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Introduction

The Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research in Oslo and the Center for research on cultural policy at the College in Borås, Sweden, are engaged in a research project with the aim to evaluate the Foundation culture of the future in Sweden. Researchers on the project are Bergljot Baklien (project leader), Line Nyhagen Predelli and Mikael Franzén. The evaluation will be undertaken in a two-year period, from February 1999 until March 2001. This paper presents an attempt to focus the analysis in a broad theoretical context within the field of cultural policy, and its status is that of ”work in progress.”

A brief presentation of the Foundation culture of the future

The Foundation culture of the future was established by the Swedish parliament in 1994. The Foundation was given a starting capital of 529 million Swedish kroners which came from the closed down, state-run ”employees fund.” The main goal of the Foundation is to «during at least ten years give economic support to long-term and creative cultural projects. The support shall stimulate regional cultural life in its widest meaning and support growth and development».

The Foundation is to support high quality cultural projects, give priority to projects that are creative and projects that give depth and variation in local cultural life, contribute to growth and development in regions, and to support projects that involve youth and immigrant groups.

The board of the Foundation consists of five individuals appointed by the Government. The Foundation’s main office is in Uppsala, where four individuals are responsible for its daily operations. Contributions to cultural projects are given roughly once a year. In order to support its decision-making in regard to project awards, the Foundation uses external quality evaluators for the evaluation of applications. Quality evaluations are done by state offices such as the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, the National Archives of Sweden, the National Heritage Board, The Arts Grants Committee, and by an ad hoc group of experts in various cultural fields appointed by the Foundation. The Foundation also co-operates with the Swedish National Board for Youth Affairs. The Foundation has given priority to a select number of programming areas, such as the development of already established cultural institutions, conditions for youth, methods in project-oriented work, industrial design and students graduating from art colleges.

1 The author wishes to thank Bergljot Baklien for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
2 Årsredovisning 94/95.1, Stiftelsen framtidens kultur. See also Regeringsbeslut 65, Kulturdepartementet, 23.06.1994.
3 ”Riktlinjer för bidragsgivning från Stiftelsen framtidens kultur, gäller fr.o.m. 1 januari 1998”.
4 ”Kulturrådet, Riksarkivet, Riksantikvarieämbetet, Konstnärsnämnden.”
5 ”Ungdomsstyrelsen.”
The Foundation culture of the future in the Swedish context of cultural policy

The Foundation culture of the future has been given a political task from the Swedish parliament and government. The Foundation has to meet expectations from the national political level, from cultural performers, and from regional and local governments. The evaluation of the Foundation must therefore include relations with the state and the national context of cultural politics, and relations with actors and projects seeking monetary support from the Foundation.

After the closing of the state-supported Swedish employees’ collective funds in the early 90s, the funds were transferred to a range of new research foundations. In 1994, the non-socialist government transferred some of the remaining funds to a new cultural policy foundation. It was the non-socialist government’s intention that the foundation should have a relatively independent position within the field of cultural policy, in the sense that there was to be an arm’s length between the state and the foundation. Later on, social-democratic governments have tried to achieve a higher degree of state control of the Foundation and its operations. This has been done through relatively frequent changes of the Foundation’s board, and through the request that the Foundation delegate decision-making power to various state authorities.  

In its first year of operation, the Foundation was the focus of intense media attention. Since its establishment in 1994, and especially during the first years of its operation, the Foundation has been the focus of political conflict within the national political context. Even if the Foundation has and runs its own economy, independent from state budgets, it is not entirely independent from the state. The board of the Foundation is appointed by the government, and the Foundation is tied to public authorities through its political assignment. On the other hand, the Foundation is not a regular part of state administration in the field of cultural policy. The political choice of a state foundation as a suitable organizational form in the cultural field is a relevant question to be looked at in our evaluation. In the Swedish context, it is not uncommon to chose the foundation as an appropriate organizational form within cultural policy. What is uncommon, however, is to design a wealthy state foundation, with its own independent economy and investments, that is to function within a limited time periods of ten years. In short, the state has created a foundation that is not dependent on yearly fluctuations in state budget allowances. An interesting research question in this regard is whether and how the choice of the foundation as an organizational form in this particular instance has an impact on the content of the cultural policy produced as an outcome of the Foundation’s operations. The evaluation of the foundation must also be seen in relation to the more general Swedish political debate on foundations as a relevant organizational form within state government.

