835,016	24.2	485,409	54,873

4.3. Finland

The information on the economical statistics is based on figures from the Association of Finnish Orchestras as well as from some of the orchestras themselves. Tables 4.5.-4.8. on pages 145-148 describe their finances.

The budget size of the orchestras varies quite a lot, depending primarily on the number of musicians employed. There is a high ratio of income from public sources, in most cases over 90% of total budget. The expenditure is mainly on wages of musicians and administrative staff, around 80% of the total figure for most orchestras. On the whole the financial picture of Finnish orchestras gives a picture of an orchestral situation in the country that could be described with the word "homogeneous" when it comes to financing. The orchestras enjoy a high level of public subsidy and if calculated as cost per musician, the variation is not great.

If the number of musicians in some of the regional Finnish orchestras is examined, it can be seen that this is in some cases somewhat lower than the definition of a "symphony orchestra" used in Chapter 3. It is, however, this author's considered opinion that it is necessary to use all the orchestras in the sample for financial comparison. The arguments for this is firstly that Finnish "town orchestras" are more flexible in their sizes when it comes to symphony orchestra concerts; although the number of regular professional players might be below the number of 40, the orchestras very often expand with freelance players to appear as full symphony orchestras. This flexibility is more common in Finland although it is known to happen in Sweden and Norway, although not with the Swedish and Norwegian orchestras included in this study. Secondly, it is common in Finland to refer to this group of orchestras presented here as the country's professional symphony orchestras, for example by the Association of Finnish Orchestras. The average number of players in Finnish orchestras, 56, is furthermore considerably above the minimum figure defined in Chapter 3.

Looking at specific orchestras, the Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra does not produce a separate set of annual accounts, since the orchestra is a part of the Finnish National Broadcasting Corporation. The remaining balance of the orchestra's expenses, other than that stated in statistics sheet [6], is calculated as coming from licence fees and thus classified as public support from the nationwide source.

In the case of the Lahti S.O. the high figure for other income is mostly rent of the concert hall, since the orchestra is responsible for running the town's only large concert venue, which is used for a wide range of purposes including the local municipality music school.

---

[6] Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra, Economic Statistics 1996, a statement with accompanying letter to Haukur F. Hannesson from Hannele Markkula, Orchestra Assistant, dated 27 May 1996.

Table 4.5. Finland - Orchestras' Income 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Total Income		Public Sources			Self Generated Income		
	FIM	GB£	FIM	GB£	% of total	FIM	GB£	% of total
Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra	29,780,000	4,321,579	28,149,000	4,084,893	94.5	1,631,000	236,686	5.5
Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra	33,752,078	4,897,994	31,125,048	4,516,768	92.2	2,627,030	381,226	7.8
Joensuu City Orchestra	8,140,511	1,181,325	7,625,451	1,106,581	93.7	515,060	74,744	6.3
Jyväskylä Symphony Orchestra	8,566,124	1,243,089	6,965,794	1,010,854	81.3	1,600,330	232,235	18.7
Kuopio City Orchestra	13,981,593	2,028,964	12,598,981	1,828,324	90.1	1,382,612	200,640	9.9
Lahti Symphony Orchestra	17,008,660	2,468,243	15,839,369	2,298,559	93.1	1,169,291	169,684	6.9
Oulu City Orchestra	14,232,047	2,065,309	13,046,601	1,893,281	91.7	1,185,446	172,028	8.3
Pori City Orchestra	6,301,673	914,479	5,882,061	853,586	93.3	419,612	60,893	6.7
Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra	25,350,725	3,678,817	23,086,587	3,350,252	91.1	2,264,138	328,565	8.9
Tapiola Sinfonietta/Espoo City Orchestra	9,430,508	1,368,525	8,136,157	1,180,693	86.3	1,294,351	187,832	13.7
Turku Philharmonic Orchestra	22,573,031	3,275,726	20,169,963	2,927,001	89.4	2,403,068	348,726	10.6
Vaasa City Orchestra	7,201,792	1,045,101	6,652,293	965,360	92.4	549,499	79,742	7.6

Table 4.6. Finland - Orchestras' Income 1995 from Public Sources

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL fr. Public Sources		National			County			Municipality		
	FIM	GB£	FIM	GB£	% of public sources	FIM	GB£	% of public sources	FIM	GB£	% of public sources
Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra	28,149,000	4,084,893	28,149,000	4,084,893	100.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra	31,125,048	4,516,768	5,236,184	759,858	16.8			0.0	25,888,864	3,756,910	83.2
Joensuu City Orchestra	7,625,451	1,106,581	3,063,558	444,574	40.2	109,157	15,841	1.4	4,452,736	646,167	58.4
Jyväskylä Symphony Orchestra	6,965,794	1,010,854	2,660,294	386,053	38.2	4,000	580	0.1	4,301,500	624,220	61.8
Kuopio City Orchestra	12,598,981	1,828,324	3,626,253	526,230	28.8			0.0	8,972,728	1,302,094	71.2
Lahti Symphony Orchestra	15,839,369	2,298,559	4,453,101	646,220	28.1			0.0	11,386,268	1,652,339	71.9
Oulu City Orchestra	13,046,601	1,893,281	3,816,944	553,903	29.3			0.0	9,229,657	1,339,378	70.7
Pori City Orchestra	5,882,061	853,586	2,188,256	317,553	37.2			0.0	3,693,805	536,033	62.8
Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra	23,086,587	3,350,252	4,893,878	710,184	21.2			0.0	18,192,709	2,640,068	78.8
Tapiola Sinfonietta/Espoo City Orchestra	8,136,157	1,180,693	2,071,028	300,541	25.5			0.0	6,065,129	880,152	74.5
Turku Philharmonic Orchestra	20,169,963	2,927,001	4,796,970	696,121	23.8			0.0	15,372,993	2,230,880	76.2
Vaasa City Orchestra	6,652,293	965,360	2,255,467	327,306	33.9	15,000	2,177	0.2	4,381,826	635,877	65.9

Table 4.7. Finland - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL Self Gen. Income		Ticket Sales			Sale of other goods & serv.			Other Income			Sponsorship		
	FIM	GB£	FIM	GB£	% of S.G.I.	FIM	GB£	% of S.G.I.	FIM	GB£	% of S.G.I.	FIM	GB£	% of S.G.I.
Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra	1,631,000	236,686	806,000	116,964	49.4	711,000	103,178	43.6	114,000	16,543	7.0			0.0
Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra	2,627,030	381,226	2,258,651	327,768	86.0	368,379	53,458	14.0			0.0			0.0
Joensuu City Orchestra	515,060	74,744	353,940	51,363	68.7	143,638	20,844	27.9	17,482	2,537	3.4			0.0
Jyväskylä Symphony Orchestra	1,600,330	232,235	1,020,311	148,064	63.8	509,094	73,878	31.8	70,925	10,292	4.4			0.0
Kuopio City Orchestra	1,382,612	200,640	913,410	132,551	66.1	257,644	37,388	18.6	211,558	30,701	15.3			0.0
Lahti Symphony Orchestra	1,169,291	169,684	600,328	87,118	51.3	109,649	15,912	9.4	459,314	66,654	39.3			0.0
Oulu City Orchestra	1,185,446	172,028	504,738	73,246	42.6	248,392	36,046	21.0	432,316	62,736	36.5			0.0
Pori City Orchestra	419,612	60,893	284,487	41,284	67.8	82,994	12,044	19.8	52,131	7,565	12.4			0.0
Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra	2,264,138	328,565	1,337,325	194,068	59.1	805,989	116,963	35.6	120,824	17,534	5.3			0.0
Tapiola Sinfonietta/Espoo City Or.	1,294,351	187,832	560,413	81,325	43.3	567,286	82,323	43.8	166,652	24,184	12.9			0.0
Turku Philharmonic Orchestra	2,403,068	348,726	1,214,246	176,208	50.5	373,788	54,243	15.6	815,034	118,275	33.9			0.0
Vaasa City Orchestra	549,499	79,742	122,773	17,816	22.3	330,911	48,021	60.2	95,815	13,904	17.4			0.0

Table 4.8. Finland - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure		Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)			Other Costs			Cost pr. musician	
		FIM	GB£	FIM	GB£	% of total expenditure	FIM	GB£	% of total expenditure	FIM	GB£
Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra	98	29,780,000	4,321,579	24,545,000	3,561,892	82.4	5,235,000	759,687	17.6	303,878	44,098
Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra	98	33,752,078	4,897,994	28,088,460	4,076,108	83.2	5,663,618	821,886	16.8	344,409	49,980
Joensuu City Orchestra	32	8,140,511	1,181,325	6,972,637	1,011,847	85.7	1,167,874	169,478	14.3	254,391	36,916
Jyväskylä Symphony Orchestra	33	9,216,210	1,337,427	7,582,955	1,100,414	82.3	1,633,255	237,013	17.7	279,279	40,528
Kuopio City Orchestra	46	13,981,593	2,028,964	10,517,692	1,526,294	75.2	3,463,901	502,670	24.8	303,948	44,108
Lahti Symphony Orchestra	59	17,008,660	2,468,243	14,152,067	2,053,703	83.2	2,856,593	414,540	16.8	288,282	41,835
Oulu City Orchestra	53	14,232,047	2,065,309	10,959,607	1,590,423	77.0	3,272,440	474,886	23.0	268,529	38,968
Pori City Orchestra	28	6,301,673	914,479	5,476,641	794,753	86.9	825,032	119,726	13.1	225,060	32,660
Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra	82	25,350,725	3,678,817	17,849,657	2,590,285	70.4	7,501,068	1,088,531	29.6	309,155	44,864
Tapiola Sinfonietta/Espoo City Orchestra	37	9,419,009	1,366,857	8,377,037	1,215,649	88.9	1,041,972	151,208	11.1	254,568	36,942
Turku Philharmonic Orchestra	73	22,573,031	3,275,726	16,573,215	2,405,052	73.4	5,999,816	870,674	26.6	309,220	44,873
Vaasa City Orchestra	31	7,201,792	1,045,101	6,505,601	944,072	90.3	696,191	101,029	9.7	232,316	33,713

Table 4.9. Iceland - Orchestra's Income 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Total Income		Public Sources			Self Generated Income		
	ISK	GB£	ISK	GB£	% of total	ISK	GB£	% of total
Iceland Symphony Orchestra	222,157,030	2,204,376	195,942,964	1,944,264	88.2	26,214,066	260,112	11.8

Table 4.10. Iceland - Orchestra's Income 1995 from Public Sources

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL fr. Public Sources		National			County			Municipality		
	ISK	GB£	ISK	GB£	% of public sources	ISK	GB£	% of public sources	ISK	GB£	% of public sources
Iceland Symphony Orchestra	195,942,964	1,944,264	160,487,491	1,592,454	81.9	0	0	0.0	35,455,473	351,811	18.1

Table 4.11. Iceland - Self Generated Income of Orchestra 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL Self Gen. Income		Ticket Sales			Sale of other goods & serv.			Other Income			Sponsorship		
	ISK	GB£	ISK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	ISK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	ISK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	ISK	GB£	% of S.G.I.
Iceland Symphony Orchestra	26,214,066	260,112	19,790,963	196,378	75.5	1,664,000	16,511	6.3	4,759,103	47,223	18.2	0	0	0.0

Table 4.12. Iceland - Orchestra's Expenditure 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure		Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)			Other Costs			Cost pr. musician	
		ISK	GB£	ISK	GB£	% of total expenditure	ISK	GB£	% of total expenditure	ISK	GB£
Iceland Symphony Orchestra	70	261,366,031	2,593,432	214,911,891	2,132,486	82.2	46,454,140	460,946	17.8	3,733,800	37,049

4.5. Norway

The finances of Norwegian orchestras are described in Tables 4.13.-4.16. on pages 155-158. The budget level seems to be similar, if taking into account the different sizes of orchestras (see Table 4.16. - "Cost pr. musician"). On the whole the orchestras received approximately 85-90% of their income from public sources of some kind, which is similar to the other Scandinavian countries. Expenditure is primarily wages of musicians and administrative staff, on average around 70%, which is similar to many orchestras in Denmark and Sweden, but a lower percentage of total budget than seen in Finland or Iceland.

Individual orchestras:

Bergen Symphony Orchestra. The high income under the BSO's "other self generated income" is mostly financial revenues from various trust funds that the orchestra has.

Stavanger Symphony Orchestra. What is entered as "other public subsidy" in the orchestra's annual accounts, separate from the state subsidy, is calculated here with the national public subsidy. Furthermore, the item "social costs" (Norwegian: arbeitgiveravgift og pensjon) is divided in percentage between musicians and other personnel in roughly the same ratio as the wage costs are entered in the annual accounts. Similar method has been applied to the other orchestras in cases where these figures were presented in a similar manner.

In the case of the Norwegian Radio Orchestra same caution is made as with other radio orchestras covered in this thesis.

Table 4.13. Norway - Orchestras' Income 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Total Income		Public Sources			Self Generated Income		
	NOK	GB£	NOK	GB£	% of total	NOK	GB£	% of total
Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra	52,544,997	5,233,565	46,322,000	4,613,745	88.2	6,222,997	619,820	11.8
Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra	13,207,396	1,315,478	12,079,000	1,203,088	91.5	1,128,396	112,390	8.5
Norwegian Radio Orchestra	25,422,934	2,532,165	21,266,000	2,118,127	83.6	4,156,934	414,037	16.4
Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra	77,748,592	7,743,884	54,758,850	5,454,069	70.4	22,989,742	2,289,815	29.6
Stavanger Symphony Orchestra	37,881,924	3,773,100	33,293,084	3,316,044	87.9	4,588,840	457,056	12.1
Trondheim Symphony Orchestra	41,514,485	4,134,909	37,450,900	3,730,169	90.2	4,063,585	404,740	9.8

Table 4.14. Norway - Orchestras' Income 1995 from Public Sources

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL fr. Public Sources		National			County			Municipality		
	NOK	GB£	NOK	GB£	% of public sources	NOK	GB£	% of public sources	NOK	GB£	% of public sources
Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra	46,322,000	4,613,745	46,322,000	4,613,745	100.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0
Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra	12,079,000	1,203,088	8,455,000	842,131	70.0			0.0	3,624,000	360,956	30.0
Norwegian Radio Orchestra	21,266,000	2,118,127	21,266,000	2,118,127	100.0			0.0			0.0
Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra	54,758,850	5,454,069	54,758,850	5,454,069	100.0			0.0			0.0
Stavanger Symphony Orchestra	33,293,084	3,316,044	23,412,000	2,331,873	70.3	3,293,714	328,059	9.9	6,587,370	656,113	19.8
Trondheim Symphony Orchestra	37,450,900	3,730,169	26,152,000	2,604,781	69.8	3,736,300	372,141	10.0	7,562,600	753,247	20.2

Table 4.15. Norway - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL Self Gen. Inc.		Ticket Sales			Sale of other goods and services			Other Income			Sponsorship		
	NOK	GB£	NOK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	NOK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	NOK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	NOK	GB£	% of S.G.I.
Bergen Philharmonic Orch.	6,222,997	619,820	3,826,631	381,139	61.5	197,000	19,622	3.2	1,962,766	195,495	31.5	236,600	23,566	3.8
Kristiansand Symph. Orch.	1,128,396	112,390	338,741	33,739	30.0	418,212	41,655	37.1	371,443	36,996	32.9			0.0
Norwegian Radio Orchestra	4,156,934	414,037	150,000	14,940	3.6	50,000	4,980	1.2	3,956,934	394,117	95.2			0.0
Oslo Philharmonic Orch.	22,989,742	2,289,815	9,899,233	985,979	43.1	11,772,467	1,172,556	51.2	1,318,042	131,279	5.7			0.0
Stavanger Symphony Orch	4,588,840	457,056	2,553,763	254,359	55.7	130,218	12,970	2.8	854,859	85,145	18.6	1,050,000	104,582	22.9
Trondheim Symphony Orch	4,063,585	404,740	2,539,079	252,896	62.5			0.0	796,506	79,333	19.6	728,000	72,510	17.9

Table 4.16. Norway - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure		Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)			Other Costs			Cost pr. musician	
		NOK	GB£	NOK	GB£	% of total expenditure	NOK	GB£	% of total expenditure	NOK	GB£
Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra	92	52,214,029	5,200,600	36,924,791	3,677,768	70.7	15,289,238	1,522,832	29.3	567,544	56,528
Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra	38	13,194,881	1,314,231	6,633,030	660,660	50.3	6,561,851	653,571	49.7	347,234	34,585
Norwegian Radio Orchestra	49	25,422,934	2,532,165	16,305,636	1,624,067	64.1	9,117,298	908,097	35.9	518,835	51,677
Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra	106	76,800,903	7,649,492	47,460,941	4,727,185	61.8	29,339,962	2,922,307	38.2	724,537	72,165
Stavanger Symphony Orchestra	65	38,139,124	3,798,718	26,881,490	2,677,439	70.5	11,257,634	1,121,278	29.5	586,756	58,442
Trondheim Symphony Orchestra	73	41,484,385	4,131,911	28,975,446	2,886,001	69.8	12,508,939	1,245,910	30.2	568,279	56,602

4.6. Sweden

In general the budgets and financial figures of Swedish orchestras show a greater variation than the other countries'. These are presented in Tables 4.17. - 4.20. on pages 160-163.

One aspect to consider here is that two of the largest orchestras, the Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra and the Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra are also responsible for running the concert halls in which they operate, generating higher figures on the whole. The variation in income from public sources also has a larger range than in the other countries, from being 67% to 91% of total income. It is somewhat surprising to see that out of Scandinavian orchestras, the Swedish ones have on average the lowest public subsidy, when this is calculated as a percentage of total budget. With the high level and tradition of public spending in Sweden, one would expect that its orchestras would be closer to the other countries, but this is not the case. When it comes to expenditure, however, the level of wages (for musicians and administrative staff) seems to be similar to the other countries, if calculated as percentage of total expenditure. There is however a considerable variation if total expenditure is calculated as cost pr. musician, a greater variation than in the other Scandinavian countries, and this is despite the fact, that negotiations for rates of pay for orchestral musicians were centrally controlled until 1996 [7].

Individual orchestras:

Gävle Symphony Orchestra: The financial year 1994-1995 was somewhat unusual for some orchestras in Sweden, since in that year many official institutions, including some of the orchestras that are the subject of this study, changed their fiscal year from the period July 1 - June 30, to the calendar year. This is the case of the Gävle Symphony Orchestra. Consequently the period reflected in the annual accounts of this orchestra for 1994-1995 is not twelve, but eighteen months, running from July 1, 1994 to December 31, 1995. In order to make comparison possible between Sweden and other countries the author decided to include calculated figures for 2/3 of the 18 month period to reflect a comparable basis.

Norrköping Symphony Orchestra: The figures are based on the actual statement of income and expenditure as with the other orchestras. No provision is made for special bookkeeping balancing due to the orchestra's move to a new concert hall, since that is extraordinary and would distort comparison with other orchestras in Sweden.

[7] Claes W. Englund, Teatrarnas riksförbund, in conversation with the author 1996.

Table 4.17. Sweden - Orchestras' Income 1995 (in most cases fiscal year 1994-1995)

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Total Income		Public Sources			Self Generated Income		
	SEK	GB£	SEK	GB£	% of total	SEK	GB£	% of total
Gävle Symphony Orchestra	18,942,135	1,681,593	17,355,870	1,540,772	91.6	1,586,265	140,821	8.4
Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra	85,542,000	7,594,013	57,741,333	5,126,002	67.5	27,800,667	2,468,011	32.5
Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra	23,779,200	2,111,005	20,183,100	1,791,760	84.9	3,596,100	319,245	15.1
Malmö Symphony Orchestra	48,976,000	4,347,857	43,630,000	3,873,264	89.1	5,346,000	474,593	10.9
Norrköping Symphony Orchestra	36,100,330	3,204,816	25,938,853	2,302,728	71.9	10,161,477	902,088	28.1
Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra	78,607,578	6,978,408	50,800,000	4,509,783	64.6	27,807,578	2,468,625	35.4
Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra								

Table 4.18. Sweden - Orchestras' Income 1995 (1994/1995) from Public Sources

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL fr. Public Sources		National			County			Municipality		
	SEK	GB£	SEK	GB£	% of public sources	SEK	GB£	% of public sources	SEK	GB£	% of public sources
Gävle Symphony Orchestra	17,355,870	1,540,772	8,987,870	797,900	51.8	4,198,000	372,679	24.2	4,170,000	370,193	24.0
Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra	57,741,333	5,126,002	19,549,333	1,735,497	33.9			0.0	38,192,000	3,390,505	66.1
Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra	20,183,100	1,791,760	8,279,400	735,006	41.0	2,128,500	188,958	10.6	9,775,200	867,796	48.4
Malmö Symphony Orchestra	43,630,000	3,873,264	10,595,000	940,574	24.3			0.0	33,035,000	2,932,691	75.7
Norrköping Symphony Orchestra	25,938,853	2,302,728	10,470,348	929,508	40.4	1,538,000	136,536	5.9	13,930,505	1,236,684	53.7
Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra	50,800,000	4,509,783			0.0	50,800,000	4,509,783	100.0			0.0
Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra											

Table 4.19. Sweden - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995 (1994/1995)

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL Self Gen. Income		Ticket Sales			Sale of other goods & serv.			Other Income			Sponsorship		
	SEK	GB£	SEK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	SEK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	SEK	GB£	% of S.G.I.	SEK	GB£	% of S.G.I.
Gävle Symphony Orchestra	1,586,265	140,821	450,777	40,018	28.4	734,999	65,250	46.3	400,489	35,554	25.3	0	0	0.0
Gothenburg Symphony Orch.	27,800,667	2,468,011	7,386,667	655,753	26.6	3,346,667	297,101	12.0	17,067,333	1,515,157	61.4			0.0
Helsingborg Symphony Orch.	3,596,100	319,245	1,379,400	122,457	38.4	1,278,400	113,490	35.5	863,300	76,640	24.0	75,000	6,658	2.1
Malmö Symphony Orchestra	5,346,000	474,593	4,083,000	362,469	76.4			0.0	1,263,000	112,123	23.6			0.0
Norrköping Symphony Orch.	10,161,477	902,088	3,273,535	290,609	32.2	3,755,137	333,363	36.9	1,917,805	170,254	18.9	1,215,000	107,862	12.0
Royal Stockh. Philharm. Orch.	27,807,578	2,468,625	9,180,000	814,957	33.0	4,952,317	439,643	17.8	8,675,261	770,149	31.2	5,000,000	443,876	18.0
Swedish Radio Symph. Orch.														

Table 4.20. Sweden - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995 (1994/1995)

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure		Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)			Other Costs			Cost pr. musician	
		SEK	GB£	SEK	GB£	% of total expenditure	SEK	GB£	% of total expenditure	SEK	GB£
Gävle Symphony Orchestra	52	20,073,965	1,782,071	15,322,051	1,360,219	76.3	4,751,913	421,852	23.7	386,038	34,271
Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra	108	85,609,333	7,599,991	46,946,000	4,167,643	54.8	38,663,333	3,432,347	45.2	792,679	70,370
Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra	50	25,251,400	2,241,700	21,047,400	1,868,488	83.4	4,204,000	373,211	16.6	505,028	44,834
Malmö Symphony Orchestra	87	48,069,000	4,267,338	24,326,000	2,159,547	50.6	23,743,000	2,107,791	49.4	552,517	49,050
Norrköping Symphony Orchestra	86	45,267,276	4,018,614	28,342,818	2,516,141	62.6	16,924,458	1,502,473	37.4	526,364	46,728
Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra	100	82,753,518	7,346,465	60,087,279	5,334,264	72.6	22,666,239	2,012,201	27.4	827,535	73,465
Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra	101										

4.7. Britain

Since the British orchestras that took part in the survey (Chapter 3) are so many and diverse, it was decided that the sample of orchestras, which had their financial statistics presented here, would be smaller. The sample was, however, selected so that different types of orchestras, contract orchestras (regional) and self governing orchestras (London), would be represented. Tables 4.21.- 4. 24. on pages 165-168 list the results.

Most of the information comes from the annual accounts of the orchestras but with some further information from Arts Council reports [8]. The purpose of th s sample is not to give an overall picture of finances of Br't sh orchestras, rather to provide a basis for comparison with the Scandinavian orchestras 'nc uded n this study

In this sample the orchestras in general show a s mi ar range of budgets to the Scandinavian orchestras. The biggest difference, however, s as cou d be expected the level of public subsidy. Whereas the Scandinav'an orchestras are rang ng from 70-95% in public subsidy as percentage of total income, Br'tish orchestras n the sample vary from 19% to 46%. The expend'ture figures seem to nd'cate a slightly lower percentage spent on wages of musicians and administrative staff than the Scandinavian orchestras have.