Main research questions

The main thesis of the evaluation project is that the Foundation culture of the future functions within a field of tension between different models and ideologies of cultural policy, and that this field of tension produces some of the conditions under which the Foundation has to operate. Since the 1970s, Scandinavian cultural policy has relied heavily on a model where the state supports art and culture through a ministry of culture, and cultural policy has
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6 See letter from the then minister of culture Margot Wallström to the board of Stiftelsen framtidens kultur, Dnr Ku94/4611/K.
traditionally been a part of general welfare policy (Vestheim 1995). Although highlighting the need for quality and professionalism, this model gives priority to what is perceived as “the needs of society.” With the establishment of the Foundation culture of the future, we see what we believe is a new phenomenon in Scandinavian cultural policy: an independent foundation, controlling its own budget, giving out contributions to cultural projects based on expert evaluations of quality and creativity. The establishment of the Foundation is in itself an implementation of the arm’s length principle between the state and the arts and culture. We believe that the processes and developments that characterize the Foundation on its way to become an established institution within the cultural field can be understood in terms of conflicts between different models for state cultural policy. One of the questions we seek to answer is the degree to which the actual content of the Foundation’s cultural policy is influenced by conflicts between different models of state cultural policy.

A related question concerns the degree to which the Foundation culture of the future has been institutionalized as part of state cultural policy, or the degree to which the Foundation has been institutionalized as an independent organization, with a clear identity and a clear purpose that can be recognized as different from mainstream governmental cultural policy (Perrow 1986:168). An organization is institutionalized when its values coincide with the values that dominate in its environments, or when an organization is impregnated with values and goals that are in opposition to the dominating societal values (ibid.). The point is that institutionalization means that a set of values and norms are permeating a given organization, and that the organization acts on the basis of these values and norms. When the values and goals of an organization correspond to the dominating political paradigm, it is likely that the organization will achieve a greater degree of legitimacy among established political authorities. When the values and goals of an organization correspond with the values and goals of its environment, the organization has a greater chance at securing resources, access to political channels, and influence and power. When the values and goals of an organization are in an oppositional relationship to the dominating political paradigm, it is likely to achieve a lesser degree of legitimacy among established political authorities. In this situation, on the other hand, there can be other segments of society that will grant the organization legitimacy. Here we are first and foremost thinking of segments that cannot be reckoned as part of the prevailing political regime. An organization can also achieve power and influence through such alternative channels. We can think of a situation where an organization has a strong basis of legitimacy outside the current political authorities, and where the state and society in turn are influenced in the direction of adapting their own values and goals to these alternative bases of power (ibid.:173).

The Foundation Culture of the Future is not only a relatively new organization within the field of cultural policy. It is also an organization that depends on a conflictual and controversial economic source, as it has been established on the basis of financial means transferred from previous employees’ funds. A relevant question is therefore whether the process of institutionalization in this case has been influenced by the nature of its economic source; a source which is, or at least has been, highly conflictual in Swedish society. The state’s desire to control the Foundation’s operations can also be related to the economic sources on which the Foundation’s operations are based.

The Foundation must be seen in relation to other actors within the field of cultural policy. To what degree and with what success is the state seeking control of the Foundation’s operations? To what degree and with what success is the Foundation seeking to operate on an independent basis? What are the similarities and differences that exist between the work of
the Foundation and that of the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs? The Foundation has chosen to use both governmental offices and individual artists and cultural performers in its evaluation of incoming applications for economic support. The relationship between government offices as quality controllers and the more independent experts in the ad hoc group of quality controllers is probably of central importance to the question of legitimacy. It seems particularly important for the Foundation to create a balance between these forms of quality evaluation, both in order to avoid a too tight coupling to other governmental authorities, and in order to meet possible criticism concerning a lack of creative thinking (the Foundation itself argues that the ad hoc group presents creativity and new thinking more than does the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs). It is also a point that the Foundation does not only use non-governmental expertise. If it were so, the Foundation could easily be charged with a lack of legitimacy by the state, and it would have been without what can be conceived as valuable experience and knowledge held by state cultural authorities. How has this attempt at creating a balance between state expertise and the independent expertise developed over time?

Another important question concerns the criteria for quality evaluation that is being used by different quality controllers. In principle, the Foundation’s guidelines are the basis of quality evaluation. It could however be that different controllers are actually using different criteria, and that they are thereby emphasizing different goals formulated by the Foundation. It is interesting to look at how different actors among the ad hoc group and state authorities are actually interpreting the guidelines of the Foundation. Among other things, we will evaluate the degree to which professional quality evaluations and/or political evaluations and priorities form the basis of the Foundations profile as it is expressed in its actual contributions to various cultural projects.

Evaluation of public policy

Many evaluations have a controlling motive, and seek to control whether a particular activity actually fulfills the goals that have been formulated for its operations (Vestheim 1998).

This kind of evaluation is often coupled with expectations about measurements of the actual effects of the economic performances of a particular activity. Legitimation is another motive in evaluations, and evaluations can be performed with the goal that a given activity or a given political decision should achieve legitimacy in its environment (Baklien 1985). Another motive can be to achieve sufficient knowledge in order to make new decisions and to develop a given activity. In our evaluation, the motives of developing a basis of knowledge of cultural policy and spreading information are central. We intend to develop new knowledge by doing a critical investigation based on scientific methods and theories, and we intend to impart the results of our evaluation to the cultural sector and to the general public. Our evaluation also has a decision-making motive, by seeking to provide a basis of knowledge for future political decision-making.

As in other evaluations of cultural policy (for example, in NIBR’s projects "Mosaic" and "Culture is Healthy"), we want to promote an approach based on dialogue. Experience shows that such an approach is important in order to produce an evaluation which has a "close fit" with the project under evaluation (Baklien and Solberg 1997). The dialogue constitutes a source of data for the project, a continuous correction of our evaluative stands, and a feedback mechanism for results. A central goal of our evaluation research is that it should lead to
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7 In this paragraph I rely heavily on Vestheim (1998), Plan for evaluering av verksemda til Framtidens kultur.
recognition: recognition in the sense that one recognizes more than what one already knew (Gadamer 1997).

There are different traditions and models in evaluative research. The two most common types of evaluation of public policy are process evaluations and result/outcome evaluations (Kjellberg and Reitan 1995). In outcome evaluations, the concern is with the effects and consequences of a particular operation. In short, outcome evaluation discusses whether a specific policy initiative works well or poorly (Baklien 1993:267). In process evaluations, on the other hand, the concern is with “those processes that characterize the implementation of an initiative, without necessarily evaluating the entire decision-making process and evaluating the final result” (Kjellberg and Reitan 1995:133). In short, we may say that process evaluation concerns “why things turn out as they do” (Baklien 1993:267). Our evaluation will include elements from both of these approaches to evaluation.

Process- and outcome evaluations can in turn be based on various models. Such models often emphasize only one dimension: either goal attainment or effects. All models of evaluation have different strengths and weaknesses, and a combination of various models is often recommended for a particular evaluation project (Vedung 1991:66). The overarching framework in our evaluation is to look at politics, decision-making, organizational development and institutionalization relevant to the Foundation culture of the future as constituting processes. Within this framework, we intend to study the Foundation’s actors, goals, processes and results, and the national politics that concern the Foundation’s operations.

Politics as process

The establishment of the Foundation culture of the future was based on a political decision made by the government and parliament in Sweden. Within a process-oriented approach to politics, politics can be defined as social constructions of different approaches to problems and solutions, forwarded by different actors with different motives and in different positions of power, in an attempt to make binding decisions (see also Jacobsen 1964:45). This definition of the concept of politics is useful in order to emphasize that politics imply certain ways of describing and evaluating reality, and that political processes consist of struggles or conflicts between the ways in which various actors describe and evaluate reality. Different actors tend to prescribe different solutions to problems. In such processes, one or more actors tend to be able to execute power over other actors, in that their description of reality tends to be used as a basis for decision-making (see Berger and Luckmann 1966:116-117).

The relationship between state control and the Foundation’s independence has been a central cultural policy question since the establishment of the Foundation. This question is also central to our evaluation, because it signifies the space within which the Foundation has potential freedom to act. During the course of a four-year period, the government has changed the members of the Foundation’s board three times, while the regular working period for appointed board members is four years. Political conflicts and disagreements concerning the Foundation’s operations have been influenced by its conflictual economic source. We believe it is important to have a process-oriented perspective on the relationship between structural constraints and institutional and organizational freedom. The government that established the Foundation in 1994, seems to have wanted a relatively large degree of freedom and

---

* This and other translations from the Norwegian, the Swedish and the Danish are mine.
independence for the Foundation, and its intention was that the arm’s length principle between the state and the Foundation was to be implemented. Later governments, however, seem to have attempted to find different ways in which to increase state control of the Foundation. In addition to investigating the state’s policy towards the Foundation, we want to study how the Foundation has actually responded to shifting state policies and to shifting political contexts. To what degree has the state’s attempt to control the Foundation had effects or implications for the Foundation’s day-to-day operations? To what degree have conflicts and disagreements between political parties had any impact on the Foundation’s operations? Among other things, we want to describe the views that exist among different political parties in regard to the Foundation’s existence and operations.

The general theme for our evaluation is policy formulation and implementation within the cultural sector. The cultural sector consists of political and administrative bodies at various management levels, of different public and private organizations, and of groups and individuals. The various actors in the sector seek to influence cultural policy in the direction they think best. Political sectors are continually changing, and actors within a given sector can have different «values, foci of interests and perceptions of causal connections» (Jansen 1989:17). In our study we are evaluating a singular organization within the cultural sector: The Foundation culture of the future. Because this organization operates within a larger political and organizational environment, it is necessary to include other relevant actors within the cultural sector in our analysis.