Individual orchestras: In the case of the London Symphony Orchestra a comparison of figures other than total income and total expenditure s diff cult since the orchestra presents their annual accounts n such a manner that t s not possible to identify the sources of the income, i.e. how much came from public sources and how much was self generated or came from sponsorship. Very much the same diff culties arose with the analysis of expenditure. W'th the London Philharmonic similar problems arose, although some more details were available as to dentifying public and private sources of income

[8] (The) Arts Council of England, Strategy or he support and devel pment of orchest as and their audiences, July 1995; BBC/Arts Counci Review of ational Orchest al P ovision Consultation Document London, October 1994; and Ritterman 1995 .

Table 4.21. Britain - Orchestras' Income 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Total Income	Public Sources		Self Generated Income	
	GB£	GB£	% of total	GB£	% of total
Bournemouth Orchestras	5,719,580	2,630,554	46.0	3,089,026	54.0
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra	5,536,137	2,286,041	41.3	3,250,096	58.7
Hallé Concerts Society	5,379,553	1,909,941	35.5	3,469,612	64.5
London Philharmonic Orchestra	5,418,738	1,058,334	19.5	4,360,404	80.5
London Symphony Orchestra	8,015,084				

Table 4.22. Britain - Orchestras' Income 1995 from Public Sources

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL fr. Public Sources	National		County		Municipality	
	GB£	GB£	% of public sources	GB£	% of public sources	GB£	% of public sources
Bournemouth Orchestras	2,630,554	1,603,380	61.0	46,000	1.7	981,174	37.3
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra	2,286,041	1,161,041	50.8		0.0	1,125,000	49.2
Hallé Concerts Society	1,909,941	1,355,060	70.9	333,881	17.5	221,000	11.6
London Philharmonic Orchestra	1,058,334	1,058,334	100.0		0.0		0.0
London Symphony Orchestra							

Table 4.23. Britain - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	TOTAL Self Gen. Income	Ticket Sales		Sale of other goods and services		Other Income		Sponsorship	
	GB£	GB£	% of S.G.I.	GB£	% of S.G.I.	GB£	% of S.G.I.	GB£	% of S.G.I.
Bournemouth Orchestras	3,089,026	1,042,659	33.8	1,426,494	46.2	13,120	0.4	606,753	19.6
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra	3,250,096	1,295,576	39.9	1,588,757	48.9	34,147	1.1	331,616	10.2
Hallé Concerts Society	3,469,612	1,614,329	46.5	395,683	11.4	422,423	12.2	1,037,177	29.9
London Philharmonic Orchestra	4,360,404								
London Symphony Orchestra									

Table 4.24. Britain - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995

NAME OF ORCHESTRA	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure	Total Wages: (regular staff: musicians and admin.)		Other Costs		Cost pr. musician
		GB£	GB£	% of total expenditure	GB£	% of total expenditure	GB£
Bournemouth Orchestras	98	5,841,374	3,362,429	57.6	2,478,945	42.4	59,606
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra	90	5,613,528	3,017,676	53.8	2,595,852	46.2	62,373
Hallé Concerts Society	101	5,467,501	3,470,355	63.5	1,997,146	36.5	54,134
London Philharmonic Orchestra		5,598,425					
London Symphony Orchestra		8,003,119					

4.8. Comparison

Tables 4.25.-4.32, pages 170-177, are a condensed form of the individual countries' data, presented in two manners:

a) average figures for each of the six countries separately
b) average figures for Scandinavia vs. average figures for the U.K.

The average figures referred to in a) are those of all the orchestras in that country divided by the number of orchestras included in the survey, thus representing "an average orchestra" of that country. Similar principles apply to b). The tables give an indication of how each country compares to others in the sample pertaining to the various aspects of income and expenditure, similarly to how individual orchestras examined in each country compare to each other. Further comparison between orchestras in the United Kingdom and Scandinavia is the subject of the next chapter.

Table 4.25. All Countries - Orchestras' Income 1995 (averages pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Average number of musicians	Total Income		Public Sources			Self Generated Income		
		Local Currency	GB£	Local Currency	GB£	% of total	Local Currency	GB£	% of total
DENMARK	73	36,427,490	4,117,915	32,086,095	3,627,146	88.5	4,341,395	490,769	11.5
FINLAND	56	16,359,895	2,374,096	14,939,775	2,168,013	90.8	1,420,120	206,083	9.2
ICELAND	70	222,157,030	2,204,022	195,942,964	1,944,264	88.2	26,214,066	260,112	11.8
NORWAY	70	41,386,721	4,122,183	34,194,972	3,405,874	82.6	7,191,749	716,310	17.4
SWEDEN	83	48,657,874	4,319,615	35,941,526	3,190,718	78.3	12,716,378	1,128,897	21.7
BRITAIN	96		5,513,502		1,971,218	35.8		3,542,284	64.2

Table 4.26. UK and Scandinavia - Orchestras' income 1995 (averages pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Average number of musicians	Total Income GB£	Public Sources GB£	Public Sources % of total income	Self Generated Income GB£	Self Generated Income % of total income
Scandinavia	71	3,427,637	2,940,852	85.8	486,714	14.2
Britain	96	5,513,502	1,971,218	35.8	3,542,284	64.2

Table 4.28. UK and Scandinavia - Orchestras' Income 1995 from Public Sources (average pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Average number of musicians	TOTAL from Public Sources GB£	National GB£	National % of Public Sources	County GB£	County % of Public Sources	Municipality GB£	Municipality % of Public Sources
Scandinavia	71	2,867,203	1,734,579	60.5	264,839	9.2	867,785	30.3
Britain	96	1,971,218	1,294,454	65.7	94,970	4.8	581,794	29.5

Table 4.29. All Countries - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995 (average pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Average number of musicians	TOTAL Self Gen. Income		Ticket Sales			Sale of other goods and services			Other Income			Sponsorship		
		Local Currency	GB£	Local Currency	GB£	% of S.G.I.	Local Currency	GB£	% of S.G.I.	Local Currency	GB£	% of S.G.I.	Local Currency	GB£	% of S.G.I.
DENMARK	73	4,341,395	490,769	1,623,250	183,499	37.3	1,822,587	206,033	42.0	345,588	39,063	8.0	550,000	62,174	12.7
FINLAND	56	1,420,120	206,083	831,385	120,648	58.5	375,730	54,525	26.5	213,004	30,910	15.0			0.0
ICELAND	70	26,214,066	260,112	19,790,963	196,378	75.5	1,664,000	16,511	6.3	4,759,103	47,223	18.2	0	0	0.0
NORWAY	70	7,191,749	716,310	3,217,908	320,509	44.7	2,094,650	208,630	29.1	1,543,425	153,728	21.5	335,767	33,443	4.7
SWEDEN	83	12,716,348	1,128,897	4,292,230	381,044	33.8	2,344,587	208,141	18.4	5,031,198	446,646	39.6	1,048,333	93,066	8.2
BRITAIN *	96		3,269,235		1,317,521	40.3		1,136,978	34.8		156,563	4.8		658,515	20.1

* Note: The British figures in this table only include the three regional orchestras included in this survey since detailed information from the two London orchestras of earned income was not available.

Table 4.30. - UK and Scandinavia - Self Generated Income of Orchestras 1995 (average pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Average number of musicians	TOTAL Self Gen. Inc. GB£	Ticket Sales GB£	Ticket Sales % of S.G.I.	Sale of Other Goods & Serv. GB£	Sale of Other Goods & Serv. % of S.G.I.	Other Income GB£	Other Income % of S.G.I.	Sponsorship GB£	Sponsorship % of S.G.I.
Scandinavia	71	560,434	240,415	42.9	138,768	24.8	143,514	25.6	37,737	6.7
Britain *	96	3,269,235	1,317,521	40.3	1,136,978	34.8	156,563	4.8	658,515	20.1

* Note: The British figures in this table only include the three regional orchestras included in this survey since detailed information from the two London orchestras of earned income was not available.

Table 4.31. All Countries - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995 (averages pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure		Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)			Other Costs			Cost pr. musician	
		Local Currency	GB£	Local Currency	GB£	% of Total Expenditure	Local Currency	GB£	% of Total Expenditure	Local Currency	GB£
DENMARK	63	36,588,318	4,136,096	25,895,762	2,927,365	70.8	10,692,557	1,208,731	29.2	495,606	56,025
FINLAND	56	16,413,111	2,381,818	13,133,381	1,905,874	80.0	3,279,730	475,944	20.0	281,086	40,790
ICELAND	70	261,366,031	2,593,432	214,911,891	2,132,486	82.2	46,454,140	460,946	17.8	3,733,800	37,049
NORWAY	70	41,209,376	4,104,520	27,196,889	2,708,853	66.0	14,012,487	1,395,666	34.0	552,197	55,000
SWEDEN	83	51,170,749	4,542,696	32,678,591	2,901,050	63.9	18,492,157	1,641,646	36.1	598,360	53,120
BRITAIN *	96		5,640,801		3,283,487	58.2		2,357,314	41.8		58,704

* Note: The British figures in this table only include the three regional orchestras included in this survey since detailed information from the two London orchestras on expenditure was not available.

Table 4.32. UK and Scandinavia - Orchestras' Expenditure 1995 (averages pr. orchestra)

NAME OF COUNTRY	Number of contracted musicians on a full time basis (or average number of players)	Total Expenditure	Total Wages (reg. staff: musicians and admin.)		Other Costs		Cost pr. Musician
		GB£	GB£	% of Total Expenditure	GB£	% of Total Expenditure	GB£
Scandinavia	71	3,551,712	2,515,126	70.8	1,036,587	29.2	48,397
Britain *	96	5,640,801	3,283,487	58.2	2,357,314	41.8	58,704

* Note: The British figures in this table only include the three regional orchestras included in this survey since detailed information from the two London orchestras on expenditure was not available.

4.9. Effects of funding patterns and sponsorship on the programming of orchestras

The different funding models and patterns demonstrated by the tables in this chapter raises a number of questions. Although the general impact of this will be addressed in the discussion and conclusion of Chapter 6, it is of interest to look at a few points at this stage that might influence the orchestra's artistic choice and direction. One such factor relevant to all orchestras, and perhaps particularly to British orchestras, is the potential influence of sponsorship on the programming of the orchestras.

Through the last decade and a half, sponsorship has become much more common and a much larger part of the orchestras' funding mix, particularly in the U.K. It is important, however, to distinguish between sponsorship and patronage. Sponsorship is always a business deal, where the two partners, the sponsor and the orchestra, enter into a business relationship that to all intents and purposes is similar to any other business deals by any two companies. This entails, in contrast to patronage where the patron usually gives funds to the orchestra to further the orchestra's own goals in a way that is decided by orchestra itself, that both parties assess carefully what it is that they want to get out of the business deal. For the orchestra the goal is quite simple: funds for running the orchestra. For the company that is granting sponsorship the motive can be somewhat more complex. It might be image building: establishing goodwill for the company through and association with an orchestra of repute, or providing opportunities for customer entertainment; or a way to avoid taxation, or to further a particular product. Some companies have a carefully worked out policy on this issue and actually see the company's link to a cultural institution, such as an orchestra, as an important aspect of their marketing policy [9].

Since sponsorship is always a two way business deal it would be justifiable to assert that both parties are influenced by the wishes and demands of their counterpart, both spoken and unspoken. It is particularly difficult to discuss this issue with orchestra managers since they are keen to appear as if the orchestra has a full control over its own programming and at the same time want to maintain a good relationship with their sponsors.

Orchestra managers in Scandinavia, to whom this author has spoken, maintain that this influence is minima or non existing but at the same time admit that they are more tempted to offer concerts with "traditional" repertoire to sponsors as an

[9] As an example of this in Scandinavia is the policy of Volvo the car manufacturers, who through their sponsorship of the Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra made it possible for the orchestra to expand to a full size orchestra of around 100 musicians. The sponsorship was particularly aimed at this enlargement of the orchestra.

opportunity for customer entertainment than to offer concerts with unusual or new repertoire.

The same is probably true in the U.K. There are interesting exceptions to this, however. The partnership of British Telecom and the Association of British Orchestras, where B.T. sponsors the composition of a new piece of music which is then performed by several of the A.B.O.'s member orchestras, is an interesting example of how sponsorship is actually instrumental in creating opportunities for the performance of new music.

As said earlier, orchestra managers are not always outspoken about the effects of sponsorship on programming. It is, however, reasonable to assume that since both parties, sponsor and orchestra, are a part of a business deal, consideration must be taken by both halves to accommodate each other's needs. This will inevitably affect the choice of programming by an orchestra, be it in whichever direction: towards the "traditional" or the "new".

Another aspect of funding's influence on the programming of orchestras, could be the funds that grant giving bodies (public) in various countries call "incentive funding" or "directed funding". In this case an orchestra is given special funding almost as a reward for doing a certain kind of programming or project, often for a specially defined group of people. Examples of this are education programmes and projects done by orchestras both in Scandinavia and the U.K. Naming such funding "incentive" funding or alike, indicates that the grant giving body wants to influence the orchestra's programming, although, as the case may be, the orchestra is happy with this and even sees such projects as an important and worthwhile part of their artistic policy.

To conclude on this point it is not possible to rule out the influence of sponsorship and specially directed funding on the programming of orchestras. A lot of these influences are on a very informal level and are not easily detectable. It is, however, reasonable to assume that these influences exist given the nature of the relationship between sponsor and orchestra, in particular.

Chapter 5 Britain and Scandinavia - A Comparison

5.1. Introduction

In the preceding chapters data from all six countries included in this study i.e. Britain, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, has been presented and analysed. Since the five Nordic countries are in many ways similar in social and political structure as well as having similar traditions in public administration, it was considered advisable to include Britain in the study as a possible contrast: a country that has significantly different traditions and practices when it comes to relationship between the arts and government. Although British orchestras operate in a different environment with regards to cultural policy compared with Scandinavian orchestras, it was felt likely to be of interest to compare the Nordic countries as a whole to Britain with regards to some key aspects pertaining to orchestral policy and organisation, as possible models of the more general differences that exist between different models of government involvement in the arts.

It was therefore considered necessary to include this short chapter focusing specifically on the above issues. This chapter will therefore briefly compare Britain to Scandinavia, drawing primarily on material from the questionnaire described in Chapter 3 as well as financial statistics from Chapter 4. However, wider consideration of different models and theories of government involvement will be left to the final discussion in Chapter 6.

5.2. Attitudes of British and Scandinavian orchestra managers

When this study was initiated the author developed a preliminary hypothesis, based on the difference between the operating environment of British vs. Scandinavian orchestras: in essence, since Scandinavian orchestras generally receive such a large part of their budget from public sources it might be expected to be self evident that the orchestra chief executives would feel stronger the presence of the politicians who, after all, granted these funds to the orchestras. In addition, as the

officially declared policy of funding the arts in Great Britain has for half a century been based on the 'arm's length principle' under which politicians (in theory at least) are formally separated from direct involvement in the distribution of funds, such a system would surely further add to the difference between Britain and the Scandinavian countries.

It was therefore somewhat of a surprise then to discover that the replies to the survey detailed in Chapter 3 proved to be remarkably similar when the average of replies from the Scandinavian countries (even taking each of the countries into account) are compared with the replies from Britain.

The following table, Table. 5.1, summarises the average scoring to each key question by the British orchestral chief executives compared with the averages for the Nordic orchestras as follows, (the numbers reflecting answers on a scale from 1- 7 as usual):

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Mostly Inaccurate	Slightly Inaccurate	Uncertain	Slightly Accurate	Mostly Accurate	Very Accurate

Table 5.1. - Britain vs. Scandinavia: Scoring in Questionnaire

Question/statement:	Britain:	Scandinavia:
1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.	3.2	2.9
2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.	5.9	6.3
3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.	5.3	5.9
4. Our **local** politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.	4.2	4.5
5. Our **national** politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.	3.8	4.2
6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.	5.0	4.5
7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.	5.7	5.8
8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.	5.0	4.8
9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable		

(Table 5.1. continued)	(Britain:)	(Scandinavia:)
group of professionals, who do a good job.	6.0	6.0
10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.	6.3	5.8
11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.	6.2	5.3
12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.	3.7	2.9
13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.	3.4	3.7
14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.	3.2	4.2
15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.	3.0	2.3
16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.	1.6	1.5
17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.	1.7	1.6
18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.	2.5	3.2
19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.	5.2	5.5
20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.	6.1	6.0
21. My orchestra could do better musically.	4.6	5.5
21. My orchestra could do better financially	6.3	6.3
23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.	1.9	2.0
24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.	5.2	5.1
25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.	3.2	3.3
26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).	1.3	2.7
27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.	3.5	3.8

(Table 5.1. continued)	(Britain:)	(Scandinavia:)
28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country .	5.7	6.8
29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.	1.8	1.3
30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.	2.5	1.9
31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.	3.6	2.3
32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.	3.6	3.9
33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.	2.9	3.8
34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.	1.5	3.9

More comments and interpretation of each question can be seen later on in this chapter as well as in Chapter 3, Section 3.7.

On the whole there seems to be little significant difference between the replies in Britain and Scandinavia, which might lead to the conclusion that the chief executives are not as affected by the difference in funding structure and thereby the different level of government involvement. Before going on, however, to draw such a conclusion, it is of interest to look at the results of questions that pertain to the relationship of chief executives to 'outer' reality, i.e. contact with society and thereby also government, on the one hand, and the attitudes of chief executives toward the 'inner workings' of the organisation they are responsible for, on the other.

Tables 5.2. and 5.3. group different questions together, depending on this principle.

Scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Mostly Inaccurate	Slightly Inaccurate	Uncertain	Slightly Accurate	Mostly Accurate	Very Accurate

Table 5.2. - Britain vs. Scandinavia: Scoring on questions pertaining to the 'outer' workings of an orchestra, relationship to community, government etc.

Question/statement:	Britain:	Scandinavia:
3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work	5.3	5.9
4. Our **local** politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work	4.2	4.5
5. Our **national** politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.	3.8	4.2
12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.	3.7	2.9
13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.	3.4	3.7
18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.	2.5	3.2
19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.	5.2	5.5
25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.	3.2	3.3
26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).	1.3	2.7
27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.	3.5	3.8
28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country .	5.7	6.8
29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.	1.8	1.3
30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.	2.5	1.9

(Table 5.2. continued)	(Britain:)	(Scandinavia:)
31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.	3.6	2.3
32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.	3.6	3.9
33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.	2.9	3.8
34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.	1.5	3.9

In none of the above questions is there a large difference in replies between the Nordic countries and Britain. The biggest difference is in question 34, concerning the national governments's cultural policy. British chief executives are clearly very unhappy about the national government's cultural policy (or more accurately its proud boast not to have a cultural policy) than the Scandinavian ones. Other interesting features can be seen in the remarkable similarity of the scoring between the Scandinavian and British chief executives in areas where more difference could be expected, given the different funding structure and the greater ratio of public funds in the overall turnover of orchestras in Scandinavia. With such a funding mix it could be expected that the chief executives could feel closer to the political power and/or that politicians would in some way exercise their possibility to influence the day to day running of the orchestra and this pressure could be expected to be felt by the chief executives. When looking at several of the questions, however, this does not seem to be the case.

Questions 3,4,5,13,19,25 and 27 show only a marginal difference between attitudes of the two groups. If anything, it can be said that the Scandinavian chief executives are on the whole more positive about the quality and behaviour of the politicians and civil service than their British counterparts, despite the 'arm's-length' principle in the U.K.

A slightly greater difference is noted in other questions such as no. 18 where the Scandinavian group is, after all, a little more convinced that the political authorities have too much of an influence over the running of the orchestra. Also in question 26, where British chief executives feel notably stronger than the Scandinavian ones that public subsidy for orchestras is too little. A surprisingly small difference is noted between the two groups in the scoring of question 33, which asks

how secure the chief executive is about the continuing public subsidy of the orchestra. The scoring is low in both groups which could be an indication that times are changing for the Scandinavian orchestras and public subsidy not a given factor as it has been in the past.

On the other hand there is hardly any difference in scoring between the two groups when it comes to feeling the support of politicians (question 25) or when determining whether orchestras could function with little or no public support (question 29), although it could be argued for this last question that the difference (1.8 for Britain and 1.3. for Scandinavia) could be considered of statistical significance. It is also interesting to note that British chief executives actually feel the involvement of politicians and civil servants more than the Scandinavian ones, if the scoring for question 30 is examined.

Finally an interesting point is the scoring of question 32, where the attitudes of the chief executives towards the link between the orchestras and politically elected authorities is assessed. In view of the different level of public funding in Scandinavia and Britain it is somewhat surprising that there is such little difference in the scoring. Is it then so that despite the different levels of public funding in Scandinavia and Britain that orchestra managers in all the countries have a more uniform view of the role of public involvement in the running of the orchestra? Or can this be explained by the difference between the 'formal' and the 'informal' relationship between the orchestras and authorities? Both these questions will be discussed further in Chapter 6. There seems to be a strong indication, however, that the environment in which an orchestra operates is not as strong a factor in the view of chief executives as the 'inner' organisational culture.

To look at issues pertaining to this 'inner' organisational culture Table 5.3. groups together the scoring from the questions that particularly dealt with the chief executives' attitudes to the orchestras as an organisational and financial unit, as well as questions on job satisfaction and administrative and artistic matters.

Table 5.3. - Britain vs. Scandinavia: Scoring on questions pertaining to the 'inner' workings of an orchestra.

Question/statement:	Britain:	Scandinav a:
1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.	3.2	2.9
2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.	5.9	6.3
6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.	5.0	4.5
7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.	5.7	5.8

(Table 5.3. continued)	(Britain:)	(Scandinavia:)
8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.	5.0	4.8
9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very group of professionals who do a good job.	6.0	6.0
10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.	6.3	5.8
11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.	6.2	5.3
14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.	3.2	4.2
15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.	3.0	2.3
16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.	1.6	1.5
17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.	1.7	1.6
20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.	6.1	6.0
21. My orchestra could do better musically.	4.6	5.5
21. My orchestra could do better financially	6.3	6.3
23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.	1.9	2.0
24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.	5.2	5.1

In questions covered in table 5.3. there is an interesting feature that can be observed. This is, that there is hardly any difference between scoring between the British group of orchestra chief executives and the Scandinavian ones. The only notable difference is in question 14, where the Scandinavian group seems to be slightly more concerned about the decision making process within the organisation than the British group. Otherwise the attitudes are almost uniform.

The only questions about the two groups that indicate how they are composed, are questions pertaining to gender and age, (as well as nationality of orchestra), since the survey was otherwise anonymous. Table 5.4. and table 5.5. show the gender and ages of the chief executives surveyed. It is noteworthy that the tables only show the composition of this group as reflected by answered questionnaires, but does not describe the objective up to date status of the orchestras.

Table 5.4. - Gender of Orchestra Chief Executives in Britain and Scandinavia

Male	32 (86%)	17 (59%)
Female	5 (14%)	12 (41%)
No answer	3	0

Table 5.5. - Average Age of Orchestra Chief Executives in Britain and Scandinavia

	UK	Scandinavia
Average age	42.1 years	43.4 years

When comparing tables 5.4. and 5.5. the only notable difference is the higher proportion of women in the Scandinavian group. Whereas the British group is heavily male dominated there is a more equal ratio of male and female chief executives in Scandinavia. The reason for this, however, is the high number of female orchestra chief executives in Finland which makes the Scandinavian average look more equal than the British one; other Scandinavian countries are much closer to the British pattern (see Chapter 3, section 3.7.).

On the whole, the survey results presented a surprisingly small difference between the Scandinavian group and the British group. The difference is slightly larger in the section pertaining to the orchestras' relationship to their environment but almost unanimous when it comes to issues of attitudes to internal organisational issues. This aspect will be discussed further in Chapter 6, as said before.

5.3. Financial Comparison

When comparing financial statistics between British and Scandinavian orchestras, it is of importance to be clear about which orchestras are being compared since the prerequisites, such as size and employment form, have to correspond to make the comparison as accurate as possible. The rate of exchange between the currencies, Pound Sterling on one hand and the five Nordic currencies, Danish Krone, Finnish Markka, Icelandic Króna, Norwegian Krone and Swedish Krona, is also an important factor in this context since these currencies' exchange rate against the Pound Sterling has changed considerable over recent years. To make some sort of an average value of these exchange rates it was decided that the rate of exchange used for this purpose in this study would be the average rate of exchange for each of the currencies against the Pound Sterling as calculated by each of the five Scandinavian national Central Banks for the year 1995 [1].

[1] See footnote no. 1 in Chapter 4 on page 137

Another comparable factor in this context is the size of each orchestra's budget. Again, here the choice of orchestras in this financial comparison has to be limited to orchestras that have roughly the same number of musicians employed on similar conditions to make the financial comparison of budget sizes interesting. To compare the budget sizes as well as wage levels in Britain and Scandinavia, a selection has been done of orchestras that all have around 100 musicians, employed on a contractual basis. Table 5.6. shows this comparison. All figures are rounded off to the nearest thousand pounds sterling.

Table 5.6. U.K. and Scandinavia : Expenditure and Wage Levels of Orchestras

Country	Orchestra and number of musicians	Total Exp. in GB£	Total Wages in GB£	% of Total
DK	Danish National Radio Symphony Orchestra, 98	6,524,000	4,161,000	64 %
Fin	Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra, 98	4,899,000	4,076,000	83 %
Fin	Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra, 98	4,322,000	3,562,000	82 %
N	Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra, 92	5,201,000	3,678,000	71%
N	Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra,106	7,649,000	4,727.000	62%
S	Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra, 108	7,600,000	4,168,000	55 %
S	Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra, 100	7,346,000	5,334,000	73 %
GB	Bournemouth Orchestras, 98	5,841,000	3,362,000	58 %
GB	City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, 90	5,614,000	3,018,000	54 %
GB	Hallé Concerts Society, U.K. 10	5,468,000	3,470,000	64 %

These figures show that the expenditure varies somewhat between the Scandinavian countries and some are above and others below the level of the British orchestras [2] . The Scandinavian average of expenditure (approx. GB£ 6,220,000 pr. year) is, however, slightly above the level of the British average (approx. GB£ 5,641,000 pr. year). In percentages the British average is about 91% of the Scandinavian one. In other words, if using a Scandinavian average at all in these calculations, the conclusions could be that orchestras are more expensive to run in Scandinavia than in Britain. There are however such big differences between the five Nordic countries that the use of such average is doubtful as a comparative tool.

[2] The orchestra that shows the lowest figures, the Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra, is a part of the Finnish Broadcasting Service and some aspects of its finance may be difficult to separate from the mother company. Same applies to other radio orchestras. The figures here, both for the Danish and Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestras have, however, been provided by the orchestras themselves and should be all right to use for comparison.

The percentage of total wages [3] in the overall budget seems to be lower in Britain if judged by these figures than in Scandinavia. There is, however, a larger margin in the wages levels of the Scandinavian orchestras in the table than the British ones, with a range from 55% - 83% and an average of 70 %. The British average of the orchestras in the table is 59%. Again it is questionable if the Scandinavian average can be used comparatively due to the rather big differences in values between the orchestras. The average is probably higher, if all Scandinavian orchestras in the survey are taken into account (around 72% [4]). On the other hand it can be seen, however, that well over half of all the orchestras' expenditure is spent on wages of regular staff.

An interesting difference between British and Scandinavian orchestras, however, is the different level of public subsidy in the two territories. Table 5.7. shows the public grants as percentage of total income. All figures rounded off to the nearest thousand pounds sterling.

Table 5.7. U.K. and Scandinavia: Income and Public Subsidy of Orchestras

Country	Orchestra and number of musicians	Total Inc. in GB£	Total Public Subsidy	% of Total
DK	Danish National Radio Symphony Orchestra, 98	6,525,000	5,643,000	86 %
Fin	Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra, 98	4,898,000	4,517,000	92 %
Fin	Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra, 98	3,322,000	4,085,000	95 %
N	Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra, 92	5,234,000	4,614,000	88 %
N	Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra, 106	7,744,000	5,454,000	70 %
S	Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra, 108	7,594,000	5,126,000	68 %
S	Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra, 100	6,978,000	4,510,000	65 %
GB	Bournemouth Orchestras, 98	5,720,000	2,631,000	46 %
GB	City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, 90	5,536,000	2,286,000	41 %
GB	Hallé Concerts Society, 101	5,379,000	1,910,000	36 %

When the above figures are compared a clear difference can be seen in the level of public subsidy between the British and the Scandinavian orchestras. Whereas the British orchestras in the table derive a range of 36 - 46% of their gross income

---

[3] Same definition of "Total Wages" is used here as in Chapter 4, i.e. wages of regular staff (musicians and administration) are calculated but fees to conductors and soloists are not, as much as it is possible to separate those figures in the orchestras' statements of income and expenditure for 1995 (or the nearest fiscal year).

[4] See Appendices 7a and 7b and Chapter 4

from public sources (average of 41%), the Scandinavian orchestras in the table have a range of 65 - 95% (an average of 81%). (The average of all the Scandinavian orchestras in the survey is, however, is 85% [5]). It is also interesting in this context to note that the funding of music organisations (not only orchestras) that is regularly funded by the Arts Council of England and Regional Arts Boards comes to 40% of gross turnover [6].

This difference in the public subsidy ratio of the funding mix is probably the largest single difference between British and Scandinavian orchestras. As can be seen in the tables in chapter 4 the major part of British orchestras' turnover comes from self generated income or 64%. Ticket sales and sales of other goods and services stand for 75% of that (48 % of gross turnover) whereas, interestingly, sponsorship only amounts to 20% of self generated income or 7% of gross turnover. The figures represent clearly a different operating environment for British orchestra chief executives, since the funding mix for the British orchestras in Table 5.7. is differently composed and most likely requires a different approach to the over all financial management and fund raising of an orchestra, than that of a Scandinavian one.

Another factor also worth considering is how readily available this public funding is in the different countries and how much unproductive bureaucracy lies behind the figures. This will be discussed in Chapter 6.

5.4. Labour market and employment philosophy

The labour market and employment philosophy in the five Nordic countries is relatively similar in terms of factors such as demography, population, political history and the role of trade unions. The Scandinavian orchestras' status in this environment is no different than that of other companies hiring labour in the same

---

[5] See Tab e 4.28. on page 173

[6] Arts Counc of Eng and Second Annual Report, 1995/96, p. 14. More specifically this s listed as fo ows for "organisations regularly funded by the Arts Counc and Reg ona Arts Boards" in the mus c sector:

Earned income	£ 63,479,000
"Contributed ncome"(.e. donat ons,sponsorship etc.)	£ 13,554,000
SUBTOTAL - self generated income	£ 77,033,000
Arts Counc Reg ona Arts Board subs dy	£ 45,564,000
Local authon ty and other subsidy	£ 6,384,000
SUBTOTAL - subs dy	£ 51,951,000
TOTAL INCOME/SUBSIDY	£ 128,984 000

On these f gures, across the Eng sh Arts counc /Reg onal Arts Board subs d sed Mus c sector as a who e, tota pub c sector subs d es average 40.3 % - though obv ous y there are b g differences between nd v dual organ sat ons.

countries. The orchestras are legally structured in many different ways [7] but most belong to some form of employers' organisations, in the private or public sphere. None of the Scandinavian symphony orchestras in this survey are freelance or self-governing. They all employ players on a contractual basis and in some of the countries, notably Sweden, there are severe restrictions on the employer's right to, for example, terminate the employment of an employee. This is a part of the general wage agreement and employment law and practice in the country, and there is no exception for the orchestras. The high level of social security tax paid by employers as well as income tax and V A T [8] is also a factor that restricts the employer's flexibility in the five countries. The Scandinavian labour market is heavily regulated, compared with Britain, and since the general labour market seems to be more homogeneous in the Nordic countries in matters pertaining to employment form, union structure and wage levels, this is also the case with the orchestras. This regulated labour market and high public levels of public subsidy do not, however, prevent orchestras going bankrupt and ceasing operation altogether. An example of this is the case of the Stockholm Wind Symphony Orchestra which closed down in the autumn of 1996.

Whereas the Scandinavian orchestras in this study all employ musicians on a contractual basis, the situation is not the same with British orchestras. Although one could argue that there is in fact only one additional employment form to contractual employment, i.e. freelance engagement, it is fair to add the third form: that of self governing orchestras as practised by the four symphony orchestras in London [9]. The reason for separating self governance from the ordinary freelance employment, is the nature of the relationship between employer and employee in the employment situation. In the "ordinary" freelance world the relationship between the player and the employer is limited to the actual occasion of the concert, recording or alike: the player plays, the employer pays. The relationship of the player in a self government orchestra is somewhat different. Although paid by session like the freelance player, the musician is also a shareholder in the company employing him or her and could in many ways be responsible for decisions made by e.g. board of directors which might

---

[7] See Appendix 6

[8] In Sweden for example, the employers's tax/social security payments is approx. 33% of the wage bill. In the U.K. compulsory payments average around 7 %, though some orchestras do pay to voluntary pension schemes in addition to this.

[9] Over the past thirty odd years a number of reports have been written about the orchestras' situation in London. These are: The Committee on the London Orchestras (the Goodman report) 1965 (Arts Council); A Report on Orchestral Resources in Great Britain (the Peacock report) 1970 (Arts Council); 'The Four London Orchestras' (the Figgures report) 1978 (London Orchestral Concert Board); The Glory of the Garden 1984 (Arts Council); Working party on the four London orchestras (the Ponsonby report) 1987 (Arts Council); Advisory Panel on Orchestral Residency (the Tooley report) 1989/90 (The South Bank Board) and The Advisory Committee on the London Orchestras (the Hoffmann report) 1993. (In the list of recourses at the end of this thesis the reports are listed alphabetically under the names they are most commonly referred to under (Figgures, Hoffman etc.))

governing and freelance labour market is dependent on, as said earlier, access to high quality labour (freelance players) AND being able to sustain such a labour market through offering enough work and financial incentive to make this option attractive to the musicians. In order to do so, there must be a large supply of musical employment opportunities, relatively concentrated to one geographical area.

This is possible in London due to the size and international status of its orchestral provision: something of immense interest and value to the recording industry, for example. It is questionable whether a symphony orchestra could be run the same way (self-governing or freelance) in Scandinavia, because of the lack of readily available high-quality freelance labour market, demographic factors (size of population, geography) as well as government policy on employment practices, a strong union involvement and general traditions of employment practices.

Although it is not wise to generalise about the labour market in the five Nordic countries, it can be said that traditionally the attitude to the relationship between the employer and the employee is marked by the domination of social democratic parties in the political arena of most of the five countries for a number of decades, where the relationship and the polarisation between the employer and the employee is (historically)at the centre of the political debate. The "class struggle" has over many years been seen as an essential prerequisite in all debate about the labour market. This is changing, however, since the political parties have realised that this agenda cannot be sustained, especially taking into account the rapid globalisation of finance and labour markets and the increasing role of the European Union. The process is painful for Scandinavian countries since this is almost a complete U-turn of values that date back over half a century. All of a sudden private entrepreneurship is no longer suspicious but instead "the solution". This is leaving an ideological vacuum, not dissimilar to the vacuum left in the former communist countries after the fall of communist regimes, although in a much milder form. It has to be stressed, however, that this is a generalisation and there are local variations in each of the five countries.

Another reason for maintaining the traditional view that it is doubtful if symphony orchestras could be run in self-governing or freelance form in Scandinavia on a regular or permanent basis is, that some admittedly limited experiments have failed. The involvement of government, in some form or another, has been the catalyst that has secured the existence and development of permanent symphony orchestras. Examples of this is Swedish legislation of 1911, involvement of the Norwegian State Broadcasting Service in Norwegian orchestral development and the Iceland Symphony Orchestra Act of 1983 [13] .

Since the form of self government for a large symphony orchestra is unique for the London orchestras, it is of interest for the purpose of this study to look

[13] See Chapter 2.

briefly at the particular situation of these orchestras and the possible influence on decision making by chief executive officers that this might entail.

London is unique in the way that it has five major symphony orchestras, four of which are self governing (only the BBC Symphony Orchestra offers contracted employment). No other major city in the world can boast about a similar number of big professional symphony orchestras. As said before in this chapter having such a number of orchestras is made possible by the large pool of high quality labour, musicians, that is available to the orchestras in London and makes it possible to run them on (basically) freelance basis.

Despite the system of self government, where the players of the orchestra basically only get paid for the sessions they play and at the same time are ultimately responsible for the hiring (and firing) of musicians as well as music director, general manager and administrative staff [14], the built in instability of the employment situation, with regards to musicians, presens particular challenges to the chief executive officers of these orchestras. The chief executive cannot count on having a regular body of (same) players all the time, a more lucrative offer from somewhere else might for example tempt a principal player to send a deputy on a particular occasion. Also, since the number of working hours for the orchestra is controlled by the need to generate income rather than a strictly regulated agreement specifying the maximum number of hours that the musicians can work, this can also cause a heavy workload for the musicians and considerable strain on key principal players. This situation is somewhat difficult and clearly a challenge for the chief executive. As an example of how new solutions to this particular problem have emerged looking at how one of the London orchestras, the London Symphony Orchestra, has approached the issue could be of interest.

In 1991 the LSO applied for a special Enhancement Funding from the Arts Council to implement the orchestra's development plan which proposed five major changes to achieve an overall objective which was: "to develop and maintain an orchestra of the highest international standard" [15]. More specifically these were: appointment of joint principals, expansion of the string sections, elimination of associate orchestra members, establishment of fixed holiday periods and improvement of player compensation. The LSO was granted this funding and could go ahead with implementing their plan. In the following section the intention is to look at some of these points and to examine how the implementation affects the chief executive in his task as well as how this affects the whole orchestra.

The appointment of joint or equal principal players made it possible for excellent players who also wanted to pursue their own careers as soloists or chamber

14 Lehman and Galinsky (1994), p. 4

15 Ibid., p. 5 - 7

music players to still play in the orchestra some of the time. This arrangement is mutually beneficial for the players, who have their obligation to the orchestra clearly defined, and to the chief executive officer who knows that excellent players will be more positive to this kind of "job sharing" which allows them certain freedom and consequently the job will be more attractive to the top players.

The elimination of associate membership of the LSO entailed that players, that previously had been named "associate players" and often had played almost as much with the orchestra as the regular players, no longer had a special category. Associate players had not had voting right and many of them lost their jobs when the development plan was implemented, since it stated that all members of the orchestra should become full members of the orchestra and the associate players had to be judged superior to newcomers, who auditioned for the orchestra (the associate players were not required to audition) in order to keep their job. Making all members into full members the chief executive further stabilised the players' commitment to the orchestra and presumably made it easier to keep the orchestra manned by the same musicians on different occasions.

The changes in player compensation that the LSO's development plan proposed entailed that although players were still paid by the service, a modicum of financial security was provided and their base compensation was raised by 15%. In return players were required to play in 85% of the orchestra's scheduled concerts [16].

It is clear that the chief executive's intention with designing the development plan was to increase the stability and commitment of the orchestra and its players. The development of the LSO, and particularly the chief executive's presentation of a development plan that is aimed at giving the orchestra stability and also attracting top level players shows that although London has a large pool of players, the chief executive's assessment of the situation was that the orchestra needed stability which the conventional system of self government, as practised by the London orchestras, could not provide. The LSO, however, seems to have succeeded in addressing the problems that are intrinsic to the system of self government without scarifying any of the principles on which this tradition is based.

5.5. Are the British orchestras different?

As a musical institution the British symphony orchestra performs similar, if not the same, tasks as a Scandinavian symphony orchestra. The relationship to government is, at least on the formal level, characterised by 'an arm's length' principle. How this formal principle is applied in reality is difficult to say, as a relationship with government operates through many informal structures as well as the

16 Ibid.

official channels (e.g. an annual Arts Council grant). These informal structures and their role in the implementation of 'the arm's length principle' will be discussed further in Chapter 6. In Scandinavia the political authorities are not shy of formalising the relationship with the orchestras, for example through legislation and/or direct funding, bypassing any 'arm's length' bodies that might otherwise exist within the public administration structure of that country.

As far as managerial tasks are concerned, however, does the everyday reality of the British orchestra manager differ radically from that of the Scandinavian orchestra manager? Analysing the answers given in Chapter 3, one could draw the conclusion that this is not the case. In both systems the chief executives are more focused on and dedicate more time to the internal administrative and managerial workings of the organisations than in relating to public authorities and political bodies. Given the difference in the typical funding mix, however, one could draw the conclusion that the British chief executive is faced with a more complex set of tasks than the Scandinavian one, when it comes to funding and trying to make the books balance, since the income of British orchestras depends to a much less extent on public sources, and hence on a wider range of sources. On the other hand, arguably the Scandinavian manager nowadays is faced with similar tasks when it comes to the funding mix since he or she is facing decreasing funding from public sources, and therefore cannot count on the public purse for future funding, as has been possible up until now. And since the Scandinavian labour market is so heavily regulated, he or she cannot have the advantages of his British colleague's more flexible labour practice. Also, since taxes on companies are so high and tax regulations about deductions for sponsorship are not as generous in Scandinavia as in Britain, will indeed the position of the Scandinavian manager not be more difficult than that of the British one?

A these questions will be discussed further in Chapter 6. It can however be said at this point that times are changing in Scandinavia and it is most likely Scandinavian managers will soon move closer to the operating environment of their British colleagues if developments continue in the present direction.

It is not within the scope of this study to draw conclusions about the working conditions, rate of pay and general artistic level of the orchestras in the five Nordic countries and in Britain. In order to reach any sort of credible conclusion on such a wide and complex matter, a much deeper study of various aspects of the wage agreements tax policies, venues and each orchestra's achievement would be needed. That, however, could be a priority for future research on orchestral policy and management.

Chapter 6 - Discussion and Conclusions

6.1. Introduction

In the five preceding chapters the various components of this study of symphony orchestras in the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, with Great Britain as a non-Scandinavian comparison, have been presented. As the title of this thesis indicates, the objective was to make a comparative study of symphony orchestra funding, national cultural models in the six countries and chief executive self-perception of certain aspects of general arts policy in each country as well as aspects of the organisational structure, policy and function of each orchestra. Before going on to discuss the findings of the first five chapters it is worth briefly reviewing the findings of these chapters. Finally this chapter aims to relate this to the original research questions, as set out in Chapter 1.

In the first chapter the symphony orchestra was presented as a constant in the equation of cultural policy, with which the variables consist of different countries' attitudes, practices and traditions in the implementation of such policy. Because the orchestras essentially play the same or similar music and are artistically structured in the same way the world over, the symphony orchestra is a good material for case studies comparing models of cultural policy as well as management, on an international level, serving as a near constant within what is otherwise a very complex equation, to use mathematical analogy. Symphony orchestras are increasingly being researched within different academic disciplines and literature from various studies was also reviewed in the first chapter. The key research questions were defined in Chapter 1 as:

1. Does the direct political involvement of local and central government bodies in the Scandinavian countries in the affairs of Scandinavian symphony orchestras create a healthy cultural environment, in which symphony orchestras can achieve their artistic goals as well as being an important part of the community?

2. Is a high level of government funding necessarily beneficial for the arts management professional in his or her quest to achieve these goals as an orchestra manager and/or policy maker in Scandinavia?

3. Do different models of funding influence significantly the organisational culture of a symphony orchestra?

In Chapter 2 the research focus was the cultural model of each of the six countries included in the study, in particular how each country's cultural representation in government has developed, current cultural policy and cultural institutions as well as the orchestral development in that particular country.

Chapter 3 describes and reports on a survey amongst 32 Scandinavian and 55 British chief executives of orchestras as a key part of this research. This survey examines several aspects of the chief executives' self perception on various factors pertaining to the orchestras' inner organisational structure and communication, as well as on policy issues in the orchestras' dealings with their political, cultural and economic environment. The methodology of the survey and its theoretical prerequisites is explained and discussed. Replies to the survey are included together with comments on these.

The subject of Chapter 4 is finance. Here some figures from all of the 32 Scandinavian orchestras are compared, such as overall turnover, level of public subsidy, wage costs and other costs. The figures pertain to the calender year 1995, or the closest fiscal year to that period. A sample of British orchestras is included in this comparison, although not as large a number as in the survey in Chapter 3.

Since the cultural policy of the five Scandinavian countries is based on a similar model, it was considered to be of potential interest to compare the five Nordic countries as a whole with Britain, which has different funding structure for the arts and culture as well as markedly different traditions pertaining to the attitudes towards the involvement of public or government bodies in cultural affairs. This is the subject of Chapter 5, which briefly discusses various aspects from the survey in Chapter 3, comparing Scandinavia as a whole with Britain. In this chapter there is also a brief examination of some financial data from a sample of comparable orchestras from the six countries as well as an examination of the different labour market and employment philosophy that Britain and the Nordic countries have in terms of the orchestral labour market and which affects the orchestras in their policy making and organisation.

6.2. Prerequisites of discussion

As explained in the previous section, the discussion of the findings which follow will centre around the research questions as presented in the first chapter. Before going on however, it is of interest to look briefly at these questions and examine their relevance and indeed why they are being asked.

The first question "Does the direct political involvement of local and central government bodies in the Scandinavian countries in the affairs of Scandinavian symphony orchestras create a healthy cultural environment, in which symphony

orchestras can achieve their artistic goals as well as being an important part of the community?" presupposes that there is a direct political involvement into the affairs of Scandinavian symphony orchestras and that their existence is more dependent on the government dominating cultural policy than for example market forces. The question is asked as a basis for a discussion that focuses on arts organisations in countries that have opted for a cultural model that involves more active involvement of government and other political means, such as legislation in the field of government funding of the arts, and how this influences the management and the local environment of the orchestras as artistic units.

The second question " Is a high level of government funding necessarily beneficial for the arts management professional in his or her quest to achieve these goals as an orchestra manager and/or policy maker in Scandinavia?" focuses on the basis of government funding. Is government subsidy really needed? This question serves as a basis for a discussion comparing different models of government funding for the arts, using the findings in previous chapters. It goes to the heart of cultural debate in Scandinavia, and in many aspects in Britain as well, and is a starting point for evaluating the role of the arts management professional (in this case the chief executives of an arts organisation) in different environments.

The third question "Do different models of funding influence significantly the organisational culture of a symphony orchestra?" follows on from the second one. With reference to what has been said earlier about the orchestras essentially being a artistic constant in a equation of cultural policy variables, this is a key question in as much as understanding the effects of the different funding models on the artistic outcome. The discussion on this question will also draw on findings from previous chapters.

In this concluding chapter the discussion will be approached in the following order. First there is a short presentation and discussion of some theories and models of government's involvement in the arts and culture, based on the work of theorists that have written on the subject. Following from that there is a look at historical factors, in particular how these have helped shape the orchestral environment of Scandinavian orchestras and how the historical background and tradition can still today be a powerful argument for the orchestras to use in their dealings with government bodies. After that the employment environment in the five Nordic countries today is also a subject of discussion. The orchestras are a part of the social environment like other employers and it is of interest to relate their work to the general conditions in the Nordic labour market and how they are affected by it. Likewise how this reality compares to the British labour market and how that affects British orchestras and in particular the orchestras' management and chief executives. This has already been discussed in Chapter 5 so the discussion in this chapter is a follow up to that study.

The chapter will end with listing and explaining several conclusions based on the findings of this research, as well as attempting to suggest a model of good practice, though without trying to generalise. The study concludes with a discussion of ideas for further research in the light of this study, and of ways in which research on symphony orchestras can be developed further within the academic discipline of arts management.

6.3. Discussion

Theory

In recent years a large number of organisational theorists have become interested in the subject of government relationships to the arts and culture in general. Many governments and politicians have at one time or another used or abused culture and the arts to reach their desired goals. Totalitarian governments, such as the Nazi regime in Germany and the communist Soviet Union, saw culture as a powerful political weapon and used it to further their indoctrination of what they saw as desirable political ideals [1]. Theorists writing about this relationship have always done so in the context of their own contemporary situation and this is also true today, when the neo-liberal discussion about the arts as industry - "the economic importance of the arts" - seems to be ebbing out and more different approaches and views are in vogue again.

The theorists have, however, given valuable analyses that are useful in the discussion of the relationship between arts organisations and political authorities. At some times governments have been eager to learn from history and have wanted to ensure the independence of the arts. An example of this is the creation of the arts council model in the U.K. after the Second World War, where the "arm's length principle" was created when government arts funding began, as a means to avoid the misuse of the arts similar in the way that happened in Nazi Germany and other countries ruled by totalitarian regimes. This model was inspired by the economic theorist and first Arts Council Chairman John Maynard Keynes who was among the first to ask the question on how economic welfare, full employment, prosperity and stability could be ensured, without the arts and culture losing its independence. Keynes answer to the question was the "arm's length principle", an arrangement in which government support is routed *en bloc* to an independent body which has the right (and duty) to use these funds as it thinks right, without political interference. This has in one form or another dominated the debate of government's involvement in the arts in post war Great Britain and to a lesser extent in the five Nordic countries [2].

---

[1] Pick (1988), p. xiv and Pick: Off Gorky Street (no year given)

[2] Duelund (1994) p. 11-15

In the following sections the analysis and theories of some scholars will be presented and briefly discussed, relating it to the research subject of this thesis, the symphony orchestras in Scandinavia and Britain.