Participants or actors in the political process can be individuals, groups, organizations and institutions. The actors operate within established but changeable structures, and structural conditions put constraints on what actors can do. On the other hand, the actors have «a certain autonomy and ‘can act differently’» (Jansen 1989:12; see also Alexander 1989:85 and Dawe 1978:366). It is precisely the interplay between structural conditions and the actors’ autonomy or freedom that produce a certain political outcome. At times there are few structural constraints, and a relatively large degree of freedom to design and implement a certain policy. At other times, structural constraints put up hindrances to active policy design and implementation.

Who are the central actors in regard to the Foundation’s operations? We know that the Foundation’s head office and board, the ad hoc group for quality evaluations, the Ministry of Culture, the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs and cultural politicians at the national level are important to the Foundation’s operations. Other important state actors are The National Archives of Sweden, the National Heritage Board, The Arts Grants Committee and The Swedish National Board for Youth Affairs. In addition, various individuals have particular responsibilities concerning the development of the Foundation’s program areas, such as the renewal of established cultural institutions, conditions for youth, questions of immigration and integration, and the development of project-related team work. The evaluation project seeks to establish a dialogue with all these actors, and with other relevant actors that are important to the Foundation’s decision-making and operations. An interesting question concerns the degree to which the stability or change of relevant actors has implications for the Foundation’s operations. While for example the members of the board have been changed several times, the employees at the head office have been the same since the Foundation was established. We will of course take a closer look at those who are the actual “users” of the Foundation. A survey documenting the experiences and attitudes of those who have applied for funding from the Foundation is well under way. The survey
includes both projects that have actually been granted monetary support and project applications which have been denied support.

In order to describe and analyze the various concepts of culture and models of cultural policy used by different actors, we will look at the goals and policies formulated by political parties represented in parliament and in government. Through the analysis of state and party documents, and through interviews, we will be able to analyze the various positions that exist concerning the role of the Foundation in Swedish cultural policy. We wish to highlight the degree of politicization of the context in which the Foundation is embedded, and to describe eventual conflicts of interest between various actors.

We also intend to evaluate the degree to which the Foundation’s actual operations correspond to the goals that have been formulated for its operations. The analysis of goals is an important part of our evaluation, and relevant questions are: Have the goals undergone changes, and if so, why and how have they changed? How are the goals interpreted by various actors? How are program areas chosen, and why have certain areas been given priority (such as youth, immigrants and integration, established cultural institutions, and so on)? Is there a contradictory relationship between various goals, such as between cultural quality and culture as an instrument to achieve other goals, or between creative cultural projects and established cultural institutions? How has the Foundation chosen to work with these types of contradictions between various goals? Evaluations of the Foundation’s degree of goal attainment is likely to vary across the range of actors involved in its operations. It is quite common that actors (such as politicians, organizations and institutions) have broad and also unclear goals (March and Olsen 1979:12). Because of such unclear or even non-declared goals, it can be difficult to evaluate actual operations in relation to the goals that have been announced. Moreover, goals often change during the course of action. We therefore must supplement the goal-focused model of evaluation with other perspectives.

On what concept(s) of culture are the Foundation’s operations based? This question is important, because we presuppose that it has an impact on decisions concerning the kinds of cultural projects that are awarded support from the Foundation. As a starting point, the Foundation uses a "broad definition" of culture, and supports projects in many different spheres of arts and culture. At the same time, the Foundation requires all projects to be of a very high quality. On the one hand, we may say that the Foundation understands culture as an instrument (culture as promoting regional development, integration and participation). On the other hand, the Foundation understands culture as an activity that has a high value in and of itself (the quality of art and culture). The Foundation’s operations can be said to support several understandings of the concept of culture. In addition to supporting the planning, production and imparting of art and culture, the Foundation organizes seminars for a broader public within the cultural sector. The Foundation also gives support to selected groups, such as youth and immigrants.

The time perspective for the Foundation’s operation is closely connected with the formulation of its goals, and it is also a question that is relevant to the evaluation of the Foundation. The actual question is whether the Foundation is to function in a ten-year period, or whether it is to function in a longer time perspective. The actual size of the annual contributions given to cultural and art projects is of course dependent on the time frame in which the Foundation operates. The Foundation’s board has expressed the desire that the Foundation functions within a ten-year period, while the 1995 state report "Kulturutredningen" suggested the Foundation to be made permanent and contributions to be limited to the size of the profit on
capital investments (SOU 1995:84: 350). A minority of those who wrote the state report, however, expressed the desire that the Foundation should function within a ten-year period (ibid.: 571). So far there has been no formal change of course in relation to the Foundation’s duration, and today it operates within a ten-year framework. The Foundation’s board has however expressed the desire that the time perspective be included in the evaluation. We believe that although the evaluation can describe certain arguments in this debate, the evaluation should not in itself be required to give the final answer to this important question.