Different Models for Supporting the Arts - Chartrand and Duelund

When approaching the subject of government involvement in the arts, be it through funding or other means, it is of interest to look at different models by which different countries have formed their policies and compare these with the research done in this study. As was said earlier, orchestras have been the focus of research within a number of disciplines in recent years, as have the arts as a whole. Theorists have debated the role of cultural activity in society as well as the intrinsic workings of cultural institutions. An important contribution to this debate is for example John Picks works, especially The Arts in a State (1988), which examines government arts policies from ancient Greece to the present.

One of the theorists who has analysed models for public support for the arts is the Canadian cultural economist Harry Hillmann Chartrand [3] . According to Chartrand the cultural policy in most of Post Second World War Europe and the USA has been characterised by one or other of four different models of supporting the arts, in which the state takes on different roles which can be either the "facilitator", "patron", "architect" or "engineer".

In the "facilitator" model the state supports the arts by granting tax concessions for individuals and corporations making donations, sponsorship etc. in support of artists or arts organisations. In this model there is in general no official regulation of the cultural life and official bodies do not decide whether a certain area of the arts, level of quality or taste is should receive (indirect) public support through this means. The decision making is left to the donors, whether private persons, companies or foundations. Except for such indirect support through the tax system, the economic survival of the artist or arts organisation is left to the individual's or organisation's ability to generate funds commercially in a free market. An example of this kind of model is the U.S.A. with its tradition of economic liberalism, philosophy of private philanthropy and generous taxation relief for the arts and heritage (currently at least $ 7 billion per year). Exceptions to this principle in the U.S. has, however, been the creation of the federal arts fund "National Endowment for the Arts" (NEA) and of parallel state funds in many states. The NEA has distributed grants from federal government sources, but has been facing serious cutbacks in recent years. (Even at its

[3] Chartrand, Harry: "The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective - Past, Present and Future, " in Milton C. Cummings Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster (eds.): Who's to pay for the Arts, ACA Books, New York 1989, as quoted in Duelund (1994) p. 16- 20

peak, the NEA's annual grant was much less than that of the Arts Council in the UK - (a country less than one-fifth of the size of the U.S.A.). The U.S. now seems to be on its way back to a model of support for the arts of a pure "facilitator" style.

In the "patron" model the state functions as "le Patron" - a role that to a large extent continues the tradition of feudal and aristocratic patronage. This model has characterised cultural policy in Britain. In this model, however, or at least in the British version of it, it is the independent bodies, such as the "arts councils" that distribute grants after having received funds from the political decision makers in government and parliament through the state budget. In other words, the funds are distributed at "arm's length" from the political decision makers.

The Danish cultural sociologist Peter Duelund [4] agues that this model has not in any means ensured freedom for the arts from political interference. He points out that the members of various councils are appointed by political authorities, there are not any definite guidelines about who is to sit on the councils, for example if the artists themselves are to be represented, there is a lack of principles in terms of who gets support and why. In his opinion this model as practised in Britain becomes elitist and private by nature, similar to the earlier practised patronage model of the aristocracy despite the declared goal of an arm's length principle, which Duelund considers more rhetoric than reality in the current British context. Many commentators have argued that because of the overt politicising of appointments, especially of Chairmen and direct interference dressed up as "accountability", the arms length principle has been seriously subverted in the latter years of the 1979-1997 Conservative government [5].

In this model there is also more emphasis on the individual artist. The aristocracy in former times rather supported one production rather than permanent institutions and this is also the case within the modern version of this model. The overall goal of support for the arts according to this model is to increase the quality of the arts rather than to give access to it for as many people as possible. The "distribution" of the arts is based on the conditions of a given market as well as those of the patrons. Similarly to the "facilitator" model, patronage in different forms enjoys tax deductibility. This model can be described as being based on a combination of private giving and commercial revenue (the "facilitator" model) on the one hand and public support of an elitist nature on the other [6].

The third model is the "architect" model. Where this is practised the state creates a framework for the development of the arts through a Ministry of Culture based on an comprehensive cultural policy, based on decisions made by the national government resulting from a public debate and initiative from the Ministers of Culture

---

[4] Duelund (1994) p. 17

[5] Boylan, (1997 B)

[6] Duelund (1994) p. 17

or leading civil servants in the ministry. The annual contribution to the arts and culture is then decided on in the state budget, similarly to what is done in the "patron" model, or through other legislated funding routines. The actual distribution of funds is however left to independent bodies, boards, committees or heads of institutions. Often the independence of the bodies disposing funds is stipulated by law and administrative orders. Duelund maintains that this model is practised in Denmark as well as the other Scandinavian countries and characterises the cultural policy of these countries [7] . This may be correct, but it is interesting to note that in all the Scandinavian countries the allocation of funds to orchestras is not a part of the arm's length system, but is rather dependent on direct action by central or local government. On the other hand it has to be said that many of the orchestras in Scandinavia are independent units in one way or another (e.g. foundations, public companies or "ideal" concert associations), and the minority are formally a part of the public administration system, thereby indicating that there is a level of independence that could be compared to an arm's length principle. In many cases however, government at national or local level appoints the majority of the institution's board members.

According to the "architect" model cultural policy is regarded as a part of public welfare policy (for almost 20 years for example the Netherlands had a Health, Welfare and Culture Ministry). Cultural policy is therefore seen as serving a role in the pursuit of democracy, to ensure artistic freedom through public support to the arts in different forms as well as ensuring equal access for the general public, through the support of fund distributing bodies and cultural promotion both at a centralised and decentralised level. In short, the "architect" model is based on a combination of direct public subsidy to permanent arts organisations (theatres, museums, libraries, orchestras, etc.), direct public subsidy to individual artists through independent distributing bodies in accordance to rules and principles that are laid down by law as well as measures aimed at "cultural democracy" i.e. ensuring access for the whole population, by for example ensuring low ticket prices and a geographical spreading of arts organisations and events. The arts in this model are to a much lesser degree dependent on commercial success and/or patronage, sponsorship, or private giving of any kind. As was said earlier this model is the main model for public subsidy for the arts in the five Nordic countries and exists in different forms in many West European countries.

Chartrand's final category, the "engineer" model is characterised by the state's ownership of both the arts organisations and the promotion bodies. The state supports the arts that meet the political requirements of the authorities, and the political goal will if necessary override considerations of free artistic expression. Artists' success thus depends on their party membership and obedience to the decision

[7] Ibid. p. 18

making apparatus of the system. The pre 1989 communist Eastern Europe was a prototype of this model. Duelund maintains that even in Western Europe since the 1960 there are elements of this model, which is characterised by the demand by various government that the arts be regarded as an "industry" and that they should be required to maximise their economic profitability [8].

Are such theoretical models useful?

After looking at Chartrand's models and Duelund's analysis of these, one can ask whether the definitions of different models for funding for the arts are useful as a working tool in the context of comparing symphony orchestras in Britain and Scandinavia. Furthermore one could also ask if defining arts funding in this manner is really accurate and if the models are correctly related to the different countries' practices in this field.

On one hand the models do seem very useful since they provide a framework for the comparison of the orchestras within the different funding traditions in different countries and of how these have developed in accordance with different political and cultural prerequisites.

On the other hand it is also possible to doubt the actual definitions of the models. Indeed, is the "facilitator" model any different from the "patron" model? And is the "architect" model as practised in some Scandinavian countries, notably Denmark, with its "double arm's length principle", not only a thin disguise for excessive bureaucracy and the creation of mighty government or semi-government fund distributing structure, thereby taking the initiative and power away from the individual artists and arts organisations and placing it in the hands of professional arts bureaucrats and politically inspired artists who prefer meetings and manipulation to creating art?! Does Britain really fall into the "patron" model - or could it not be floating somewhere between "facilitator", "patron" and "architect" model?

There are obviously other aspects concerning the definition of all the models that could be discussed. The important issue is, however, to relate them to the culture and history of the country in which a particular model is practised and to try to evaluate if the definition of the model is fair in relation to that particular country. If the models are accurate enough to be used in discussing the status of arts organisations and to help increase understanding of their positions and workings. In their basic form, as definitions, it is this author's assessment that Chartrand's models are useful in the context of this study as framework of reference and these will be used in this chapter.

Chartrand's four different models furthermore focus on an important

---

[8] Ibid. p. 20

detail. One of the prerequisites of all of the models, is that government in one form or another, is always involved in supporting or regulating the arts, despite different approaches. It is, indeed, hardly possible to imagine a country where political authorities are not involved in the arts in some way or another, be it a government of a totalitarian country using the "engineer" model or a government claiming not to influence the arts at all through the "facilitator" model.

The last example is of particular importance to orchestras. It is often said that orchestras in countries like the United States do not receive the same amount of public subsidy as orchestras in for example Germany and the Scandinavian countries. The funding pattern of Scandinavia and British orchestras has already been looked at in Chapter 4 of this thesis and it would be interesting to include in this context an example from the United States, for comparison. The following table is based on information from the American Symphony Orchestra League and shows the basic funding mix of American orchestras as it was in 1995 as well as comparable figures for British and Scandinavian orchestras [9].

Table 6.1. U.S., British and Scandinavian Symphony Orchestras: Distribution of Total Income 1995 ($ 763 million for the U.S. orchestras)

	U.S.A.	U.K.	Scandinavia
Concert Income	41.5 %	45.0 %	6.8 %
Endowment Income	8.5 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
Private Support	34.0 %	8.0 %	2.5 %
Government Support	6.0 %	47.0 %	85.8 %
All other income	10.0 %	4.5 %	4.9 %

Using Chartrand's definition of different government models for arts funding to assess these figures, according to the "facilitator" model in calculating government support, to the 6 % in direct support should also be added the tax deductible 34 % private giving, giving a real total for government subsidy of 40%. The level of public funding of American symphony orchestras therefore is, on such a basis, approaching that of British ones, even though the British orchestras at first sight appear to get a larger part of their public funding though the "patron" model, or as practised in Britain, the arts councils and local government. Concert income seems

[9] Sources: American Symphony Orchestra League: Personal fax to author from Monica Buffington, Executive Assistant to Catherine French, Chief Executive, March 22, 1996, and Facts About The Arts, 3rd edition (1995) p. 5, BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision (1994) p. 89 - 90 and Chapter 4 of this thesis. The figures for the British orchestras pertain to the fiscal year 1993/94.

to be on a similar level in the U.S.A. and U.K., and almost seven times greater than that in Scandinavia.

A note of caution however has to be included on the finances of the British orchestras since the ratio of public subsidy varies greatly from being 93% for the BBC Symphony Orchestra (licence fees) to 21% on average for the London orchestras.

As these examples show, it is difficult to assess the real, overall, government subsidy to the arts on the basis of the direct government grants paid in a country, and therefore a more holistic picture is needed. The models described above aim to provide such an approach and are therefore used in this discussions. On a more general point one could discuss further models of government practice in the funding of the arts that are of particular relevance to the countries included in this study and in particular the concept that has dominated the post-war debate, that of the arm's length principle, which is claimed by both the "patron" and "architect" models.

It is possible to ask if the arm's length principle, even when practised in its utopian form, is really a secure method to free government arts funding process from political influences? It is difficult to give a completely affirmative reply to that question. Political decisions and influences are not only confined to governments and political parties, they can appear in one form or another in the "government" of independent or semi-independents arm's length arts funding bodies. The point at issue here is, however, if there is a democratic structure and a defined democratic process in place when it comes to the selection and criteria of membership of the arm's length funding body's governing board and/or other decision making organs.

The prerequisites for such a process and structure is a funding body board membership that is not politicised and in which the funding bodies have a duty to operate in the open with public access to meetings and documents. Should a structure of an arm's length arts funding body not meet these requirements, for example if the formal or informal influences of a minister or a government on either appointments or workings is obvious, one could actually argue that such 'semi-political' system is less democratic and less free of political influence than an arts funding system based on a politically elected government, in part or whole, exercising a more direct arts funding process. Are not the arts funding systems where such a direct political involvement in the open is the practice in fact demanding a greater accountability of politicians since their responsibility is clear and their actions scrutinised by the public and the press? After all, the politicians have to be reelected and can be voted out by the public; this can be a catalyst for accountability. Who, on the other hand, apart form either the appointing government ministers or appointing peer groups can influence who gets to sit on an arm's length fund distributing body and how this body operates? Whichever way one looks at it, politics are in one way or another involved in every step of the process, although not always party politics. Which then is better, one can ask, the risk

that the culture minister appoints party loyals to the funding bodies or that some peer group (the artists themselves) appoint their friends and relations? It is difficult, if not impossible, to answer that question. There is an element of human nature involved in all aspects of such appointments. It can be said, however, that the only method that is acceptable is one that is open for public scrutiny, ideally no less effective than the population's influence at general elections. Whether such a process is practical, possible or even effective is another story.

Of course utopia is not possible in a system for distributing funds to the arts. Although there is a certain justifiable demand for the influence of peers in the funding process there is also a requirement for stability of funding in at least the medium term, especially for larger permanent arts organisations within which instantaneous change in for example staffing and programming is not possible. Such demands must be considered legitimate. It is tempting to conclude that the, overt, direct funding for those institutions directly from the public purse, as done in Chartrand's "architect" model practice, is a more efficient and secure way of distributing government funds, bypassing at the same time an unnecessary level of bureaucracy. An arms length's funding body can easily be pressured into giving the major part of its funds to large institutions anyway, through informal channels of communications thereby giving the elected politician an alibi in the case of unpopular decisions which may, in fact, derive from his or her own undue influence. A formal process in the matter would probably make the politicians choose their methods more carefully.

Historical Factors

There are other factors than different models of government funding for the arts that can influence the work of the arts management professional. Factors that seem to be irrelevant at first can in fact be of importance when the environment of orchestras is examined. Is it possible, for example, that history and traditions in a country have a much greater influence on the economic and artistic success of a symphony orchestra than the actual model of government support can be made responsible for? There is no simple answer to this question. Ignoring history and tradition is, however, not possible when discussing the orchestras' position and possibilities, in Scandinavia at least. A few examples will explain this point further.

In recent years Finland, with its small population, has surprised many people inside and outside the country by producing a large number of extremely good musicians. For example, many Finnish conductors have reached international fame and the number of orchestras and concert houses in Finland is the source of envy for many other countries. It is interesting to note that a country like Sweden has hardly any

conductors of similar repute as the Finns, despite its much larger population (and financial resources). Both countries have similar funding patterns for the arts, so what could the explanation be? In order to find an answer one would have to go and look for reasons for this, that go beyond the actual model of government subsidy.

One starting point is to look at the role of music education. In both countries there is a tradition of local government initiative and involvement in the primary music education and although Finland has been going through a deep economic recession since the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was the country's most important export market, access to music education does not seem to have diminished in recent years. Sweden in contrast has cut back on music education although some is still available in municipal music school, but explaining the difference between the two countries just in terms of access to music education does not answer the question. It is necessary to go even deeper than that.

In most countries there is a unifying factor in a common language. This is the case with Sweden, where all cultural works based on language, literature, theatre and media is in Swedish, a language spoken by the whole population. In Finland this is not the case. The majority language, Finnish, was in former times the language of the lower classes, while Swedish was the language of public administration and the upper classes. Whenever literature, theatre or the media is discussed in Finland, there are elements of the language debate involved. Should Swedish continue to be an official language in Finland? Is the Swedish speaking minority population now an oppressed cultural minority that must be allowed to express themselves in their own language as a basic human right? The language debate is at times heated and extremes are easily visible.

Music, however, is a common language understood by everyone. The language debate does not touch musical performances and therefore (together with visual arts and architecture) has arguably become a proportionally more important part of cultural life than other art forms, due to the politically unifying factor that music life in Finland has, away from the painful ever present language debate. One of the explanations for the importance of music in Finland could therefore be that it is less controversial and 'safer' to give money to music, because the language question will not come up.

Another reason is Finland's musical giant, the composer Jean Sibelius. Although originally a Swedish speaker, Sibelius was a part of a movement of a national romantic character where the Finnish language was an important part of the ideology, so he spoke Finnish as well. Sibelius is probably still a strong argument for public funding of the musical life in Finland and is used by arts managers, or as one chief executive of a Finnish orchestra told this author in a private conversation: "I go to the government, stretch out my hand and say 'Sibelius' and go home with a cheque!"

Other historical arguments in the case of Finland also have importance in the context. In this century alone Finland is the only Scandinavian country that has fought two bloody wars, one of which was a civil war, fought shortly after Finland declared its independence in December 1917. The war broke out on January 27, 1918 and although it lasted for a few months only, it was characterised by great brutality and internal division. This has resulted in what historians have described as a collective trauma for the Finnish people. Traces of this can still be detected in Finland and the country is perhaps in a greater need of the unifying factors of cultural life, such as music, visual art and architecture, than other art forms that remind people of the factors that after all separate, or have separated, the population culturally or politically [10]. It is clear that a civil war is one of the worst things that can happen to a people and in the case of Finland it has taken generations for the wounds to heal.

In the other Scandinavian countries historical reasons for funding the arts can be also be traced. In Iceland, for example, there was no permanent symphony orchestra until initiative was taken by the government, local and national, as well as semi-government institutions, such as the Icelandic State Broadcasting Service, to start one. The picture for the Icelanders is therefore clear in the light of history: with government support there is an orchestra, without it there is not one.

In Sweden, the very strong tradition of the "Protestant work ethic" (Lutheran tradition) and the traditional social democratically inspired concept of the "worker's rights" is perhaps a stronger factor in determining the work conditions of musicians in orchestras. By putting pressure on politicians to make sure that the people working in the orchestras have the conditions acceptable for employees in other companies, the orchestras' management feel obliged to meet the general demands of the labour culture and use this argument in trying to acquire public grants to the orchestras. The "employment culture" in Sweden is dominated by the demand for equality: if professional musicians enjoyed markedly less good general working conditions and pay in their work place than other professional "workers", this would not be good news for politicians seeking votes.

In Britain, on the other hand, there is a different tradition based on a greater variety of funding models and a much more varied and complex history which has shown that it was possible to establish and run orchestras with much less public funding or even without any subsidy at all through the greater part of the history of many major orchestras. Therefore historical arguments for government funding do not weigh as heavily. The development of the British "patron" model for government funding of the arts seems to have come from the tradition of patronage, although an element of political ideology on the role of the arts was thrown in originally, when the Arts Council of Great Britain was created at the end of World War II. In terms of

---

[10] Ylikangas (1995) p. 23 and p. 486-492

symphony orchestras it is hardly possible to ignore the contribution of 19th century patron-manager-conductors like Charles Hallé and Sir Henry Wood, or of Sir Thomas Beecham in the first half of this century.

Historical factors and tradition are elements of modern cultural policy that are difficult to separate from the environment of the arts management professional of today. Although not always that apparent, they can often explain why two countries with seemingly identical structure in government funding policy and similar operating environment, can produce very different arts organisations and that attitudes to different art forms, such as music, and in particular to symphony orchestras, can differ so much. History and tradition cannot explain everything but it can contribute to the understanding of the present, if analysed in context with modern reality and can even help understanding the status of symphony orchestras in countries with different models of funding for the arts.

How does the Scandinavian environment affect the orchestras?
How is it different from the British environment ?

It has been said earlier that symphony orchestras the world over are basically similar arts organisations in terms of artistic processes and working methods, regardless of the political, financial or organisational environment they operate in. Having said that, however, it is clear that the environment of the orchestras can be influenced by those various external factors, and financial, political or historical considerations can decide whether an orchestra is created or continues to exist at all. One of the factors that is of importance in this context is the employment culture of a country, as this can influence and in some cases control the spending pattern and organisational culture of an orchestra. In this aspect the five Nordic countries are far more homogeneous in their approach than Britain.

In Scandinavia there is a strong tendency toward uniformity in the labour market. To illustrate this the best example is probably Sweden, since the regulation of the labour market there is far reaching and the effects on the orchestras can be clearly demonstrated as has already been discussed in Chapter 5. In general the Swedish labour market is characterised by stringent rules of employment, even to the degree that when an employer has formally employed someone on a full time basis, he or she cannot fire the person unless the business ceases to operate or if there are dramatic cutbacks in the production. The very strong central role of Swedish trade unions together with the unions' direct membership of the Social Democratic Party, has ensured the unions' strong influence of the labour market. The relationship between employers and employees on the Swedish labour market is marked by the polarisation promoted by traditional social democratic ideology and has created a culture that is currently facing

a massive head on collision with the reality of Sweden's EU membership, increased internationalisation of large corporations and the demand for more flexibility for employment practices. It can be said, that although the other Nordic countries base their employment policies on similar principles, most of them have traditionally not adapted an equally dogmatic approach to labour market issues as Sweden. In many ways this system is a reminiscent of the British Labour Party's policies as it was before the Thatcher government, although in Britain this approach never acquired the same consensus among the voters as has been the case in Sweden.

How then are the orchestras or in particularly the chief executives of the orchestras affected by an environment, that on one hand gives stability in form of government funding but on the other regulates the labour market to a degree that could be seen as a hindrance for orchestral development? In Chapter 5 some major questions were raised on the issue and to take this discussion further it would be of interest to look at these questions once more.

Does the everyday reality of the British orchestra manager for example differ radically from the everyday reality of the Scandinavian orchestra manager? On one hand one could basically start to answer this question with a "no". The tasks of a chief executive of a symphony orchestra is more focused on the inner workings of the orchestras although one could say that the British chief executive is continually faced with a more uncertain funding basis for his or her orchestra and therefore perhaps with a more diverse set of managerial tasks than the Scandinavian one, and in particular his or her task of raising sufficient funds.

On the other hand one could ask if the Scandinavian manager, nowadays, is not faced with the same problems due to not being able to count on the public authorities for future funding, and thereby in terms of multiplicity of managerial tasks in relation to the funding mix, is approaching his or her British counterpart? And since the Scandinavian labour market is so heavily regulated, he cannot have the advantages of his British colleague. Further, since taxes on companies are so high and tax regulations about deductions for sponsorship and private giving are not as generous as in Britain, will indeed the position of the Scandinavian manager not be more difficult than that of the British one? It could be argued that this is the case. Looking at the percentage of government funding in the funding mix of Nordic symphony orchestras is, however, an indication that the managerial tasks of a chief executive of a Scandinavian orchestras are (still) focused on trying to secure the funding through means of access to public funding. If the governments of the five Nordic countries continue to base their policy of government funding for the arts on the "architect" model as they have done for the past decades, this source of funding will furthermore continue to be the most important funding source for Nordic chief executives in the future.

It looks indeed as if the greatest difference between the environment of

orchestras in Britain and Scandinavia in more general terms, is the difference in the funding mix. As is indicated in Chapter 4, the ratio of public funding of Scandinavian orchestras can be up to 90% whereas in Britain this ratio at the highest does not reach 50% (with the exception of the salaried BBC orchestras). This fact alone creates a different managerial culture, that requires different approaches.

Another factor influencing the orchestras' funding mix in terms of the public subsidy, is which bureaucratic exercises they have to go through in order to get the funds. In other words, how much paperwork is needed to satisfy the public authorities that give money? Judging from the answers to the survey in Chapter 3, despite that much higher level of funding in percentage terms, the Scandinavian orchestra managers do not seem to experience any more bureaucratic obstacles in their dealing with the public administration than their British counterparts do, and there are even signs that point to the contrary. Could it be the case that since the funding of larger arts organisations in the Nordic countries is often decided by legislation that the actual bureaucratic exercise required each year is in fact smaller and less time consuming than if a new application for funding has to be written every year? Could it even be cheaper? There is a lot that speaks for an affirmative answer to that question. The channels of communication in a country which has a cultural policy based on the "architect model" as practised in the Nordic countries, are more pre set for larger permanently based arts organisations and it can be argued that this predictability actually saves money in the long run, since the grant givers don't require or need as much information as a basis for their decision for a grant.

There is also the question of fashions in the contemporary management such as the widespread introduction of the use of business plans as a managerial tool nowadays. Several orchestras in Scandinavia actually use business plans as an internal management tool although, unlike Britain, this is not required of them by their funding bodies. The creation and use of these plans has grown out of the organisations as a natural need and has in many cases been a success for the orchestras. In Britain, on the other hand, a business plan has been required as a part of an application for public funding, regardless of its use or relevance to the arts organisation. The arts organisations, often without the sources of knowledge to produce such documents, spend large sums of money on hiring consultants to write these plans. One can then ask if this money spent on the creation of a business plan, just to satisfy grant givers (and ultimately government), is a worthwhile management tool for orchestra managers? In this case the creation of this particular management approach is dictated from above and does not spring from the organsation's own need for such a tool. It is then questionable whether the management will then use the business plan as originally intended, as a tool to help them run the orchestras, it just becomes a bureaucratic exercise.

Another factor that is interesting to mention, is the net public funding of orchestras. This is where tax and social security payments paid back to government have to be considered. Both tax and social security payments in Scandinavia are high and it would be interesting to examine and compare what is left of the public subsidy in the different Scandinavian countries and Britain after subtracting the orchestra's V.A.T. , social security payment for employees, and the employees' own income taxes. To be able to discuss that further, more research is needed since it has not been within the scope of this study to examine the implications of this and is therefore left to future research.

What if?

What if the Scandinavian model of supporting the arts (based on the "architect" principle) was abandoned and a different one, meaning a less active role by government, was practised? What would happen to the orchestras? Would they survive? Discussing the issue in such hypothetical fashion is always difficult. It is of interest, however, to create a small thinking experiment to try to find out which factors would be decisive in the orchestras' continuing (or discontinuing) existence, should a radically different situation become a reality and perhaps try to use a real life example, as that of the changes for orchestras in the former East Germany after German reunification, as a comparison.

Let us, for the moment, assume that governments in the Scandinavian countries abandoned the principle of ensuring funding for the orchestras through a special legislation and instead adopted the more general "facilitator" model, making the only contribution to the arts, tax benefits for private and corporate giving. This, in essence, would not mean that the government takes away the arts funding, as discussed before, government money is still available to the orchestras, although its distribution is not guaranteed or predetermined.

What would be the possible effect for the orchestras? Before going on any further it is interesting to look at what happened in East Germany after reunification and when the principle of the state's funding and ownership of its orchestras was abandoned ("the engineer" model). In communist East Germany prior to 1989 there were 76 symphony orchestras. This was a high density of orchestras per capita as well as per geographic area compared with West Germany, the UK or the USA. The following table quoted from Harvard University Four Nation Study of Symphony Orchestras by Allmendinger and Hackman (1992) shows this density in the four different countries [11] .

[11] Allmendinger & Hackman (1992) p. 18 as well as Table 4 on page 18b.

Table 6.2. Density of Symphony Orchestras in East and West Germany, the USA and the UK

	Number of Orchestras	Area Covered Per Orchestra (square kilometres)	Citizens Served Per Orchestra
East Germany	76	1,435	218,945
West Germany	89	2,792	691,011
United States	133	70,487	1,839,098
United Kingdom	14	17,436	4,046,285

What the East German orchestras have seen in recent years is an increased polarisation between the major orchestras in larger cities that have been able to adjust to changes made in the funding environment and adapting western management technique, obviously aided by transitional funding from the German federal government. The smaller community orchestras, the minor orchestras, however have not fared so well and have seen increased difficulties in making ends meet as they have to face West German social and economic policies and practices [12].

It is interesting to note however, that in the four nation study of symphony orchestras by the Harvard team, the researchers come to the conclusion that despite forty years of separate operation under radically different political and economic systems, East and West German orchestras turned out to have many more similarities than differences and seem to have preserved a uniquely German character that distances them from the market-orientation that dominates musical culture in many other countries [13]. These findings are interesting in many ways and say a lot about the intrinsic organisational culture of the symphony orchestra as an arts organisation.

Is there any reason to expect any different development to happen in Scandinavia if radical changes to funding principles were being made? The answer is probably no. The smaller orchestras would probably disappear and a handful of big ones, based in the capitals of the countries, would survive. In effect it would be reversing the development back to at least the situation of the 1950s if not the 1930s or even earlier. It is important to keep in mind that some sort of initiative by government, at local or national level, or a semi-government institution such as public radio stations marks, in almost all the cases of Scandinavian symphony orchestras, the beginning of the orchestras as regular and stable arts organisations.

The final question in this context would then be whether such radical changes in the funding of the symphony orchestras are likely to happen. The answer to

---

[12] Ibid. p. 46-50

[13] Ibid. p. 45

that question is probably no. The tradition of "comprehensive solutions" (trying to solve problems or to regulate certain areas of society in a comprehensive way, often through active involvement of government, government agencies and/or special legislation) in public policy and legislation in Scandinavia is extremely strong in the political culture of these countries. This tradition cannot be ignored when discussing cultural policy. Since equal access to the arts is one of the basic elements in this policy, this argument has indeed acquired such a dominant position that it would require a radically altered way of thinking as well as a dramatic change of policies, for changes to happen that would entail a more "elitist" approach where only a handful of orchestras survive. It is, however, not impossible and meanwhile the current orchestral culture could be lost. Another possibility is that the orchestras will "die a natural death" through the lack of qualified labour, as music education in some of the countries (notably Sweden) is cut down, which in the long run will reduce the available future labour force for the orchestras. This is probably a more real threat to the orchestras in Scandinavia than any potentially radical changes in funding policy.

6.4. Conclusion

To draw a brief and concise conclusion of this thesis perhaps the easiest approach would be to look at the original research questions and answer them with a yes or a no. Although such a reply to the questions can only be an indication of the contents of the thesis it summarises in some form the process leading from the beginning to the end of this study. Before going on to discuss the conclusions further it could be interesting to look at the original research questions in such manner.

1. Does the direct political involvement of local and central government bodies in the Scandinavian countries in the affairs of Scandinavian symphony orchestras create a healthy cultural environment, in which symphony orchestras can achieve their artistic goals as well as being an important part of the community?
Answer: Yes

2. Is a high level of government funding necessarily beneficial for the arts management professional in his or her quest to achieve these goals as an orchestra manager and/or policy maker in Scandinavia?
Answer: Yes

3. Do different models of funding influence significantly the organisational culture of a symphony orchestra?
Answer: No

Leading on from this, one can start by saying that symphony orchestras really are very much alike and the operating environment will not change the internal workings of an orchestra, if the orchestra reaches the level of minimum existence in financial terms. Only when the minimum existence level of the orchestra is threatened (by e.g. spending cuts of government and the orchestra is unable or does not have the tradition to seek stable funding elsewhere) will the leading administrative personnel feel the closeness of politically elected representatives and government in general. This seems to happen regardless of the model of public funding of the arts and is indicated by the survey in Chapter 3.

Symphony orchestras are a part of the respective societies in which they operate. In a country like Britain orchestras, traditionally, do not receive a high level of funding and different models of running the orchestras have existed at the same time. They have for example access to finance through other channels such as tax benefits for sponsors and a patronage tradition (coupled with a more flexible labour market and a larger source of quality labour (musicians)). However, such an approach would not necessarily work in Scandinavia where society is more structured, the relationship between employers and employees marked by the social democratic polarisation tradition and which lacks a tradition of private funding in the form of patronage and or sponsorship. This is primarily the consequence of an unsympathetic tax system, or perhaps more accurately, the political authorities have chosen the model of direct support to the arts ("architect model") instead of using the tax system ("facilitator model"). If public subsidy was taken from the Scandinavian orchestras they would probably die, unless radical changes are also made in other areas in society, such as the introduction of a greatly reformed tax system and a more flexible deregulated labour market. Demographic factors, however, will also determine the survival or otherwise of the orchestras if the high subsidy is taken away, and it is questionable whether any orchestras apart from the largest ones will survive at all. Another significant factor is the historical fact that many of the orchestras only started operating in the beginning when some sort of public subsidy was given to start them.

In the end it is a question of political will. If the structure of the Scandinavian welfare society is to remain and unless politicians are willing to radically change the whole basis of the welfare ideal, the Scandinavian symphony orchestras will quickly die without their traditionally generous public subsidy.

Having said that, however, one can ask if a particular model of public support for the arts necessarily creates a better orchestra, and more explicitly, does for example the Scandinavian "architect" model create better orchestral music? In the light of the survey described in Chapter 3 of this thesis as well as the Four Nation Study of Orchestras by the team from Harvard [14] it can be asserted that the intrinsic

14 Allmendinger & Hackman (1992), p. 45

organisational culture and values of a symphony orchestra appear to be stronger than outside funding factors influencing that orchestra. The crucial thing is to have a body of qualified musicians who can concentrate on their work and conductors who are artistically capable of leading the musical creativity of the orchestra. Theoretically, at least, one could have a symphony orchestra without administrative personnel. On the other hand one could not have a symphony orchestra consisting of administrative personnel but no musicians. The work force of a symphony orchestra cannot rationally be reduced below a certain minimum and this is where direct or indirect public funding is required, in one form or another. Either the orchestra exists or it dies: a minimal survival level has to be maintained. It seems to be the worldwide experience that symphony orchestras generally cannot survive without direct or indirect public support in one form or another, though there are widely different models of support of the arts in different countries as has been discussed earlier in this chapter. It would therefore be the end of the world's network of symphony orchestras as we know it, if all public support was taken away and the orchestras left only to act in a commercial market. This is particularly applicable to orchestras in smaller countries that do not have access to a larger market for their activities due to geographical location.

The history of the Scandinavian orchestras furthermore indicates that if the model of public support for the orchestras is changed or abolished, this would mean the end of most of the orchestras in their present form, since the prerequisite for their original growth and current stability has its roots in cultural policy decisions made in the 1960s. It would require not only a complete change in the way of thinking regarding the concept of the Scandinavian welfare state but also an extensive change in basic philosophy behind tax legislation, employment policy and public administration in general. Symphony orchestras cannot be taken in isolation from the total political culture and traditions of a country: the whole basis of the role of government in society has to be involved in the discussion of the funding of the arts and arts organisations.

Is it then possible to even discuss 'a model of good practice' of management and public funding for symphony orchestras in general, taking into account the different experiences of the orchestras in Britain and Scandinavia? Given the results from the research undertaken in this study the chief executives' attitudes to the key internal and external factors in the environment of the orchestras do not seem to differ radically between Scandinavia and Britain. This is an indication that the political, social or even financial environment of the orchestras is less of a determining factor for the chief executives in their daily work than are managerial tasks relating to the inner reality of the orchestra. It has to be said, however, that the general entrepreneurial culture and the role of public authorities in a country must affect the attitudes presented by someone in the position of a chief executive of a company or an orchestra. In Britain one could argue that the chief executive has learned to have no

great expectations for support from public funding agencies, and has been forced to be creative in finding unusual and novel solutions for the orchestra's financial problems, whereas the Scandinavia orchestra chief executive is more used to and more readily expects public authorities to take the major responsibility for financing his or her orchestra. In times of radical political change, however, the Scandinavian chief executive may well feel more vulnerable than his British counterpart who has learned not to rely on public subsidies, since they are unstable and cannot be counted on in the long term financial planning in the British system.

There are pros and cons for both groups of chief executives. The Scandinavian one enjoys relative stability and can concentrate on managing the orchestras as an artistic unit, but operates within a culture of dependency relying largely on one source of funding. His or her British counterpart often has more managerial freedom in finding new and creative ways of financing the orchestra, though that often, however, influences the artistic planning and outcome. He or she enjoys less stability and is continually faced with using his or her energy to secure funding.

There are signs in Scandinavia, however, that public subsidy for symphony orchestras might in not too distant a future cease to be the source of security it has been. Since the completion of the survey of Chapter 3 in 1995 chief executives have started complaining about diminishing subsidies (particularly in Sweden and Denmark) and at the same time are faced with a heavily regulated labour market, which makes any sort of flexibility difficult.

On the other hand one can ask if the national and major regional symphony orchestras will be allowed to deteriorate or are they among the "untouchables" in the sphere of public funding for the arts in Scandinavia? As said before, the orchestras in the Scandinavian countries have hardly ever been dealt with by arm's length bodies when the subject of their funding comes up, but instead have a much closer direct link to the fund distributing authority, usually the Ministry of Culture or local government authority. In this way, many symphony orchestras in Scandinavia have been able to secure their status, at least formally, a status that is difficult for politicians to change without a major parliamentary process involving, in many cases, legislation.

The question of a model of good practice for running a symphony orchestra can therefore not be taken out of context, and has to be considered in relation to a country's model for public support for the arts (whichever that is), traditional attitudes to public spending, role, trust or mistrust of politicians and/or government and how the general public's access to cultural events is seen as a policy issue . On the other hand one can approach the issue from the viewpoint of the orchestra itself. It is important to keep in mind that the primary purpose of a symphony orchestra is to achieve artistic goals in terms of making music, and to communicate this goal to the orchestra's environment (audience and/or local community in general). In order to be

able to fulfill this goal the orchestra has to have access to qualified labour (musicians and conductors), a platform to communicate its artistic products and time to produce these in an artistically acceptable manner. Since this is the basic task, it is necessary to look from case to case at what really is a model of good practice for a symphony orchestra. Although the symphony orchestra's task is almost uniform in different countries, the orchestra's administrative and financial base has to be in harmony with the basic culture of organisations as well as public administration, government and private enterprise in the country where the orchestra is run. It is therefore not possible to state that one single model is correct for all symphony orchestras in all countries, or indeed in any one country. The British tradition shows that there is a possibility, be it good or bad, for orchestras to operate within a country with a very different model of employment from that in most other European countries, whether of the Christian Democrat, social welfare or former communist traditions. This is possible because of the British political climate, which not only is based on the cultural policy of recent years, but also of a traditional attitudes to public spending and the role of government. In Scandinavia, however, where in this century political policymaking and implementation has been characterised by 'comprehensive solutions' , often through legislation, it is more difficult for arts organisations to change their basic funding mix or organisational culture.

Although it is not the main purpose of this study to examine in detail the effects of various factors on the internal organisational culture, it could be of interest to try to identify a few issues that might affect this culture since the different funding systems do not seem to profoundly affect this.

For the purpose of this study it is necessary to look at the difference between the U.K. and the Scandinavian countries with regard to legislation and rules controlling the labour market and how these may affect the internal organisational culture of orchestras. This is a particularly important feature in Scandinavia and to illustrate this the example of Sweden is perhaps an interesting one.

The Swedish chief executive of a symphony orchestra is faced with a number of Acts of Law that directly affect, and in many ways prescribe, a number of internal organisational issues. The two main Acts of Law of this nature in Sweden are the Act on Protection of Employment and the Act of Consultation [15] .

The Act on Protection of Employment effectively protects an employee who is on a permanent/long term contract from being dismissed from his or her job. If such dismissal should take place there must be very strong causes and cases like these are often taken to court in Sweden (Arbetsdomstolen). It is interesting to note, however, that it is only the administrative staff of orchestras that are fully protected

---

15 Swedish: "Lagen om anställningsskydd" from 1982:80 and "Medbestämmelselagen" from 1976:580

by this legislation; the Musicians' Union has in their collective wage agreement agreed to relax on certain aspects of the stringent rules [16]. These exceptions give the chief executives some flexibility to hire and fire musicians, but no flexibility to fire administrative staff which is bound to affect the internal organisational culture. The chief executive has to accept the administrative body as it is and cannot made changes in the personnel as he or she wishes.

The Act of Consultation also has a strong impact on the chief executive's possibility to influence the internal organisational culture. The law effectively says that any major decision made about the orchestra's affairs must be discussed with the employees and their union representative before the chief executive implements the decision. This pertains particularly to issues concerning the budget of the orchestra and any reorganisation or restructuring that might be planned. The effects on the inner reality of the organisation are substantial, since the decision process is often formal and must at times go through various committees which often makes the process long and tedious. On the other hand the chief executive can be reasonably sure when the decision is finally made, that its effects are "rooted" amongst the personnel who have had the possibility to debate and in many cases vote on the issue.

In the U.K. the role of legislation and rules, over and above fire regulations and alike, is probably not as influential on the inner organisational culture as in Scandinavia. The different employment forms, however, as practised by British orchestras are much more likely to affect the organisations and the chief executives that are in charge of running them. The example of the London orchestras is perhaps of special interest in this context (see Chapter 5).

The chief executive of a London orchestra is faced with having a formalised relationship with the musicians of the orchestra through the musicians' ownership of the company. The musician is guaranteed employment basically on a freelance basis and this leaves the chief executive with the problem of ensuring that enough musicians that belong to the group of players that the chief executive actually wants to see on stage for a particular occasion, actually are available and willing to play the concert, rehearsal or recording in question. The internal organisational culture is thereby influenced by the system of employment, that of a self governing orchestra. The chief executive has to find ways of establishing stability through solutions that give the stability required and at the same time respects the organisational culture and traditions that derives from the stem of self government as practised by the London orchestras.

On a more general point one could also point out the conventional, and quite common, rift between the inner organisational culture of the musicians playing in the orchestra and that of those working for the orchestra in an administrative capacity.

Swedish Musicians Professional Union (SYMF) and Theatre Association's (TR) Collective age Agreement 1995-1998 (Swedish: SYMF och TR Kollektivavtal 1995-1998), p. 4

This differs from orchestra to orchestra and has to this author's knowledge not been researched in detail although this rift could be a considerably influential factor in the internal organisational structure of an orchestra.

Research focused on the internal workings of an orchestra was presented in Chapter 1 and this particular approach to the subject of orchestra research seems to be fairly popular amongst researchers. With reference to the answer "no" to this author's research question on whether different funding models are significant in affecting the internal organisational structure of a symphony orchestra, it is intersting to note that Allmendinger et al. came to a similar conclusion when comparing orchestras in East Germany and West Germany that operated under two totally different political systems prior to 1989 [17]. According to this, the tradition of German orchestras in terms of internal organisational culture was a much stronger factor than different political prerequisites in the orchestras' environment. It is, however, worth considering if the often unspoken influence of grant giving bodies and in particular that of sponsors can influence the artistic choice (i.e. programming) of an orchestra. If this is the case, one would expect that this influence of sponsors in a country such as the U.K. is greater on this particular point, since sponsorship is a larger percentage of the funding mix in the U.K. than for example in the Nordic countries.

So why is the symphony orchestra in Scandinavia not dead or at least threatened with turning to dust in the corridors of public administration archives? The symphony orchestra's strong intrinsic organisational culture seem to be, after all, the determining factor of the equation. Like painting, the orchestra's death has often been announced, but it lives on despite different political systems and even a complete collapse of a funding structure as happened in East Germany after 1989 [18]. To end this section, a quote from the BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision, Consultation Document is perhaps fitting:

> The death of the symphony orchestra, predicted since the 1950s, has failed to occur for a number of reasons, because:
> • composers still find the orchestra a viable and expressive medium in which to work;
> • audiences continue to respond with enthusiasm to live performances;
> • orchestras have begun to adapt their artistic aims to the expectations of a changing audience;
> •educationalists have begun to realise the resource which the

17 Allmendinger & Hackman (1992), p. 4
18 Allmendinger & Hackman (1992), p. 45

orchestra represents in introducing music to the young [19] .

The symphony orchestra is not dead or dying, be it in Scandinavia and Britain, although the "symphony orchestra landscape" may be evolving and changing all the time. The problems facing the management of the orchestras might, however, change the picture as we know it today. For a radical change, in Scandinavia anyway, it would require a complete change of basic cultural policy for the orchestras to disappear completely. This is unlikely to happen, unless the Scandinavian welfare model is abandoned in all areas of society, then the orchestras in the five countries will have to face a new reality together with the rest of the countries' arts organisations.

6.5. Areas for further research

A study such as this one can only be a starting point into the research of symphony orchestras. Since the number of orchestras was large, it was necessary to keep the focus of the research clear on a small number of issues and not try to cover a large area of subjects. It has to be said, however, that during the course of the research more and more questions have appeared that would have been interesting to include in the study. That would however taken the focus away from the main issues asked in the research questions and, although many of them are fascinating, the task of including them in the thesis would have created a work of gigantic proportions.

Research on symphony orchestras is a relatively new field and, as indicated in Chapter 1, scholars of many different disciplines are becoming increasingly interested in the orchestra as a research subject. Within the emerging discipline of arts management, however, it is important that the symphony orchestra continues to be a part of research activity that not only focuses on the orchestra itself as an isolated phenomenon, either internal workings or the orchestra's dealings with its environment, but is constantly seen in context with other factors that can influence its existence and operational capability. Such factors could for example be the general music education situation in a country. In the following short section some ideas for further research will be suggested, all including orchestras in some way or another. Hopefully this will be an inspiration for researchers that are interested in continuing the research on this subject.

Training of orchestral musicians - reality and utopia

Training of orchestral musicians is a research subject that is highly relevant to the subject of symphony orchestras. There are different opinions at

19 BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision, Consultation Document (1994) p. 70

different times about what sort of music college training orchestral musicians should get in order to prepare them for life in orchestras. Are the music colleges responding to the need of the orchestras? Or is it counter productive for the music colleges to act as 'training centres' for the orchestras and not see to the holistic needs of the music student that enters? Are there special courses needed for the instrumentalist that wants to become an orchestral player rather than aiming for a virtuoso solo career that is the main focus of many conservatoire courses? How can the music colleges cater for the needs of the orchestral players that wish to re-enter college for shorter courses during their career, as a part of a continuous 'learning-for-life' approach? Indeed, should it be the role of the music colleges to take part in such a process? Which responsibilities lie with the orchestras themselves to improve the training situation for their employees? Can they themselves do something about the situation and not only complain about the music colleges not turning out adequate players? This is an example of some of the questions that could be asked initially when approaching the subject.

It is good to note that currently there is a research project nearing completion in the City University's Department of Arts Policy and Management, in London, on this subject, by the Ph.D. student Chris Ridgeway [20] .

Education Programmes

In recent years it has become increasingly popular to establish special education and community outreach programmes as a part of an orchestra's regular activities. This has been particularly successful in Britain but has also spread to Scandinavia. School concerts, in some form or another, have been a part of many orchestras' programming for a long time, but education projects, where often the pupils are involved in a creative process and in some cases in the performance of the resulting musical work are relatively recent. It has been stated by people that have been actively involved in the creation of the modern education programming in Britain that the difference between a old fashion school concert and an education programme is that when a pupil takes part in an organised education programme he or she is actually learning something but when going to the ordinary school concert this learning process is not taking place. It is therefore important for the funding bodies to distinguish between a 'real' education programme and a school concert, to assess the 'actual' learning that takes place, when deciding on grants to orchestras for that particular activity [21] .

---

[20] Ridgeway, Christopher: The Training of Orchestral Musicians in Britain from age 16 to 25 Doctoral thesis in process, City University, Department of Arts Policy and Management, London, submission due late 1997 or early 1998.

[21] Source: John Stephens, Head of Music Education Department, Trinity College of Music, London, in discussion at the conference "Concerts for Children" organised by the Stavanger Symphony Orchestra, in Stavanger, Norway, May 19 -21, 1996.

This issue raises many interesting questions and possibilities for research. Are education programmes that orchestra's organise really educating? Or are they just a nice way of making the orchestra look attractive to the potential funding partners? Why is it so important in Britain that the children that go to concerts are 'educated' or are seen 'learning something'? Why are adults that go to concerts not required to 'learn something' as well? Is there anything wrong with just 'experiencing' music? Could there be an intrinsic difference in culture between for example Britain and Scandinavia when it comes to education so that music for children should primarily be education in Britain but in Scandinavia more a combined education/experience? Do the musicians like taking part in education work? Do they have the right training for it?

These are some of the questions that could be asked in research undertaken on this subject. There is currently at least one M.A. thesis in Arts Management at the City University's Department of Arts Policy and Management that has been written on the subject of education programmes of British orchestras, though none so far on international comparisons [22] .

Symphony orchestras in countries that do not have western classical music as a part of their traditional national culture.

What is is like to run a symphony orchestra in Japan or Korea? Are the orchestras foreign objects in the cultural heritage of countries that don't have the tradition of western classical music? How is the orchestra affected by an environment that doesn't share the same cultural prerequisites, artistically and/or organisationally?

This could be an interesting research subject, in particular in testing the conclusions reached by this author's and other studies, that symphony orchestras have intrinsically such a stable organisational culture that the environment of the orchestras is less important for them, provided that a minimum financial existence level is reached.

The life cycle of an orchestra

Why do orchestras die? Because they certainly do. How can theories on the life cycle of organisations in general be applied to orchestras? When is an orchestra in its infancy, reaches its prime or declines to bureaucracy and death [23] ? Case studies could for example examine orchestras in two different environments, one in Sweden,

---

[22] Siltanen (1991)

[23] Theories on the life cycle of companies presented for example by Adizes (1988) and the life cycle of museums by Boylan (1997 A).

the Stockholm Wind Symphony Orchestra that "died" after subsidy was cut completely and the San Diego Symphony Orchestra in the U.S., both orchestras in 1996.

Public Broadcasting Services and their influence on orchestral development in 20th century Europe.

This is an important subject, particularly in view of the European symphony orchestras' situation today. Public broadcasting services, such as the BBC and other European broadcasting services that are based on the concept of public radio and are financed by licence fees have played, and do still play, an important role in the lives of symphony orchestras. Not only in the role of the orchestras, but also in the promotion of and access to music for the general public and thereby indirectly creating audiences for orchestras. Many broadcasting services have been and are actively involved in running symphony orchestras. This is certainly true about Britain as well as Scandinavia, where there are radio orchestras in every country.