In addition to looking at goals, we will focus on internal political processes within the Foundation, and on relevant political processes in the Foundation’s environments. A process can be seen as a course of events where different and changing actors participate and produce conditions for policy design and policy outcome. Vedung (1991:160) emphasizes that process analysis «concentrates on the actual politics within their natural political, administrative and social context, and is implemented in close relation to both principals and potential users [of the analysis]...». … In a process-oriented approach, the historical background of politics, actual political decisions, implementation of political decisions, and relations to other programs, government offices, networks and environments are important perspectives (ibid.:165).

The outcome or results of political decision-making are also important: to what degree are actual operations a result of decision-making processes, negotiation processes and legitimation processes? In the analysis of results, it will be important to look at relations between the Foundation and those actors and projects that seek economic support from the Foundation. An analysis of accepted and refused applications will be included, along with the investigation of carefully selected projects (case-studies) that have received support. What are the main characteristics of projects that receive support? What does the geographical distribution of projects look like? What does the distribution of prioritized program areas look like, along with the distribution on different areas of culture (film, art, dance, information technology, et cetera)? Is there a contradictory relationship between the Foundation’s wish to support long-term projects and its wish to contribute financial support for a limited time only? Who are the actors that contribute additional support to projects that are only partly funded by the Foundation? To what degree has the Foundation been successful in supporting projects that are creative and ground-breaking? What does the Foundation mean by its concept of ground-breaking? How is the concept “groundbreaking” interpreted by various quality evaluators, and what are the effects if the understanding of the concept varies across different evaluators? What characterizes those applications that do not receive support from the Foundation, and what are the reasons for refusal? On this point, it could be useful to select and take a closer look at a number of projects that do not receive support. Among board documents, there are letters from projects that have been refused, and these letters often emphasize the existence of a lack of agreement between the Foundation’s guidelines and its actual decision-making. What is the relationship between the central/national and local/regional levels in the Foundation’s operations? What is the geographical distribution of
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“See protocol from board meeting 1, 1998.
10 The Foundation is also working on how to define and develop the concept of ”ground breaking” (“nyskapende”). Görel Elf, a member of the ad hoc group, has written a memo on this concept. A student from the Department of Cultural Studies at the University of Uppsala has gone through all applications reveived by the Foundation in order to see how applicants define ”nyskapende” (see Eva Skarp, ”Nyskapande i blickfånget: En utredning om begreppet nyskapande,” University of Uppsala, June 1999.)
supported projects on the regional level? Does Stockholm get a majority of the projects, and if so, what are the reasons?

Relations between actors, goals, processes and results are important. Reality is often more dynamic than what can be represented in a table. In sum, however, our approach to the evaluation of the Foundation Culture of the Future may be presented in the following way:

**Table 1. Politics as process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Actors</strong></th>
<th>Foundation, with board, head office and quality evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politicians/political parties and parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental offices in cultural sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants and those who receive support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Given goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear goals? Different interpretations of goals/guidelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contradictory goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>Decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build and develop operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal displacements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Actual operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of legitimacy among state and applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effects (such as regional effects, effects for integration and participation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our approach to evaluation in the cultural sector is primarily chosen on the basis of scientific evaluation criteria, and not on the basis of specific characteristics of cultural policy. We do however believe that the special characteristics of cultural policy must be emphasized in our evaluation. These characteristics concern what we might call the *content* of art and cultural policy, which in turn consists first and foremost of the critical and conservative functions of art and culture in society. On the one hand, art and culture may have a critical function by questioning the direction of society and politics. On the other hand, art and culture can have a conservative function by transmitting traditions and identity. In a representative democracy, the state’s cultural policy is likely to support both critical and conservative elements of art and culture. The state can use various mechanism in order to support these functions. An example is the principle of freedom of expression in the media. The freedom of artists and cultural producers can in turn function as a necessary condition in order to secure critical and conservative functions. In concrete terms, the establishment of a state foundation within the cultural sector can also be a possible means to secure such functions. In our evaluation, we want to emphasize the ways in which the Foundation is able to carve out a relatively independent role in relation to the state.
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11 In addition to conservative and critical functions, art can have a «diversive function», where art functions to misguide or to make time pass (Vestheim 1995:33; based on Möller Kristensen 1970).