Since the radio orchestras are usually a part of a larger organisation they may face different managerial and funding problems than symphony orchestras that are an independent unit. How does the management of a radio orchestra differ from that of other orchestras? Are radio orchestras more free to choose their own repertoire? Is the artistic excellence helped or threatened by the internal bureaucracy of the radio station? How do radio orchestras compete with other orchestras? Should they do education work?

These are some of the questions that could be addressed by research into radio orchestras. The management teams of radio orchestras are becoming increasingly aware of their different situation amongst orchestras and have even formed networks and organised conferences to discuss their special status as arts organisations [24] . A subject worth looking at as a part of academic research.

Audience Profile

"Audiences for orchestra concerts are getting older and older". This is a statement often heard as a passing comment. Is this a myth or reality? Do we really know if audiences for orchestral concerts are any older now than they were twenty years ago? Has there been any long term study of audiences of orchestral concerts over a long period of time? How does this compare with research on theatre audiences (for example the research that Dr. Caroline Gardiner at the City University has been doing on the West End Theatres for fifteen years). Could this be an interesting long term co-

[24] See for example a report from a conference on radio orchestras in Geneva, 5-6- November 1992 (title: Radio Orchestras).

operation project between the interest organisations of orchestras and a university?

Such study is not only interesting from an academic point of view, but could also be useful for orchestras as well as contributing to the general research on audiences for the arts.

'Musical Ecology'

How do different aspects of a country's music life affect each other? How for example does the availability of music education at beginner's level affect the recruitment possibilities of orchestras? Isn't there an "ecological music" system that needs feeding from all different sources? How does this happen?

This subject is one that offers a more 'holistic' view of the music life of a country, including its orchestras. This subject of "musical ecology" touches on many factors. To name but one example the (local) authorities of Sweden are cutting down the availability of music education at communal music schools, in particular private instrument teaching. At the same time the national government put 25% VAT on private music teaching that is being run independently, but not on private music teaching run by adult education centres ("studieförbund"). In other words, government is both cutting down on the public availability of music education and making private initiative in a field, where the public purse served earlier, more difficult, therefore contributing to the death of music teaching at primary level and therefore in time, contributing to the decline of not only the orchestras, but also music colleges and the music industry as a whole, which interestingly enough is sometimes rated as the number one export industry in Sweden.

Further research into this 'ecology' would be an interesting contribution to understanding the workings of organisation and management of music as well as the future of musical institutions.

6.6. The Symphony Orchestra - a source of fascination and fantasy

The symphony orchestra continues to be a source of inspiration for academic researchers in various fields. One has come to realise that the orchestra is not only an arts organisation providing artistic pleasure through its musical activities but also an interesting research subject for a number of academic disciplines. It has also become a fascination for novel writers, such as Jilly Cooper in her best seller *Appassionata,* where she writes, what can only be described as her fantasies, on the subject of a fictive symphony orchestra that leads a considerably more glamourous and

outrageous life than real life orchestral musicians could ever dream of [25] and the British journalist Norman Lebrecht, in a role a polemicist, analyses and criticises the role and power of conductors of orchestras [26] .

Whatever can be said about the orchestra as an organisation, source of fascination, fantasy or polemics it is however important to keep in mind that at the heart of it all is the music and the communication of musical performance from the performer on stage to the listener. The magic of music is the source of the orchestra and should not be forgotten, even if the orchestra as an organisation or as a part of a cultural environment continues to fascinate.

25 Cooper (1997)

26 Lebrecht (1991)

APPENDIX 1 a - Questionnaire: British Version

British; page 1

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphony orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

\- - -

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

British; page 2

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

_____10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

_____11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

_____12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

_____13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

_____14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

_____15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

_____16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

_____17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

British; page 3

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

_____19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

_____20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

_____21. My orchestra could do better musically.

_____22. My orchestra could do better financially.

_____23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

_____24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

_____25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

_____26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

_____27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

_____28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

_____29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

British; page 4

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

_____31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

_____32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

_____33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

_____34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Part Two

Background information

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Age: _____ years

APPENDIX 1 b - Questionnaire: Danish Version

Nordic/DK/ page 1

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphony orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

\- - -

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

Nordic/DK/page 2

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

_____10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

_____11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

_____12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

_____13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

_____14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

_____15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

_____16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

_____17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

Nordic/DK/page 3

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

_____19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

_____20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

_____21. My orchestra could do better musically.

_____22. My orchestra could do better financially.

_____23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

_____24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

_____25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

_____26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

_____27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

_____28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

_____29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

Nordic/DK/page 4

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

_____31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

_____32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

_____33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

_____34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Part Two

Background information

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Age: _____ years

APPENDIX 1 c - Questionnaire: Finnish Version

Nordic/Fin/ page 1

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphony orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

\- - -

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

Nordic/Fin/page 2

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

_____10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

_____11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

_____12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

_____13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

_____14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

_____15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

_____16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

_____17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

Nordic/Fin/page 3

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

_____19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

_____20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

_____21. My orchestra could do better musically.

_____22. My orchestra could do better financially.

_____23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

_____24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

_____25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

_____26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

_____27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

_____28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

_____29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

Nordic/Fin/page 4

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

_____31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

_____32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

_____33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

_____34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Part Two

Background information

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Age: _____ years

APPENDIX 1 d - Questionnaire: Icelandic Version

Nordic/IS/ page 1

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphony orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

\- - -

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

Nordic/IS/page 2

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

_____10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

_____11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

_____12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

_____13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

_____14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

_____15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

_____16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

_____17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

Nordic/IS/page 3

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

_____19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

_____20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

_____21. My orchestra could do better musically.

_____22. My orchestra could do better financially.

_____23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

_____24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

_____25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

_____26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

_____27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

_____28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

_____29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

Nordic/IS/page 4

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

_____31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

_____32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

_____33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

_____34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Part Two

Background information

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Age: _____ years

APPENDIX 1 e - Questionnaire: Norwegian Version

Nordic N page 1

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphon orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

Nordic/N/page 2

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

_____10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

_____11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

_____12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

_____13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

_____14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

_____15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

_____16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

_____17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

Nordic/N/page 3

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

_____19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

_____20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

_____21. My orchestra could do better musically.

_____22. My orchestra could do better financially.

_____23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

_____24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

_____25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

_____26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

_____27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

_____28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

_____29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

Nordic/N/page 4

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

_____31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

_____32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

_____33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

_____34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Part Two

Background information

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Age: _____ years

APPENDIX 1 f - Questionnaire: Swedish Version

Nordic/S/ page 1

Part One

Listed below are a number of statements that could describe a symphony orchestra.

Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or inaccurate description of your orchestra or the environment in which it operates.

\- - -

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your orchestra?

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 1. Our orchestra is getting stronger and stronger financially.

_____ 2. With each season, this orchestra is improving musically.

_____ 3. The people of our local community think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 4. Our local politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 5. Our national politicians think highly of the orchestra and their support and general positive attitude is an encouragement for us in our work.

_____ 6. Our system of administrative decision making is efficient and effective for the whole organisation.

Nordic/S/page 2

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____ 7. I feel that in my job as a Chief Executive I enjoy the wholehearted support of my governing Board of Directors.

_____ 8. The members of the Board of Directors are very capable individuals who do a good job.

_____ 9. The administrative staff of the orchestra is a very capable group of professionals, who do a good job.

_____10. The musicians of the orchestra are a group of dedicated hard working professionals who show interest and enthusiasm in their work.

_____11. The administrative staff of the orchestra are well educated and have the proper background for working in the management of an orchestra.

_____12. The decisions made by politicians (local and/or national) regarding this orchestra are often made difficult to implement through the interference of the civil service bureaucracy.

_____13. The civil service often helps to lessen effects of bad decisions made by politicians concerning the affairs of this orchestra.

_____14. Decision making is difficult in this orchestra due to the complicated route affairs have to take through various different people and/or committees.

_____15. The musicians' union is a difficult factor in the administrative and artistic growth of the orchestra and present a threat to the organisation as a whole.

_____16. Musicians in this orchestra are paid too much.

_____17. Administrative staff in this orchestra are paid too much.

Nordic/S/page 3

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____18. Politically elected authorities have too much influence over the running of this orchestra.

_____19. The local media is positive to the orchestra.

_____20. My orchestra is an excellent orchestra from a musical point of view.

_____21. My orchestra could do better musically.

_____22. My orchestra could do better financially.

_____23. The musicians in the orchestra are an undisciplined lot.

_____24. It is a wonderful, rewarding and appreciated job to be a chief executive of a symphony orchestra.

_____25. It helps me in my job as chief executive to know that there are politicians who make sure that the orchestra gets the public subsidy it needs.

_____26. The orchestra gets all the funds it needs from public sources (national or local).

_____27. If I make a suggestion to politicians or official authorities, for the purpose of improving conditions for the orchestra, they listen carefully and help me in any way they can.

_____28. It is necessary to have a high level public subsidy, from national and local authorities, for a symphony orchestra to function at all in this country.

_____29. Symphony orchestras in this country could function with little or no public funding.

Nordic/S/page 4

1 Very Inaccurate	2 Mostly Inaccurate	3 Slightly Inaccurate	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Accurate	6 Mostly Accurate	7 Very Accurate

_____30. Politicians and civil servants stick their noses into the affairs of the orchestra and interfere with my job a lot of the time.

_____31. I would be happier if the authorities interfered less in the day to day running of the orchestra.

_____32. The link between politically elected authorities (through public funding and other more direct involvement) and my orchestra, is a healthy base for reaching artistic and financial goals as well as strengthening the orchestra's roots in society.

_____33. I feel secure about the continuing stability of public subsidy for my orchestra.

_____34. I am happy with my national government's cultural policy.

Part Two

Background information

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Age: _____ years

APPENDIX 2 a - Questionnaire: Accompanying Letter; British

May 1995

British and Scandinavian Symphony Orchestras - A Survey.

Dear Chief Executive.

The brief survey enclosed has been developed as a part of a study of symphony orchestras currently being carried out by the undersigned as a part of his Ph.D. in Arts Management at the City University in London.

The purpose of the survey is to compare conditions symphony orchestras in Great Britain operate under to the conditions of Scandinavian symphony orchestras. Through the responses the author hopes to be able to establish, to a degree anyway, the effect two different public policies (one with a relatively low level of public funding, the other with a relatively high level of public funding) have on the economic and artistic reality of symphony orchestras as well as how it influences the arts management professional involved in the running of an orchestra.

The survey is short, it should take no more than 5-10 minutes to complete. Please fill it in, put into the stamped addressed envelope provided and post.

Your responses will be completely confidential. The survey is not identified with any number or name, the only identification is whether the survey is answered in Britain or in Scandinavia. This is done to make comparison possible, but no one will know the names of individual responsées.

Your participation in this survey is of a great value to the research currently being undertaken, the findings of which will hopefully be a source of useful information for arts management professionals involved in the running of symphony orchestras. I thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Haukur F. Hannesson

APPENDIX 2 b - Questionnaire: Accompanying Letter; Scandinavian

May 1995

British and Nordic Symphony Orchestras - A Survey.

Dear Chief Executive.

The brief survey enclosed has been developed as a part of a study of symphony orchestras currently being carried out by the undersigned as a part of his Ph.D. in Arts Management at the City University in London.

The purpose of the survey is to compare conditions that Nordic symphony orchestras operate under to the conditions of symphony orchestras in Great Britain. Through the responses the author hopes to be able to establish, to a degree anyway, the effect two different public policies (one with a relatively low level of public funding, the other with a relatively high level of public funding) have on the economic and artistic reality of symphony orchestras as well as how it influences the arts management professional involved in the running of an orchestra.

The survey is short, it should take no more than 5-10 minutes to complete. Please fill it in, put into the stamped addressed envelope provided and post.

Your responses will be completely confidential. The survey is not identified with any number or name, the only identification is whether the survey is answered in Britain or in one of the Nordic countries. This is done to make comparison possible, but no one will know the names of individual responsées.

Your participation in this survey is of a great value to the research currently being undertaken, the findings of which will hopefully be a source of useful information for arts management professionals involved in the running of symphony orchestras. I thank you in advance for your assistance and enclose furthermore, for your information, a copy of a letter of introduction from the Director of the Association of British Orchestras which was sent to the 67 British orchestras involved in this survey.

Yours sincerely,

Haukur F. Hannesson

APPENDIX 3

Association of British Orchestras

Francis House
Francis Street
London SW1P 1DE
Telephones:
0171-828 6913/6930
Fax:
0171-931 9959
Chairman: Clive Gillinson
Director: Libby MacNamara

May 1995

To: ABO member orchestras

Dear Colleagues

I am writing to introduce **Haukur Hannesson** to you, and to seek your help with some important research he is currently undertaking.

You may remember Haukur, from Iceland, who spent some time in the ABO office a few years ago when he was studying at the City University, researching and comparing the management structure of a number of British orchestras. He visited several of you at that time. Others may have met him at our annual conferences, including at Leeds last January.

Haukur's current research is a comparison of British orchestras with Scandinavian orchestras. His own letter of introduction gives a fuller account. I hope that you will feel able to spare a few minutes to complete the questionnaire, which will help to give Haukur the vital information he needs for his study. If his previous research is anything to go by, this project will be well produced and of great interest to us all.

Thank you very much indeed for your help.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

Libby MacNamara
Director

APPENDIX 4 a - Questionnaire: First Follow Up Letter; British

June 1995

British and Scandinavian Symphony Orchestras - A Survey.

Dear Chief Executive.

Approximately a month ago I sent you a questionnaire which is a part of a survey currently being undertaken where the subject is a comparison between British and Scandinavian symphony orchestras.

If you have already answered the questionnaire and returned it to me, I would like to use this opportunity to thank you for taking the time to answer. This is much appreciated and gives me valuable data for my research.

If, however, you have not had the time yet to answer and return the questionnaire, I would like to ask you kindly to take five minutes of your time to fill in the form I sent and return it to me in the stamped addressed envelope which was enclosed with the questionnaire. This would be of a great help to me, as the survey's conclusions can only be accurate if as many orchestras as possible are included in the final data analysis.

I would be very grateful for your assistance. If you have any queries concerning the questionnaire or my research, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Haukur F. Hannesson

APPENDIX 4 b - Questionnaire: First Follow Up Letter; Scandinavian

June 1995

British and Nordic Symphony Orchestras - A Survey.

Dear Chief Executive.

Approximately a month ago I sent you a questionnaire which is a part of a survey currently being undertaken where the subject is a comparison between British and Scandinavian symphony orchestras.

If you have already answered the questionnaire and returned it to me, I would like to use this opportunity to thank you for taking the time to answer. This is much appreciated and gives me valuable data for my research.

If, however, you have not had the time yet to answer and return the questionnaire, I would like to ask you kindly to take five minutes of your time to fill in the form I sent and return it to me in the stamped addressed envelope which was enclosed with the questionnaire. This would be of a great help to me, as the survey's conclusions can only be accurate if as many orchestras as possible are included in the final data analysis.

I would be very grateful for your assistance. If you have any queries concerning the questionnaire or my research, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Haukur F. Hannesson

APPENDIX 5 a - Questionnaire: Second Follow Up Letter; British

August 1995

British and Scandinavian Symphony Orchestras - A Survey.

Dear Chief Executive.

Almost three months ago I sent you a questionnaire, which is a part of a survey currently being undertaken, where the subject is a comparison between British and Scandinavian symphony orchestras. You will also have received a letter from me concerning this at the end of June.

If you have already answered the questionnaire and returned it to me, I would like to apologize for sending this letter, but as the survey is completely anonymous I have no way of knowing who amongst the eighty four orchestra chief executives in Britain and Scandinavia contacted, has already replied and who has not. I would like to thank you once more for assisting me in my research, by sending me your filled in questionnaire.

If, however, you have not had the time yet to answer and return the questionnaire, I would like to ask you kindly to take five minutes of your time to fill in the form I sent and return it to me. You might have misplaced the questionnaire form during the summer, so I enclose a new copy of the questionnaire for you to fill in as well as an envelope to post it in.

I do hope you have had a nice summer and would like to express my gratitude once more for your help. If you have any queries concerning the questionnaire or my research, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Haukur F. Hannesson

APPENDIX 5 b - Questionnaire: Second Follow Up Letter; Scandinavian

August 1995

British and Nordic Symphony Orchestras - A Survey.

Dear Chief Executive.

Almost three months ago I sent you a questionnaire, which is a part of a survey currently being undertaken, where the subject is a comparison between British and Nordic symphony orchestras. You will also have received a letter from me concerning this at the end of June.

If you have already answered the questionnaire and returned it to me, I would like to apologize for sending this letter, but as the survey is completely anonymous I have no way of knowing who amongst the eighty four orchestra chief executives in Britain and the Nordic countries contacted, has already replied and who has not. I would like to thank you once more for assisting me in my research, by sending me your filled in questionnaire.

If, however, you have not had the time yet to answer and return the questionnaire, I would like to ask you kindly to take five minutes of your time to fill in the form I sent and return it to me. You might have misplaced the questionnaire form during the summer, so I enclose a new copy of the questionnaire for you to fill in as well as an envelope to post it in.

I do hope you have had a nice summer and would like to express my gratitude once more for your help. If you have any queries concerning the questionnaire or my research, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Haukur F. Hannesson

APPENDIX 6 -

List of orchestras, towns of residence, population and formal organisational structures of British and Scandinavian orchestras involved in this study.[1]

In the following list of orchestras, their basic formal organisational structure will be described by the following code:

- Ltd. : A company limited by guarantee
- CA : Concert Association, usually organised as an interest organisation with membership of individuals and organisations (even authorities, such as local councils). This association is the umbrella body under which the orchestra operates, usually with contracted musicians. (In Scandinavia this form is also known as an "ideal" association.)
- SG : Self governing orchestras. In this form the orchestra is owned and run by the musicians themselves, as for example the big London orchestras. If this collective is also a limited company this is indicated in the list by "SG/Ltd."
- FL : Freelance, indicating that this is a freelance orchestra run by a private person, a company or other parties hiring musicians on a freelance basis for shorter or longer periods.
- Pub. : "Public Administration". In this form the orchestra is formally a part of the public administration system (in Sweden e.g. "stadsförvaltningen") at local, regional or national level. This category also entails the only orchestra of this study that has its own special national legislation, the Iceland Symphony Orchestra. (The Iceland Symphony Orchestra Act was especially created to ensure the orchestra's financial and organisational prerequisites and structure.
- Rad. : A radio orchestra, which is a part of a public broadcasting service.
- Found. : A "Foundation", usually in Scandinavia in accordance with special legislation that allows certain "self-owning" institutions to take this form.
- CH: A trust with charitable status (UK).
- N/A: Information not available

---

[1] This list was prepared from sources provided by the orchestras' annual accounts and reports, as well as additional information from The Association of British Orchestras, The Association of Finnish Orchestras, Teatrarnas Riksförbund (Sweden) and the Danish Regional Orchestras' Coordination Council (Landsdelsorkestrenes samråd).The population figures come directly by electronic mail and fax from the National Statistical Bureaus of each of the countries. These figures reflect the population of the countries at the end of 1995 as follows: Denmark 1/1/96 (the Danish figures pertain to the administrative municipalities covered by each of the towns and cities, not just the population in the main town), Finland 31/12/95, Iceland 1/12/95, Norway 31/12/95 (population figures in towns pertain to the whole municipalities covered by the particular town/city council), Sweden 31/12/95 . The United Kingdom population figures are a mid-year estimates for 1995, as provided by the Office for National Statistics.

APPENDIX 6, cont.

Orchestra/Country	City/Town of of Residence	Population	Formal Org. Struct.
DENMARK, 6 orchestras:		5,251,027	
Aalborg Symfoniorkester - The Aalborg Symphony Orchestr	Aalborg	159,980	Found.
Aarhus Symfoniorkester - Aarhus Symphony Orchestra	Aarhus	279,759	Found.
Odense Symfoniorkester - Odense Symphony Orchestra	Odense	183,564	Pub.
Radiosymfoniorkestret - The Danish National Radio Symphony Orchestra	Copenhagen	476,751 (municipality) 1,752,078 (CPH region)	Rad.
Sjællands Symfoniorkester - The Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra	Copenhagen	-	Found.
Sønderjyllands Symfoniorkester - Symphony Orchestra of South Jutland	Sønderborg	29,357	Found.
FINLAND, 12 orchestras:		5,116,826	
Helsingin Kaupunginorkesteri/ Helsingfors stadsorkester - The Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra	Helsinki	525,031	Pub.
Joensuun kaupunginorkesteri/ Joensuu stadsorkester - The Joensuu City Orchestra	Joensuu	50,431	Pub.
Jyväskylän Orkester Oy/ Jyväskylä Orkester AB - The Jyväskylä Symphony Orchestra	Jyväskylä	74,072	Ltd.
Kuopion Kaupunginorkesteri/ Kuopio Stadsorkester - The Kuopio City Orchestra	Kuopio	84,733	Pub.
Lahden Kaupunginorkesteri/ Lahtis stadsorkester - Sinfonia Lahti	Lahti	95,119	Pub.

APPENDIX 6, cont.

Orchestra/Country	City/Town of of Residence	Population	Formal Org. Struct.
Oulun Kaupunginorkesteri/ Uleåborgs Stadsorkester -The Oulu City Orchestra	Oulu	109,094	Pub.
Porin kaupunginorkesteri/ Björneborgs stadsorkester - The Pori City Orchestra	Pori	76,627	Pub.
Radion Sinfoniaorkesteri/ Radions Symfoniorkester - The Finnish Radio Symphony Orchestra	Helsinki	525,031	Rad.
Tampereen Kaupunginorkesteri/ Tammerfors Stadsorkester - The Tampere Philharmonic Orchestra	Tampere	182,742	Pub.
Tapiola Sinfonietta/ Esbo Stadsorkester - The Espoo City Orchestra	Espoo	191,247	Pub.
Turun Kaupunginorkesteri/ Åbo Stadsorkester - The Turku Philharmonic Orchestra	Turku	164,744	Pub.
Vaasan Kaupunginorkesteri/ Vasa Stadsorkester - The Vaasa City Orchestra	Vaasa	55,502	Pub.
ICELAND, one orchestra:		267,806	
Sinfóníuhljómsveit Íslands - Iceland Symphony Orchestra	Reykjavík	104,458	Pub.
NORWAY, 6 orchestras:		4,369,957	
Bergen Filharmoniske Orkester - Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra	Bergen	223,238	CA
Kringkastningsorkestret - Norwegian Radio Orchestra	Oslo	488,659	Rad.
Kristiansand Symfoniorkester - Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra	Kristianssand	69,269	Found.

APPENDIX 6, cont.

Orchestra/Country	City/Town of of Residence	Population	Formal Org. Struct.
Oslo Filharmoniske Orkester - Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra	Oslo	488,659	CA
Stavanger Symfoniorkester - Stavanger Symphony Orchestra	Stavanger	104,373	Found.
Trondheim Symfoniorkester - The Trondheim Symphony Orchestra	Trondheim	143,829	Found.
SWEDEN, 7 orchestras:		8,837,496	
Gävle Symfoniorkester - Gävle Symphony Orchestra	Gävle	90,587	Pub.
Göteborgs Symfoniker - Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra	Gothenburg	499,189	Ltd.
Helsingborgs Symfoniorkester - Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra	Helsingborg	114,339	CA
Kungliga Filharmoniska Orkestern - Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra	Stockholm	711,119	Found.
Malmö Symfoniorkester - Malmö Symphony Orchestra	Malmö	245,699	Ltd.
Norrköpings Symfoniorkester - Norrköping Symphony Orchestra	Norrköping	123,795	CA
Sveriges Radios Symfoniorkester - Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra	Stockholm	711,119	Rad.
BRITAIN, 51 orchestras:		58,605,782	
Academy of London	London	7,007,091	N/A
Academy of St. Martin in the Fields	London	7,007,091	CA
BBC National Orchestra of Wales	Cardiff	309,416	Rad.
BBC Philharmonic	Manchester	432,641	Rad.

APPENDIX 6, cont.

Orchestra/Country	City/Town of of Residence	Population	Formal Org. Struct.
BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra	Glasgow	618,430	Rad.
BBC Symphony Orchestra	London	7,007,091	Rad
BT Scottish Ensemble	Glasgow	618,430	Ltd
Birmingham Contemporary Music Group	Birmingham	1,017,458	Ltd.
Bournemouth Orchestras	Bristol and Bournemouth	399,633/160,898	Ltd.
Brandenburg Consort	Bath	164,643	Ltd
Britten Sinfonia	Cambridge	114,791	Ltd.
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra	Birmingham	1,017,458	Ltd
City of London Sinfonia	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
City of Oxford Orchestra	Oxford	134,816	N/A
Corydon Orchestra	London	7,007,091	N/A
East of England Orchestra	Nottingham	283,846	td /CH
English Camerata	Leeds	724,967	N/A
English Classical Players	London	7,007,091	N/A
English Northern Philharmonia	Leeds	724,967	CH
English Sinfonia	Bedfordshire	-	Ltd
English String Orchestra	Worcestershire	-	Ltd
Guildford Philharmonic Orchestra	Guildford/London	7,007,091	P ıb
Halle Concerts Society (i.e. Hallé Orchestra)	Manchester	432,641	CA
London Handel Orchestra	London	7,007,09	CA/ td / H
London Jupiter Orchestra	London	7 007,09	A
London Mozart Players	London	7,007 091	d
London Sinfonietta	London	7,007,091	H

APPENDIX 6, cont.

Orchestra/Country	City/Town of of Residence	Population	Formal Org. Struct.
London Soloists Chamber Orchestra	London	7,007,091	N/A
London Symphony Orchestra	London	7,007,091	SG/Ltd.
Manchester Camerata	London	7,007,091	FL
Milton Keynes City Orchestra	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
Mozart Orchestra Sinfonia	Coventry	303,555	Ltd.
New London Orchestra	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
New Queens Hall Orchestra	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
Northern Sinfonia	Newcastle	283,555	Ltd.
Orchestra da Camera	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
Orchestra of St John's Smith Square	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
Philharmonia Orchestra	London	7,007,091	SG/Ltd.
Philomusica of London	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
Regent Sinfonia of London	London	7,007,091	N/A
Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Society	London	7,007,091	CA
Royal Philharmonic Orchestra	London	7,007,091	SG/Ltd.
Royal Scottish National Orchestra	Glasgow	618,430	Ltd.
Scottish Chamber Orchestra	Edinburgh	447,550	FL
Sinfonia 21	London	7,007,091	Ltd.
The London Philharmonic	London	7,007,091	SG/Ltd.
The Orchestra of the Golden Age	Cheshire	-	N/A
Ulster Orchestra	Belfast	296,700	Ltd.
Wren Orchestra of London	London	7,007,091	N/A

Bibliography

This list of sources cited in the thesis is arranged alfabetically by author or title, in the original language. English translation of title and/or publisher's name is included in [] for all entries which original language is Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, Norwegian or Swedish.

Aalborg By-Orkester, Nordjysk Symfoniorkester 1943-1968
[Aalborg Town Orchestra, a North Jutland Symphony Orchestra 1943-1968]
Aalborg By-Orkester [Aalborg Town Orchestra], Aalborg 1968.

Aalborg Symphony Orchestra/Aalborg Symfoniorkester (DK).
Annual Accounts 1995/Årsregnskab 1995
Deloitte & Touche Statsautoriseret Revisionsaktieselskab
[Deloitte &Touche Chartered Accountants].

Aarhus Symphony Orchestra/Aarhus Symfoniorkester (DK).
Annual Accounts for 1995/Årsregnskab 1995.

Aarhus Symfoniorkester 50 år [Aarhus Symphony Orchestra 50th anniversary]
(editors Janne Lauritzen and Jens Rossel)
Aarhus1985.

Aarhus Symfoniorkester. Perspektivplan 1995
[Aarhus Symphony Orchestra. Perspective Plan 1995]
Fritids og kulturforvaltningen [The Council's Leasure and Cultural Administration),
Aarhus 1995.

Adizes, Ichak.
Corporate Lifecycles: how and why corporations grow and die and what to do about it
Prentice Hall, Engelwood Cliffs, N.J., 1988.

Allmendinger, Jutta.
Die Kunst des Überlebens oder das Überleben der Kunst?
Frankfurter Rundschau, Nr. 299 (December 24) 1990, S. 26

Allmendinger, Jutta.
Staatskultur und Marktkultur Ostdeutsche Orchester im Vergleich
Report No. 2, Cross-National Study of Symphony Orchestras,
Harvard University 1991.

Allmendinger, Jutta, and Hackman, J. Richard.
The Survival of Art or the Art of Survival?
Report No. 1, Cross-National Study of Symphony Orchestras,
Harvard University 1991.

Allmendinger, Jutta, and Hackman, J. Richard.
Bringing Music to the People: Continuity and Discontinuity in East German Orchestras. Report No. 3, Cross-National Study of Symphony Orchestras, Harvard University 1992.

Allmendinger, Jutta, and Hackman, J. Richard.
The more the better? A Four-Nation Study of the Inclusion of Women in Symphony Orchestras in *Social Forces* December 1995, 74(2):423-460.

Allmendinger, Jutta; Hackman, J. Richard; Kowal-Wolk, Larissa and Lehman, Erin V.
Methods and Measures for the Cross-National Study of Symphony Orchestras. Report No. 4, Cross-National Study of Symphony Orchestras, Harvard University 1993.

Allmendinger, Jutta and Hackman, J. Richard.
Akzeptanz oder Abwehr? Die Integration von Frauen in professionelle Organisationen. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, No.46, 1994, p. 238-259.

Allmendinger, Jutta; Hackman, J. Richard, and Lehman, Erin V.
Life and Work in Symphony Orchestras: An Interim Report of Research Findings. Report No. 7, Cross-National Study of Symphony Orchestras, Harvard University 1994.

Allmendinger, Jutta, and Hackman, J. Richard.
The more the better? A four nation study of the inclusion of women in symphony orchestras. *Social Forces*, 74, 1995, p. 423-460.

Allmendinger, Jutta, and Hackman, J. Richard.
Organizations in changing environments: The case of East German symphony orchestras. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, in press 1996.

(Allmendinger, Jutta, and Hackman, J. Richard.
"Die Freiheit wird uns in die Pflicht nehmen": Ostdeutsche Orchester zwischen Staats- und Marktkultur. In *Jürgen Gerhards (Hrsg.), Soziologie der Kunst: Produzenen, Vermittler und Rezipientent.*
Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, in press 1996.

Alsvik, Jan.
Stavanger symfoniorkester 1938-1988
[The Stavanger Symphony Orchestra 1938-1988]
Stavanger: Dreyer 1988.

American Symphony Orchestra League.
Americanizing the American Orchestra: A Task Force Report
Washington, D.C.: ASOL, 1993.

Andersen, Benny E. & Ressel, Otto (editors).
Radioens Spillemænd, Symfonikerne bli'r fyrre [The Players of the Radio, The Symphony Orchestra Turns Forty]
Chr. Erichsens Forlag, Copenhagen, 1965.

Arnold-Baker, Charles.
The Five Thousand or The Living Constitution
Longcross Press Ltd. in association with The City University, London 1986.
ISBN 0 902378 07 4

Arts Council of England, information sheet, London 1994.

(The) Arts Council of England.
Strategy for the Support and development of orchestras and their audiences
July 1995.

(The) Arts Council of England and how it works
The Arts Council of England, London, July 1996.

(The) Arts Council of Great Britain - What it is and What is does , booklet
The Millbrook Press Ltd., Southampton, November 1967.

Arts news - The Magazine of the National Campaign for the Arts
Summer 1997, Issue 44

Association of Finnish Orchestras.
Concert Calender, Spring 1995
Association of Finnish Orchestras, 1995.

Association of Finnish Orchestras.
Symphony Orchestras in Finland
Association of Finnish Symphony Orchestras, year not given.

Bäckström, Henrik.
Administrativ styrning. Musik i Uppland, Examensarbete vid Företagsekonmiska institutionen, Uppsala universitet. Ht. 1992 [Administrative Control. The Music Foundation in Uppland. Examination work at the School of Business, Uppsala University, Autmn term 1992], unpublished.

Bakke, Marit.
Spillet om kulturen, Dansk kulturpolitik 1945-1985
[The Game of Culture, Danish Cultural Policy 1945-1985]
Aarhus universitetsforlag, Århus 1988.

Barnetta, W.L.
The non-respondent problem in questionnaire research.
Journal of Applied Psychology, 34, 397-8, 1950.

(The) Basic Principles of Finnish Government Decision-Making Structure and Procedure, published by The Prime Minister's Office, Helsinki, no year given.

BBC/Arts Council Review of National Orchestral Provision, Consultation Document
London, October 1994.

Belson, William A.
The Design and Understanding of Survey Questions
Gower Publishing Co. Ltd., Aldershot, Hants, England, 1981.

Belson, William A.
"The effects of reversing the presentation order of verbal rating scales?"
Journal of Advertising Research, vol. 6(4), 1986.

Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra/Harmonien-Bergen Filharmoniske Orkester (N).
Annual Accounts 1995/Årsberetning 1995

Berthelsen, Herman (editor)
Råd for uråd, Norsk kulturråd gjennom 30 år [Norwegian Arts Council 30 years]
Grøndahl og Dreyers Forlag AS Oslo, 1994.

Betænkning, Avgivet af orkesterudvalget af 1991
[Report, Given by the Orchestra Committee of 1991]
Statens Musikråd [The Stat's Music Council], Copenhagen, September 1992.

Birch, Anthony H.
The British System of Government Ninth edition
Routledge, London 1993.

Bogason, Peter.
Forvaltning og stat [Public Administration and the State]
Forlaget Systime A/S, Herning 1992.

Borda, Debra.
The Orchestra--Do We Need to Reinvent it? Keynote speech at the 1994 British Association of Concert Agents (BACA) Annual Conference, London, England 1994, (unpublished).

Bournmouth Orchestras. *Annual Report 1995*

Boylan, Patrick J. and City University, UK, World Wide Web pages (December 1997); Culture in the United Kingdom - Outline of Government Structure and Responsibilities: http://www.city.ac.uk/artspol/culture/html

Boylan, Patrick J. (1997 A)
Les Musées Face à La Décroissance. pp.17-41 *in* Coté, M. & Ferrara,L., 1997. *Perspectives Nouvelles en Muséologie/New trends in Museum Practice*
Quebec: Musée de la Civilisation, 1997

Boylan, Patrick J. (1997 B)
British Art in the 1980s and 1990s: The Social and Political Background. pp. 147-159 *in* Murphy, B. (editor), 1997. *Pictura Britannica: British Art of the 1980s and 1990s*
Sydney: Museum of Contemporary Art

Bradburn, Norman M. and Sudman, Seymour.
Polls and Surveys - Understanding What They Tell Us
Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Fransisco 1988.

(The) British System of Government in *Aspects of Britain,* Reference Services, Central Office of Information, London: HMSO, 1994.

Brown, R.G.S. and D.R. Steel.
The Administrative Process in Britain Second edition
Methuen & Co Ltd., London 1979.

Butler, David and Butler, Gareth.
British Political Facts 1900-1985 Sixth edition
The Macmillan Press, London 1986.

Cavanagh, D.
Constituency Electioneering in Britain
Longmans, London 1980.

Chartrand, H.H./McCaughey, C.
"The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective - Past, Present and Future", in Cummings, M.C./Schuster, J.M.D. (edit.): *Who's to pay for the Arts? The International Search for Models of Support.*
ACA Books, New York 1989.

Chiapello, Eve.
LES ORCHESTRES - L'interdépendance des modes d'organisation, des structures et des types de productions culturelles
Groupe HEC, 78350 Jouy-en-Josas, September 1993.

Christensen, J.G.
Centraladminstration: organisation og politisk placering [Central Public Administration: Organisation and Political Placing], 3rd printing
Copenhagen: Jurist- og økonomforbundets forlag [The Lawyers' and Economists' Association's Publishing], 1989.

City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. *Report and Accounts 1995*

Concerts for Children, British Orchestras' Achievement - Models for Nordic Symphony Orchestras? How to establish a Nordic Network, Report from a Conference in Stavanger, Norway, May 19th - 21st 1996.
Stavanger Symphony Orchestra, Stavanger 1996.

Cooper, Jilly.
Appassionata
Corgi Books, London 1997.

Copenhagen Philharmonic Orchestra/Sjællands Symfoniorkester (DK).
Accounts for 1995/Regnskab for 1995
Revisionsfirmaet H.E. Noiesen, Statsutoriserade revisorer [Accountants H.E. Hoiesen Chartered Accountans], Copenhagen

Council of Europe.
National Cultural Policy in Sweden, Report of a European group of experts
(European programme of national cultural policy reviews),
Swedish Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs/Almänna förlaget, Stockholm 1990.

Council of Europe.
Swedish State Cultural Policy, a national report
(European programme of national cultural policy reviews)
Swedish Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs/Almänna förlaget AB,
Stockholm 1990.

Craven, Robert R., ed.
Symphony Orchestras of the United States: Selected Profiles Westport
CT: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Craven, Robert R., ed.
Symphony Orchestras of the World: Selected Profiles
Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Cultural Policy in Finland, National Report, European Programme of National Cultural Policy Reviews, Council of Europe.
The Arts Council of Finland, Research and Information Unit, Helsinki 1995.

Cultural Policy in Finland, Report by the panel of European experts compiled by Jacques Renard, European Programme of National Cultural Policy Reviews, Council of Europe.
Council for Cultural Co-operation, Helsinki 1995.

Cultural Policy of the Norwegian Government, An Introduction
Royal Norwegian Ministry of Cultural Affairs, 1995.

Cummings, Jr., Milton C., and Katz, Richard S.
The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Cummmings, Jr., Milton C., and Schuster, J.M.D.
Who's to Pay for the Arts?:The International Search for Models of Arts Support
New York: ACA Books 1989.

Danmarks Radio, Koncerter, Sæson 1994-1995 [Danish National Broadcasting Service, Concerts, Season 1994-1995] - annual programme
Damarks Radio, Copenhagen 1994.

Davidson, Rolf.
En undersökning av repertoaren vid svenska symfoniorkestrar med tonvikt på nyare svensk musik. [A survey of the repertoire of Swedish symphony orchestras with emphasis on new Swedish music].
unpublished report, Kungl. Musikaliska Akademien i samverkan med Svensk Musik Royal Musical Academy in cooperation with Swedish Music Information Centre], Arvika, February 1996.

Davidson, Rolf.
Norsk samtidsmusikk i Norden [Norwegian Contemporary Music in the Nordic Countries], published in *Norsk samtidsmusikk gjennom 25 år*, Oslo 1992.

Davidson, Rolf.
"Överhuvudtaget visa sig norborna inte särskilt stolta över sin kultur - de flaggar hellre med annat" - en skiss till en studie över repertoar inom konsertliv och undervisning på uppdrag af Statens Musikkråd, Oslo 1993. ["The citizens of the Nordic countries do not seem to be specially proud of their own culture - they rather boast with something else" - a draft of a study of repertoire in concert activites and teaching, commissioned by the State's Music Council, Oslo 1993.]

Deming, Edward.
On Errors in Surveys
American Sociological Review, no. 4, p. 363, August, 1944.

Den statliga kulturpolitiken [The National Cultural Policy], Kungl. Maj:ts proposition nr. 28 år 1974 [His Royal Highness' Parliamentary Bill no. 28 in 1974] Riksdagen [Swedish Parliament] 1974.

Dillman, D.A.
Mail and Telephone Surveys
New York: Wiley, 1978.

Donald, Marjorie N.
Implications of Nonresponse for the Interpretation of Mail Questionnaire Data
Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 24., no. 1, pp. 99-114, spring, 1960.

Duelund, Peter.
Kunstens vilkår, Om de kulturpolitiska tendenser i Denmark og Europa [Conditions for the Arts, Tendencies in Cultural Policy in Denmark and Europe]
Akademisk Forlag, Copenhagen 1994.

Duelund, Peter.
Den danske Kulturmodel, En idepolitisk redegørelse
(skriftserie *Kulturens politik nr. 18*) [The Danish Cultural Model, A Report of Political Ideas (serie *The Politics of Culture no. 18)]*
Nordisk Kultur Institut [Nordic Cultural Institute]/KLIM, 1995.

Dunnett, Sir James.
The Civil Service: Seven Years after Fulton
Public Administration , Vol. 54, 1976.

Dupin, François.
L'Orchestre nu
Hachette, Paris1981.

Ekqvist, Lars.
Statlig Musikpolitik - en granskning av principresonemangen i några musikpolitiska dokument [National Music Policy - an investigation of principal arguments in some music policy documents], unpublished thesis
Musikvetenskapliga Institutionen [The Institute of Musicology],
Stockholms universitet, 1976.

Elíasson, Helgi.
Lög og reglur um skóla- og menningarmál á Íslandi sem gildi eru í marzlok 1944, Helgi Elíasson bjó undir prentun.[Acts of law and rules on schools and cultural affairs which are valid at the end of March 1944, edited byHelgi Eliassson.]
Gefið út af Fræðslumálastjórninni[Published by the Education Authorities],
Reykjavík 1944.

Erdos, Paul L. with the assistance of Morgan, Arthur J.
Professional Mail Surveys
McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York 1970.

Evans, Franklin B.
On Interviewer Cheating
Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 126, 127, spring, 1961.

Facts About the Arts, 3rd edition
National Campaign for the Arts, London 1995

Fasting, Kåre.
Musikselskabet "Harmonien" gjennom to hundre år 1765-1965 [The Musical Association "Harmonien" Through Two Hundred Years 1765-1965]
Bergen 1965.

Felton, Marianne V.
Historical Funding Patterns in Symphony Orchestras, Dance, and Opera Companies in *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 24 (1): p. 8-32, 1994.

"(The) Figgures Report" *'The Four London Orchestras'*
London Orchestral Concert Board, London 1978.

Finlands Lag II [The Laws of Finland II] (Päivi Kämäräinen, editor)
Helsinki 1995.

Fleischmann, Ernest.
Community of Musicians; Proposal from the Symposium on the Future of the Symphony Orchestra in *Symphony* 40 (3): p. 65-69, 1989.

Fleming, Margaret Helen Keay.
Dance Policy in France - An investigation into French Government Policy for Dance with Reference to its Significance for Britain, unpublished MA Thesis in Arts Management, City University Depertment of Arts Policy and Managment, London, 1995.

Fogel, Henry
When Bad Things Happen to Good Orchestras in *Symphony* 40 (3): p. 65-69; 1988.

(Fulton Report) *Report of the Committee on the Civil Service 1966-68* Cmnd. 3638, Vol. 1, London, 1968.

Galinsky, Adam, and Lehman, Erin V.
Emergence, divergence, convergence: Three models of symphony orchestras at the crossroads. *The European Journal of Cultural Policy*, 2(2), 1995.

Garniss, Howard and Young, Steve.
Are Music Schools Preparing Performers for Real Life?
Boston: American Federation of Musicians, 1985.

Gävleborg's Symphony Orchestra/Gävleborgs Symfoni Orkester (S).
Annual Report 1994-1995/Verksamhetsberättelse 1994-95

Gävle Symfoni Orkester [Gävle Symphony Orchestra].
Program säsongen 1996/97 [Programme the season 1996-97]
Gävle 1996.

Glass, David V.
Numbering the People: The Eighteenth Century Population Controversy and the Development of Census and Vital Statistics in Britain
Farnborough, Hants, UK: Saxon House, 1973.

(The) Glory of the Garden
Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1984.

"(The) Goodman Report" *The Committee on the London Orchestras*
The Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1965.

Gothenburg Symphony Orchestra(Gothenburg Concert Company Ltd.)/Göteborgs Konsert Aktiebolag (S).
Annual Accounts 1/7 1994-31/12 1995/Årsredovisning1/7 1994-31/12 1995

Goyer, John.
The Silent Minority - Nonrespondents on Sample Surveys
Polity Press, Dales Brewery, Gwydir Street, Cambridge CB1 2LJ, UK, 1987.

Grimlund, Bengt E., Gustafsson, Agne, Zanderin, Lars.
Förvaltning i stat, kommun , landsting - en introduktion [Public Administration at National, County and Municipal Level - An Introdction]
Bokförlaget Prisma, Stockholm 1993.

Grøndahl, Carl Henrik.
Musikken i det røde lyset , En forunderlig beretning om Kringastingsorkestret i 50 år [The Music in the Red Light, a History of the Radio Orchestra for 50 years]
NRK Oslo 1996.

Grønnegård Christensen, Jørgen and Munk Christiansen, Peter.
Forvaltning og omgivelser [Public Administration and Environment]
Forlaget Systime, Herning 1995.

Grønnegård Christensen, Jørgen and Ibsen, Marius.
Bureaukrati og bureaukrater [Bureaucracy and Bureacrats]
Forlaget Systime a/s, Herning 1991.

Guillard, Jean-Pierre.
The Symphony Orchestra as a Public Service: The Orchestra of Paris in *Journal of Cultural Economics* 9 (2): p. 35-47, 1985.

Hackman, J. Richard/Judy, Paul.
Life and Work in Symphony Orchestras: An Interview with J. Richard Hackman
Reprinted from *HARMONY: Forum of the Symphony Orchestra Institute*, Number 2, Deerfield, USA, April 1996.

Hallé Concert Society.
Annual Report and Accounts 1994/1995

Hannesson, Haukur F.
The Iceland Symphony Orchestra - a study of the legal and managerial frameworks, as well as policies, audiences and finance, in its forty years' history, unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Arts Policy and Management, City University, London, August 1991.

Hart, Philip.
Orpheus in the New World
New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1973.

Heilbrun, James.
Innovation in Art, Innovation in Technology and the Future of the High Arts in *Journal of Cultural Economics* 17 (1): p. 89-98, 1993.

Helsingborg Symphony Orchestra/Helsingborgs Symfoniorkester (S).
Annual Report 1994-95/Verksamhetsberättelse 1994-95

Hewison, Robert.
Culture and Consensus
Methuen, London 1995.

Hodne, Bjarne.
Norsk nasjonalkultur, En kulturpolitisk oversikt
[Norwegian National Culture, A Summary of Cultural Policy]
Universitetsförlaget, Oslo 1994.

"(The) Hoffmann Report" *The Advisory Committee on the London Orchestras 1993*
The Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1993.

Iceland Symphony Orchestra/Sinfóníuhljómsveit Íslands.
Annual Accounts 1995/Ársreikningur 1995
Ríkisendurskoðun [State Audit Office].

Institute for Social Research.
Interviewer's Manual
Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research 1969.

Introducing the Arts Council of Finland (leaflet)
The Arts Council of Finland, Helsinki 1995.

Jenkins, Hugh (Minister for the Arts 1974-1976)
The Culture Gap - An Experience of Government and the Arts
Marion Boyars Publishers Ltd., London and Boston 1979.

Jónsson, Agnar Kl.
Stjórnarráð Íslands 1904-1964 [The Icelandic Ministries 1904-1964]
Sögufélagið [The Historical Society], Reykjavík 1969.

Kennedy, Michael.
The Hallé 1858-1983 - A History of the Orchestra
Manchester University Press, 1982.

Kenyon, Nicholas.
The BBC Symphony Orchestra 1930-1980
British Broadcasting Corporation, London 1981.

Kommunerna, staten och kulturpolitiken [The Municipalities, the State and the Cultural Policy] Rapport från Kulturrådet 1984:3 [A Report from the Swedish Arts Council], Stockholm 1985.

Köping, Ann-Sofie.
The Production of a Symphony Concert, unpublished paper, Stockholm University, Department of Business Administration, Stockholm May 1992.

Köping, Ann-Sofie.
The Symphony Orchestra as a Working Place , unpublished paper, Stockholm University, Department of Business Administration, Stockholm 1993.

Kringkastingsorkestrets Konsertsesong 1994-95, General Program [The Radio Orchestra's Concert Season 1994-95, General Programme] booklet, Oslo 1994.

Kristiansand Symfoniorkester, 75 år 1919-1994, Program Sesongen 94-95 [Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra 75 years 1919-1994, Programme for the Season 94-95], Kristiansand 1994.

Kristiansand Symphony Orchestra/Kristiansand Symfoniorkester (N).
Annual Accounts 1995/Årsmelding 1995

Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi.
Embættismenn og stjórnmálamenn, Skipulag og vinnubrögð í íslenskri stjórnsýslu [Civil Servants and Politicians, Organisations and Approaches in Icelandic Public Administration]
Heimskringla - háskólaforlag Máls og menningar, Reykjavík 1994.

Kristjánsson, Ingólfur.
Strokið um strengi - ævisaga Þórarins Gudmundssonar fiðluleikara [The Biography of the Violinist Thorarinn Gudmundsson]
Setberg, Reykjvík 1966.

Kultur i tiden, Stortingsmelding nr. 61 (1991-1992), Kulturdepartementet, Oslo 1992. [Culture in Our Times, A Norwegian Parliamentry Committee Report no. 61 (1991-1992), Royal Ministry of Culture, Oslo 1992.

Kultur og kulturpolitikk,Norsk kulturråd - fortid og framtid [Culture and Cultural Policy, Norwegian Arts Council - Past and Future]
J.W. Cappelens Forlag As, Oslo 1985.