12 Duelund (1994:58) gives the following explanation of the distinction between art and culture: «art in the narrow sense is about the aesthetic gestalt of experiences, emotions and fantasy, while culture is about the values that give meaning to everyday life, to traditions, interactions and ways to act that characterize different societies and population groups». Art relates to the humanistic concept of culture, while culture relates to the enlightenment, the sociological and the anthropological concepts of culture (see Duelund 1995:33). When I use the general concepts of culture or cultural policy in this paper, art is included.
Methods and data sources

The evaluation of the Foundation culture of the future must include different levels of analysis. The Foundation and its operations is of course the most important levels of analysis. This level includes a description and an analysis of the projects that seek and/or receive support from the Foundation, and it includes a study of relations between the Foundation and a select number of projects that receive support. The second level of analysis will include a description and analysis of the Foundation as part of public cultural policy, and it will include the Foundation’s relations to the state and the national context of cultural policy. Generally, we intend our study in large part to be based on conversations and dialogues with various participants relevant to the Foundation (such as decision-makers at the state level and applicants/receivers of support). We find it useful to combine qualitative and quantitative approaches in collecting the necessary data.

Level 1: The Foundation’s operations:
In regard to the Foundation’s actual operations, we will collect our own data and use data already collected by the Foundation itself. The Foundation’s data consist of a well-developed data base which includes all project applications. The Foundation also has a document archive. We will analyze memos from board meetings and strategy documents, and participate in board meetings, seminars and so on. In addition to a document analysis of project applications, we will run statistical analyses of data in the project data base. We will also interview individuals working in relation to the Foundation, including representatives of the board and the head office, the ad hoc group for quality evaluation, and project coordinators for the various program areas.

We will do our own survey (in the form of a post enquete) of applicants. This survey will produce useful data for the description and analysis of relations between the Foundation and the population it is intended to serve through monetary awards. The survey will also produce knowledge about those projects that actually receive support. On the basis of this survey and other acquired knowledge, we will select about 8 single projects for a closer study. These case-studies will mainly consist of in-depth interviews with project leaders. They will give more detailed knowledge about projects receiving support from the Foundation, the problems they might face, and relations between projects and the Foundation. Through these methods we seek to highlight the actors, goals, processes and results that can best describe the Foundation’s operations (see also table 1 and 2).

Level 2: The Foundation’s relations to state cultural policy:
We will collect data through document analysis of public reports (such as SOU 1995:84, “Kulturpolitikens inriktning” and SOU 1995:85, “Tjugo års kulturpolitik 1974-1994”), and of political party programs and newspaper clippings. In order to describe the field of political tension that provides the context for the Foundation’s operations, we will interview those who have been ministers of culture in the 90s. We will also interview politicians at the national level, and representatives of various public offices within the cultural sector, such as The Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, The National Archives of Sweden, The National Heritage Board and The Arts Grants Committee. Through these methods, we seek to describe those expectations and conditions that have been present at the state level in regard to the Foundation’s operations. We also seek to analyze relations between the Foundation and the broader context of cultural policy (see also table 1 and 3).
In evaluation projects, it is common that the principal, the researchers and the subject of evaluation actually are three different actors. In this particular evaluation project, however, the principal and the subject to be evaluated is one and the same actor. As researchers we depend upon openness in regard to internal organizational processes. We do not expect to face any such problems in regard to the Foundation culture of the future. We do however wish to emphasize that the research team will proceed on the basis of independence and scientific criteria.

**Concepts of culture**

Generally, it can be said that politics in representative democracies is run for the sake of politics itself, as democratic politics have value as a form of cooperation and decision-making. Often, however, politics have instrumental goals, which implies that politicians make decisions with a view to the distribution of benefits and burdens. Cultural policy also has such a double role: on the one hand, the state seeks to support culture for culture’s own sake, and on the other hand the state seeks to use culture as an instrument to achieve political goals that may be unrelated to the value of culture for its own sake. For example, cultural policies can have as a goal to achieve health or economic effects. Moreover, cultural policies can be implemented in order to achieve a higher degree of participant democracy, or simply in order to put people to work (employment as the main goal) (see Mangset 1992:49). Right now, NIBR is responsible for the evaluation of ”Culture is healthy,” a project sponsored by the Norwegian Cultural Council and the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs. In this project, the state and municipalities are implementing an instrumental view of culture in order to promote health among various groups of the population. NIBR is also evaluating “Mosaic,” another project financed by the Norwegian Cultural Council. The goal of ”Mosaic” is to develop relations between art and the multicultural society. “Mosaic” applies an instrumental view of culture in order to promote the participation of immigrants in art and cultural institutions. The political motivation behind cultural policies is often the result of a combination of views that value both culture for its own sake and culture as an instrument to achieve other policy goals.