Kulturpolitikens inriktning, Kulturutredningens slutbetänkande, Statens offentliga utredningar (SOU) 1995, nr. 84 , Kulturdepartimentet Stockholm 1995. [*The Aim of the Cultural Policy*, the Cultural Committee's Final Report, the State's Offical Inquiries (SOU) 1995, no. 84, The Department of Culture, Stockholm 1995].

Lægred, Paul and Roness, Paul G.
Sentraladministrasjonen [Central Government Administration]
Tiden Norsk Forlag, Oslo, 1983.

Lang, Serge.
The File: Case Study in Correction
New York: Springer-Verlag 1981.

Lange, Mark D.; Bullard, James; Luksetich, William A. and Jacobs, Philip
Cost Functions for Symphony Orchestras
in *Journal of Cultural Economics* 9 (2): p. 71-85, 1985.

Lange, Mark D. and Luksetich, William A.
The Cost of Producing Symphony Orchestra Services
in *Journal of Cultural Economics* 17 (1): p. 1-15, 1993.

Länsmusiken 1994, Siffror och kommentarer kring länsmusikorganisationernas verksamhet [The County Music 1994, Figures and Comments About the County Music Foundations' Activities]
Statens Kulturråd [Swedish Arts Council] 1995.

Leacock, Stephen.
Winnowed Wisdom.
London: Lane 1926.

Lebrecht, Norman.
The Maestro Myth, Great Conductors in Pursuit of Power
Simon & Schuster Ltd., Sydney 1991.

Lehman, Erin V.
Symphony orchestra organizations: Development of the literature since 1960. in *HARMONY: Forum of the Symphony Orchestra Institute*, Number 1, 1995 (a), p.37-54, Deerfield, USA

Lehman, Erin V.
Recruitment Practices in American and British Symphony Orchestras: Contrasts and Consequences in *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 24, No.4, Winter 1995 (b), p. 325-343

Lehman, Erin V., and Galinsky, Adam.
The London Symphony Orchestra - Scenes from a Symphony Harvard Business School Publishing, Case No.N9-494-034, Boston, MA, 1994.

Lenski, G.E. and Legget, J.C.
Chaste, class, and deference in the research interview
in *American Journal of Sociology* 65:463-467, 1960.

Levine, Robert.
Stress and Musicians
Milwaukee, WI, 1993.

Local Authorities, Entertainment and the Arts
The Audit Commission for Local Authorities and the National Health Service in England and Wales, London: HSMO 199.

London Philharmonic Orchesra Limited.
Report and Financial Statement 31 August 1995
Deloitte & Touche, London.

(The) London Symphony Orchestra Limited.
Financial Statements for the Year Ended 31st March 1995
D. Stoker & Co., Registered Auditors, London.

Louis de Geer konsert och kongress [Louis de Geer Concert and Conference], booklet CLE Marknad, Norrköping 1996.

Lunden, Leon Emanuel.
Major Symphony Orchestra Labor Relations
unpublished Ph.D. thesis at the University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Magnússon, Atli (editor).
Skært lúðrar hljóma - saga íslenskra lúðrasveita
[The History of Icelandic Brass Bands]
The Federation of Icelandic Brass Bands/ Ísafoldarprentsmidja h.f., Reykjavík 1984.

Malmö Symphony Orchestra Ltd./Malmö Symfoniorkester AB (S).
Annual Accounts for the Fiscal Year 1 July 1994 - 30 June 1995/
Årsredovisning för räkenskapsåret 1 juli 1994 - 30 juni 1995

Mangset, Per.
Kulturliv og forvaltning, Innføring i kulturpolitikk [Cultural Life and Public Administration, an Introductions to Cultural Policy]
Universitetsforlaget, Oslo 1992.

Meyer, Poul.
Styrningen af den ofentlige forvaltning (in *Den offentlige forvaltning i Denmark (Nyt fra samfundsvidenskaberna nr. 33)* red. Nue Møller, Jørgen)
[The Control of the Public Administration (in *The Public Administration in Denmark (News From the Social Sciences No. 33)* editor Nue Møller, Jørgen)]
Copenhagen 1973.

Meyer, Poul; Vendel Smith, Georg; Nørgaard Madsen, Ole; Bruun, Finn.
Offentlig forvaltning i Denmark, 2. reviderede udgave [Public Administration in Denmark, 2. revised edition]
Forlaget Politica, Århus 1980.

Midgaard, John.
A Brief History of Norway
Aschenhoug, Oslo 1989.

Miller, William L.
The Survey Method in the Social and Political Sciences - Achievements, Failures, Prospects
Frances Pinter (Publishers), London 1983.

Minihan, Janet.
The Nationalization of Culture -
The Development of State Subsidies to the Arts in Great Britain
Hamish Hamilton Ltd., London 1977.

Moore, Jerrold Northrop.
Philharmonic Jubilee 1932-1982,
A Celebration of the London Philharmonic Orchestra's Fiftieth Anniversary
Hutchinson, London 1982.

Morales, Olasso and Norlind, Tobias.
Kungl. musikaliska akademien 1771-1921, Minnesskrift av Olasso Morales & Tobias Norlind [The Royal Swedish Musical Academy 1771-1921, A History by Olasso Morales & Tobias Norlind]
Bröderna Lagerströms Förlag, Stockholm 1921.

Morgan, Michael.
The Music Is Multicultural in *Symphony* 45 (6): p. 48-50, 1994.

Morgunblaðið Daily - Iceland, Thursday July 27, 1996.

Morris, Thomas W.
Prescription for Survival in *Symphony* 40 (2): p. 26-30, 1989.

Musica (Music Magazine) yr.1, issue 1, April 1948.

Musik för miljoner. En utvärdering av länsmusikreformen. Rapport från Statens kulturråd 1994:2 [*Music for Millions. An acessment of the county music reformation.* A report from the Swedish Arts Council 1994:2]

Musik i försvaret, Kulturrådets rapport 1981:5, [*Music in the Defence Forces*, Swedish Arts Council Report 1981:5].

Musikpolitisk utredning. Delrapport II 1986. Västmanlands läns landsting 1986 [*Music Policy Investigation. Report Part II 1986*, Västmanlands County Council 1986]

Musikreformen längst i norr av Karl-Ola Nilsson; I: Kulturrådet 1989:3, s. 9-16 [*The Musical Reformation in the Far North* by Karl-Ola Nilsson, I: Swedish Arts Council 1989:3, pages 9-16]

Nationalencyklopedin, band 14 - Ett uppslagsverk på vetenskaplig grund utarbetat på initativ av Statens Kulturråd [The National Encyclopedia, Volume 14 - A Reference Work on Scientific Basic initiated by the Swedish Arts Council]
Bokförlaget Bra böcker, Höganäs 1994.

Nationalencyklopedin, band17, - Ett uppslagsverk på vetenskaplig grund utarbetat på initativ av Statens Kulturråd [The National Encyclopedia, Volume 17- A Reference Work on Scientific Basic initiated by the Swedish Arts Council]
Bokförlaget Bra Böcker, Höganäs 1995.

Nettel, Reginald.
The Orchestra in England, A Social History
Jonathan Cape, London 1946.

NOMUS Catalogue 94-95, Addresses of authorities, institutions, organizations etc. n the are of Nordic and Baltic music, published by the Nordic Music Committee (NOMUS) in collaboration with the national Music Information Centres (MIC) and the Nordic Information Offices in the Baltic countries, Stockholm1995.

NOMUS Catalogue 95-96, Addresses of authorities, institutions, organizations etc. n the are of Nordic and Baltic music, published by the Nordic Music Committee (NOMUS) in collaboration with the national Music Information Centres (MIC) and the Nordic Information Offices in the Baltic countries, Stockholm 1996.

Nordal, Jóhannes and Kristinsson, Valdimar (editors).
Iceland - The Republic handbook
The Central Bank of Iceland, Reykjavík 1996.

Norden, Folk och länder [The North, People and Countries]
Time-Life Books/Bokorama [Stockholm] 1989.

Nordic Democracy - Ideas, Issues, and Institutions in Politics, Economy, Education, Social and Cultural Affairs of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden - Editorial Board: Erik Allardt, Nils Andrén, Erik J. Friis, Gylfi Þ. Gíslason, Sten Sparre Nilson, Henry Valen, Frantz Wendt, Folmer Wisti, published by Det danske Selskab, Copenhagen 1981.

Norges Bank (Central Bank of Norway), World Wide Web Pages (July 1997): Terminkurser månedlige [Monthly Rates of Exchange]; http://www. norges-bank.no/stat/terminkurser/kurs_mtn.html

Norlind, Tobias and Trobäck, Emil.
Kungl. hovkapellets historia 1526-1926, Minnesskrift av Tobias Norlind och Emil Trobäck [The Royal Swedish Orchestra's History 1526-1926 by Tobias Norlind and Emil Trobäck]
Wahlström & Widestrand, Stockholm 1926.

Norrköping Symphony Orchestra/Symfoniorkestern Norrköping (S).
Annual Report 1994-95/Verksamhetsberättelse 1994-95

Norsk Kulturråd, Norsk Kulturfond 1995
[Norwegian Arts Council, Norwegian Cultural Fond 1995](brochure),
Oslo January 1995

Norton, R.
How the land lies *Guardian,* p. 16, 7 February 1986.

NOU - Norges Offentlige Utredninger - 1979:3 - Symfoniorkester
[NOU - Norwegian Public Investigations - 1979:3 - Symphony Orchestras]

Nousiainen, Jaakko.
The Finnish Political System, translated by John H. Hodgson
Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971.

Nue Møller, Jørgen.
Den kommunale forvaltning (in *Den offentlige forvaltning i Denmark (Nyt fra samfundsvidenskaberna nr. 33)* editor Nue Møller, Jørgen)[The Municipal Administration (in*The Public Administration in Denmark (News From the Social Sciences No. 33)* editor Nue Møller, Jørgen)]
Copenhagen 1973.

Ny kulturpolitik, Nuläge och förslag, (Kulturrådet) Statens offentliga utredningar 1972:66, Utbildningsdepartimentet, Stockholm 1972 [*New Cultural Policy, Present State and Proposals,* (The Swedish Arts Council) The Swedish State's Official Investigations 1972:66, Department of Education, Stockholm 1972]

Odense Symphony Orchestra/Odense Symfoniorkester (DK).
Accounts 1995/Regnskab 1995

Öhrström, Eva.
En orkester i omvandling, om Helsingborgs Symfoniorkester speläret 1979/77 - Göteborgs Universitet, Musikvetenskapliga institutionen, 60-poängsuppsats Ht 1978 (unpublished thesis) Gothenburg 1978.

O'Malley, Tom.
Closedown? The BBC and Government Broadcasting Policy 1979-92
Pluto Press, London and Boulder, CO, 1994.

Olsen, Johan P.
Organized Democracy; Political Institution in a Welfare State - the Case of Norway
Scandinavian University Press, Oslo 1983.

Osland, Lidvin M. and Mangset, Per.
Norwegian Cultural Policy, Characteristics and Trends
Norsk kulturråd [Norwegian Arts Council], Oslo 1995.

Oslo Filharmonien 75 år: jubileumsårbok 1919-1994 [The Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra 75 years: a Jubilee Year Book 1919-1994]
Oslo: Filharmonisk selskap 1994.

Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra/Oslo Filharmonien (N).
The Oslo Philharmonic's Annual Accounts 1995/
Oslo-Filharmoniens Årsberetning 1995

Pálsson, Hrafn (editor).
FÍH 50 ára [Icel. Mus.Union - 50th anniversary]
Icelandic Muscians' Union, Reykjavík1982.

"(The) Peacock Report" *A Report on Orchestral Resources in Great Britain* 1970
The Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1970.

Pearton, Maurice. *T*
The LSO at 70 - A history of the orchestra
Victor Gollacz Ltd., London 1974.

Pedersen, Anne and Solvang, Helle.
Dansk Musikpolitik (skriftserie "Kulturens politik" nr. 10)
[Danish Music Policy (series "The Politics of Culture" no. 10)]
Nordisk Kultur Institut/KLIM, [Copenhagen]1994.

Petersen, Niels.
Oversigt over centraladministrationens udvikling siden 1848 (in *Den offentlige forvaltning i Denmark (Nyt fra samfundsvidenskaberna nr. 33)* editor Nue Møller, Jørgen) [An overview of the development of central government administraion since 1848 (in*The Public Administration in Denmark (News From the Social Sciences No. 33)* editor Nue Møller, Jørgen)]
Copenhagen 1973.

Pettitt, Stephen J.
Philharmonia Orchestra - A Record of Achievement 1945-1985
Robert Hale, London 1985.

Pick, John.
Off Gorky Street
City Arts (no year given).

Pick, John (with contributions from Razak Ajala and Malcolm Hey Anderton).
The Arts in a State, A Study of Government Arts Policies From ancient Greece to the Present
Bristol Classical Press, 1988.

"(The) Ponsonby Report" *Working party on the four London orchestras*
The Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1987.

Puntila, L.A.
The Political History of Finland 1809-1966 translated by David Miller (original title: Suomen poliittinen historia 1809-1966)
The Otave Publishing Co., Helsinki 1974.

Quinn, S. and Belson, W.A.
The effects of reversing the order of presentation of verbal rating scales in survey interviews
Survey Research Centre, London 1969.

Radio Orchestra Policy, A report on the meeting, Geneva, 5-6 November 1992
European Broadcasting Union, Grand-Saconnex, Switzerland, 1992.

Rapport från Statens Kulturråd 1994:2, bilaga, Stockholmsmusiken och Länsmusiken i Blekinge. En komplettering till Kulturrådets utvärdering av länsmusiken *"Musik för miljoner"* [A Report from the Swedish Arts Council 1994:2, an appendix to the Swedish Arts Council's acessment of the county music *"Music for Millions"*]

Regeringens proposition: 1991/92:100, bilaga 12, Kulturdepartimentet Riksdagen 1991-1992 1 saml. Nr. 100. Bilaga 12 ,Stockholm 1991. [*The Government's Proposal (Bill): 1991/92:100, attachment 12, Department of Culture* Swedish Parliament 1991-1992 1st collection No. 100. Attachment 12, Stockholm 1991.]

Regional Musikpolitik, Kulturrådets rapport 1981:6 (*Regional Music Policy*, Swedish Arts Council Report 1981:6)
ISBN 91-38-72476-6

Regionala Musikstiftelser, Verksamheten 1990
[*Regional Music Foundations, Activites 1990]*
Statens Kulturråd [Swedish Arts Council], October 1991.

Regionalt samspel. Hur skall vi forma en regional musikpolitik [Regional co-operation. How shall we design a regional music policy]
Topper, Enflo/Statens kulturråd [Swedish Arts Council] 1979.

Reitan, Lorentz and Storaas, Reidar (editors).
Spill orkester, spill! Bergen Filharmoniska Orkester, Musikselskabet "Harmonien" 225 år, Bergen 1990 [Play Orchestra, Play! Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra, The Music Society "Harmonien" 225 Years Old, Bergen 1990]
Bergen: John Griegs Forlag 1990.

Ridgeway, Christopher
The Training of Orchestral Musicians in Britain from age 16 to 25
Doctoral thesis under process, City University, Department of Arts Policy and Management, London, submission due late 1997 early 1998.

Rikskonsertene - NorConcert - The Largest Distributor of Live Music in Norway
brochure, Oslo 1994.

Ritterman, Janet.
BBC/Arts Council of England, National Review of Orchestral Provision, Report of the Consultations, April 1995.

Rohde, Henning.
Om kulturministeriets oprettelse - og lidt om de første år
[About the Ministry of Culture - and a little about the first years]
Udgived i anleding af Kulturministeriets 35-års jubilæum
[Published in conjunction with the Ministry of Culture's 35 anniversary]
Kulturministeriet [Ministry of Culture], Copenhagen 1996.

Robinson, John P.
Arts Participation in America: 1982-1992
Washington, D.C.: Seven Locks Press, 1993.

Robinson, Joseph.
Players and Proselytes: Take Your Oboist to Lunch
in *Symphony* 38 (1): p. 8-11, 1987.

Rockefeller Foundation.
The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects
New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1965.

Rothschild, Agnes.
Den svenska symfoniorkesterns framväxt
[The Development of Swedish Symphony Orchestras] (unpublished thesis)
Musikvetenskapliga instituionen. Stockholms Universitet 1995.

Royal Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra (Stockholm Concert House Foundation)/Stockholms Konserthusstiftelse (S).
Annual Accounts 1994-95/Årsredovisning 1994-95

Schuman, Howard and Presser, Stanley.
Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys — Experiments on Question Form, Wording, andContext (A volume of: *Quantitative Studies in Social Relations*)
Academic Press, New York 1981.

Schuster, J.M.D.
The Performance of Performance Indicators (In the Arts)
Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-Operation of the Council of Europe, 1992.

Schuster, J.M.D.
Funding the Arts and Culture Through Dedicated State Lotteries: The Twin Issues of Additionality and Substitution in *The European Journal of Cultural Policy* 1 (1): p. 21-41,1994 (a).

Schuster, J.M.D.
Funding the Arts and Culture Through Dedicated State Lotteries: Opening the Way For Alternative Decisionmaking and Funding Structures in *The European Journal of Cultural Policy* 1 (2): p. 329-354, 1994 (b).

Siltanen, Elina
The Development of Educational Programmes of Four British Orchestras
unpublished M.A. thesis in Arts Administration, City University, Department of Arts Policy and Management, London 1991.

Sinclair, Andrew.
Arts and Cultures -
The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain
Sinclair-Stevenson, London 1995.

Skare, Leif H. (editor).
Forvaltningen i samfunet; En bok om byråkrati og demokrati, planlegging og effektivitet [Public Administration in Society; A Book on Bureaucracy and Democracy, Palnning and Efficiency]
Forlaget Tanum-Norli, Oslo 1984.

Southern Jutland Symphony Orchestra/Sønderjyllands Symfoniorkester (DK)
Accounts for the Year 1995/Regnskab for året 1995

Statistical Yearbook of Iceland 1995 (Landshagir 1995)
Statistics Iceland, Reykjavik 1995.

Statistical Yearbook of Iceland 1996 (Landshagir 1996)
Statistics Iceland, Reykjavik 1996.

Statsrådets kulturpolitiska redogörelse till riksdagen 1993
[The Cabinet's Report of Cultural Policies to Parliament 1993]
Helsinki 1993.

Stavanger Symphony Orchestra/Stavanger Symfoniorkester (N).
Annual Report and Accounts 1995/Årsberetning og regnskap 1995

Stortings proposition nr. 1 (1995-96), for budsjetterminen 1996 - Kulturdepartementet (Kap. 300-398, 3300-3390), Tilråding frå Kulturdepartementet av 15. september 1995, godkjend i statsråd same dagen, Oslo 1995. [Norwegian Parliamentary Bill No. 1 (1995-96), for the fiscal year 1996 - The Royal Ministry of Culture (Kap. 300-398,3300-3390), Proposal from the Royal Minstry of Culture dated 15 September 1995, accepted in cabinet the same day, Oslo 1995.]

Street, Sean and Carpenter, Ray. *T*
he Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra - A Centenary Celebration
Dovecote Press, Stanbridge Wimborne, Dorset 1993.

Suchman, Edward A. and McCandless, Boyd,
Who Answers Questionnaires?
in *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol. 24, o. 6, pp. 758-767, December 1940.

Suchman, Edward A. and McCandless, Boyd.
Who Answers Questionnaires?
Journal of the American Statistical Association, vol. 42, no. 240, pp. 497-511, December, 1947.

Sudman, Seymour and Bradburn, Norman M.
Asking Questions - A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design
Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco 1982.

Suomen Laki II [The Laws of Finland II] (editors Erkki Onikki and Hannu Ranta)
Helsinki 1995.

Suomen sinfoniaorkesterit ry *Toimintakertomus, Tietoja Jäsenorkestereista Kalenterivuodelta 1995*
[Association of Finnish Orchestras *Annual Report, Information on Member Orchestras, for the Calendar Year 1995*]

Sveriges Radios Symfoniorkester - P2:s konsertsäsong 1995-1996 [Swedish Radio Channel 2 Season Programme], Stockholm 1995.

Swedish Musicians Professional Union (SYMF) and Theatre Association's (TR)
Collective Wage Agreement 1995-1998 [SYMF och TR Kollektivavtal 1995-1998]

Symfonierna och samhället, Översyn rörande de samhällstödda symfoniorkestrarnas situation m.m. [The Symphony Orchestras and Society, An overview concerning the situation of the publicly supported symphony orchestras, and more]
Utbildningsdepartimentet Ds 1989:46 [Swedish Department of Education, Departmental Investigation (Ds) 1989:46]

Symfoniorkestern i Finland 200 år, Finlands symfoniorkestrar R.F. 25 år; Finlands Symfoniorkestrar r.f:s festpublikation - Suomalainen sinfoniaorkesteri 200 vuotta, Suomen Sinfoniaorkesterit ry. 25 vuotta [*The Symphony Orchestra in Finland 200th anniversary, Association of Finnish Orchestras 25th anniversary* a Jubilee Publication) Suomen Sinfoniaorkesterit ry:n juhlajulkaisu, 1990. [Association of Finnish Orchestras, December 1990].

Teater, dans och musik, Rersultatanalys, Bilaga 1:1 till Statens kulturråds fördjupande anslagsframställning för perioden 1993/94-1995/96 [Theatre, Dance and Music, Result Analysis, Attachment 1:1 to the Swedish Art Council's in Depth Grant Prensentaion for the Period 1993/94-1995/96]
Statens kulturråd [Swedish Arts Council], Stockholm 1992.

"(The) Tooley Report" *Advisory Panel on Orchestral Residency 1989/90*
The South Bank Board, London 1989/90.

Törnblom, Rune.
Offentlig förvaltning [Public Administration]
CE Frites AB, Stockholm 1993.

Trondheim Symfoniorkester, sesong program 1995/96
[Trodheim Symphony Orchestras, Programme for the Season 1995/96]
Trondheim 1995.

Trondheim Symphony Orchestra/Trondheim Symfoniorkester (N).
Annual Accounts 1995/Årsmelding 1995

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Planning Notes for 1970 Decennial Census," no. 1, p. 2, Mar. 17, 1966.

Ut med musiken, Slutrapport från centrala musikkommittén om musiklivets regionalisering, SOU 1988:51 [*Out with the music!*, Final report of the central music committee on the regionalization of musical life, The Swedish State's Official Investigations 1988:51]

Vagn-Hansen, C.A. (editor).
Sønderjyllands Symfoniorkester 1963-1988
[The Southen Jutland Symphony Orchestra 1963-1988]
Sønderjyllands Symfoniorkester, Sønderborg 1988.

Vestergaard, Mogens (editor).
Fra Byorkester til Symfoniorkester, Odense Symfoniorkester 1946-1996 [From Town Orchestra to Symphony Orchestra, The Odense Symphony Orchestra 1946-1996]
Odense Symfoniorkester, 1996.

Viborg, Brynjar.
Um fjárveitingar alþingis til skálda og listamanna fram til ársins 1915
(unpublished BA thesis) Reykjavík May 1973.

Walin, Stig.
Svensk Musikhistoria, en översikt av Stig Walin, Studentföreningens Verdandis småskrifter, N:r 504 [Swedish Music History, an overview by Stig Walin, The Student Society Verdandi's booklets, No. 504]
Albert Bonniers Förlag, Stockholm, 1949.

Wallin, Nils L.
Har vi råd med symfoniorkestrar? Symfoniorkestern i det moderna systemsamhället, (Kungl. Musikaliska akademiens skriftserie nr 15) [Can we afford symphony orchestras? The symphony orchestra in the modern system's society (Royal Swedish Music Academy's series no. 15]
Sohlmans Förlag, Motala 1977.

Wenzel Andreasen, Mogens.
Kongens musikanter, Det kongelige Kapels koncerter 1883-1983
[The King's Musicians, The Royal Danish Orchestra's Concerts 1883-1983]
Gyldendal, Copenhagen 1983.

Wyszomirski, Margaret I.
Philanthropy, the Arts and Public Policy
in *The Journal of Arts Management and Law* 16 (4): p. 5-29, 1987.

(The) Wolf Organization.
The Financial Condition of Symphony Orchestras
Washington, DC: American Symphony Orchestra League, 1992.

Ylikangas, Heikki.
Vägen till Tammerfors, Striden mellan röda och vita i finska inbördeskriget 1918
[The Road to Tampere, The war between the red and the white in the Finnish Civil War 1918]
Atlantis, Stockholm 1995.

Zolberg, Vera L.
Displayed Art and Peformed Music:
Selective Innovation and the Structure of Artistic Media
in *Sociological Quarterly* 21(2): 219-231, 1980.