The concept of *culture* is in itself unclear and complex: «Culture consists of ... a field of tension between the individual and the collective, between the socially determined and the autonomous, between the common and the group-specific, between the hierarchical and non-hierarchical, and between the evaluative and the descriptive» (Fink 1988:21). In our evaluation we are concerned with cultural policy. The actual content of cultural policy is dependent on the cultural concept that is being used by political decision-makers. A “narrow” concept of culture applies the concept of culture to professional art only, and supports the idea of culture for its own sake. A ”wide” concept of culture is on the other hand concerned with a broader area of cultural policy, which often includes art produced by both professionals and amateurs, and popular culture in its widest sense. Such a wide concept of culture can be concerned with both the value of culture for its own sake, and the value of culture as an instrument to reach other policy goals.
Peter Duelund (1995:33) has given the following illustration of possible relations between various cultural concepts and cultural policy:\footnote{My presentation of Duelund’s pyramid of culture is simplified and modified in comparison to his own presentation in Duelund 1995:33.}

The cultural concepts in this pyramid are value-oriented concepts, as they support different values. They are not mutually exclusive, and the "lower" concepts can consist of elements from the "higher" concepts. The humanistic concept of culture is the most narrow concept, and it emphasizes the production of quality art and culture. A relevant criticism would be that this concept is elitist. The enlightenment concept of culture is somewhat broader, and emphasizes the diffusion, information about and experience of culture. The enlightenment concept of culture is associated with the wish to develop a common identity and common societal values, but it is the imparting of art and culture that tends to be in focus. The sociological concept of culture emphasizes common values, attitudes, traditions and ways of living in a society or in a group (ibid.). The sociological concept of culture has as a goal to promote participant democracy, and focuses on cultural participation and activities. The anthropological concept of culture is the widest concept, and it emphasizes all aspects of life. In short, society is culture in the anthropological concept of culture.
In our evaluation, we intend to describe and analyze if and in what ways different actors make use of different concepts of culture in their descriptions of and prescriptions for cultural policy.

Models of state cultural policy

The two Canadian researchers Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey (1989) have developed a typology of various types of state cultural policy. The models developed in this typology are useful in order to understand development, change and variation in state cultural policy. The models are ideal types, or analytical tools, that can be used to evaluate reality. An ideal type is formed through the analytical accentuation of certain elements in reality in a consistent system of concepts (Weber 1949:91). In practice, the cultural policy of a given state tends to include elements from several models. Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey’s four ideal typical models for state cultural policy are the facilitator model, the patron model, the architect model and the engineer model. The facilitator model and the patron model may be associated with a humanistic concept of culture, because they emphasize multiplicity, creativity and quality in the production of art and culture. The architect model has more in common with the sociological and anthropological concepts of culture, as culture tends to be defined in a broader societal perspective. In the architect model and engineer model, culture tends to be used as a means or an instrument to achieve more general political goals in the areas of welfare and economy, while the quality and professionalism of art and culture tend to be less emphasized.

A. The facilitator model

When the state functions as a facilitator within the area of cultural policy, it does not give any direct support to art and culture. Instead, it "foregoes taxes" by making donations to art and culture tax deductible. The state’s goal is here to promote variety and creativity. The state does not itself formulate goals and standards of artistic quality, and leaves these questions to be decided by firms, foundations and individuals who give direct economic support to art and culture. A relevant critique of this model would be that it does not necessarily support quality. The model does not provide any guidelines concerning what might be important national responsibilities within art and culture. The facilitator model is most clearly expressed in the United States, where the state, among other things, promotes artistic production through a program of tax deductions.

B. The patron model

When the state functions as a patron within cultural policy, it supports art and culture through the so-called arm’s length principle. In this model, the state sets aside a certain amount of financial resources to art and culture, but arts councils generally decide which organizations and individuals should receive support. Even if the board of an arts council is appointed by the government, the intention is usually that the board should make its own decisions, based on independent evaluations. Independent arts councils are responsible for their own operations, and decisions are generally based on quality evaluations done by professional artists and cultural producers. Support is generally given on the basis of evaluations of artistic and cultural quality, and on evaluations of creativity. A possible critique of this model is that
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14 The models have been suggested by Harry Hilmann-Chartrand og Claire McCaughey (1989), and have been used by Vestheim (1995) and Duelund (1994). My presentation is mainly based on Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey.
it can function to promote artistic and cultural expressions from the elite, and that it favors an
elite audience. Moreover, it could be a problem that a politically appointed council can
operate as the prolonged arm of government, instead of as an independent council. The patron
model is most clearly expressed in Great Britain, where the state promotes art and culture
through «The Arts Council of Great Britain».

C. The architect model
When the state functions as an architect within cultural policy, it supports art and culture
through a specially designated ministry of culture. Actual decision-making concerning
support to art and cultural activities is done by bureaucrats on the basis of political guidelines.
As an architect, the state is interested in supporting art and culture as part of its general
welfare policy. Perceived societal needs tend to decide who and what gets support, while
quality and professionalism come second to these needs. A relevant critique of the architect
model is that it is instrumentally oriented, in that it gives priority to the importance of art and
culture to other policy areas rather than to art and culture for its own sake. In addition, the
architect model can lead to stagnation in relation to artistic and cultural creativity. The
Netherlands provide a typical example of the architect model. The cultural policies of the
Scandinavian countries are also to a large degree based on elements from the architectural
model. Vestheim (1995:48) has introduced two varieties of the architect model: the
decentralized and the centralized versions. France, with its direct governing of the regions by
a large, centralized state, provides an example of the centralized architect model.
Furthermore, Vestheim points to the Scandinavian countries (Norway, Sweden and Denmark)
as typical representatives of the decentralized architect model. In this version, the state has a
designated ministry of culture, and the state is first and foremost a “facilitator” for regional
policy formulations. The regional policy level generally makes its own cultural policy
decisions within the decentralized architect model (ibid.).

D. The engineer model
When the state functions as an engineer in cultural policy, the state itself owns all means of
production for artistic and cultural production. The state as an engineer only supports art and
culture that promotes the state’s political goals, and it is not concerned with other standards of
quality or with creativity. The state makes its own decisions concerning who and what should
receive support. The engineer model is characteristic of totalitarian regimes. A relevant
critique of the engineer model is that art and culture have lost their independent and critical
roles in society. In the period 1918 – 1932, the Soviet Union was an example of the state as
an engineer within the area of cultural policy.

These models of different state cultural policies can help us understand relevant processes
concerning the establishment and further development of the Foundation culture of the future.
Among other things, we would like to use these models to describe the processes of
institutionalization undergone by the Foundation on its way to become an established cultural
organization in Sweden. In many countries, there has been a trend from the state taking the
role of a patron within cultural policy towards the state taking on the role as an architect
(Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey 1989:65). Towards the end of the 90s it can be relevant
to ask whether this trend is now reversing or diminishing in importance.

At the time when the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs was established, the
intention was that it should to a certain degree function according to the patron model, or the
principle of an arm’s length between the state and the council. The distance between the state and the council was to be secured through a high degree of participation by organizations and cultural producers in the council (Kleberg 1987:183). At the same time, the council was to implement and develop the state’s cultural policy, as it was formulated by the parliament and government (ibid.:182). An investigation as to whether the cultural council functions according to this model is beyond the purpose of our evaluation. We do however wish to study if and the degree to which differences between these two models of cultural policy contribute in determining the operations of the Foundation culture of the future. The Foundation was established by the then conservative government with the intention that it should function according to the patron model. We will investigate the degree to which the Foundation actually works according to this model. At the outset, we have reason to believe that the Foundation’s operations are best described as a mix of the patron and the architect models, and that the Foundation works within a field of tensions between different models and ideologies of cultural policy.

Different levels of analysis

Our analysis will include actors and structures that partake in the Foundation’s operations. We are especially concerned with the processes in which actors and structures participate. In a sense the establishing processes go back all the way to the establishment of the employees’ funds. We must however take the history of the employee’s funds as a given, as our goal is not to study the development and closing of these funds. At any rate, we must use a historical approach in our evaluation, and it is therefore necessary to start our investigation at that point in time when the employees’ funds were closed down, and the national political level was concerned with how to use and distribute the money that came out of the funds. The debate concerning the closing and further use of the funds will therefore be a point of departure for our analysis of the societal context in which the Foundation culture of the future was established. Historical conditions may put limits on the Foundation’s ability to act, while at the same time providing opportunities for action. In addition to the Foundation’s relations to political processes at the national level, we will study internal processes within the Foundation that concern its development as an organization and an institution within Swedish cultural policy, and the internal processes that more directly relate to applicants and those who receive support for cultural projects.

When the Foundation culture of the future acts within the field of cultural policy, it acts on the basis of both formal and informal rules and norms. The Foundation is likely to act on the basis of conditions that were formulated in rules and guidelines at the time when the foundation was established, on the basis of expectations from its external environments, and on the basis of its own decision-making and development processes. Moreover, it is likely to act on the basis of more informal perceptions of reality, and on the basis of interpretations of rules and expectations. This gives us various possibilities in terms of how our evaluation can be structured. Firstly, we want to have a more “internal” perspective on how the Foundation works, in the sense that we will look at those actors who participate more directly in its day-to-day operations, the products and results produced by its operations, its organizational structure, decision-making processes, and ideologies represented through its operations. This “internal” perspective concerns the operations of the Foundation itself, and relations to applicants and those who receive project support. Secondly, we want to have a more ”external” perspective on the Foundation as a product of decision-making at the national or
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See for example «Att handlägga en badtvål», Göteborgs-Posten 21.05.97:44.
In this "external" perspective, we want to emphasize the structural, institutional and ideological relations in which the Foundation take part. We will look at actors at the national political level, at national debates about the establishment and development of the Foundation, the presence (or absence) of conditions put forward by the state concerning the choice of organizational structure, expectations (or lack of expectations) for its operations at the national political level, and various ideologies of cultural policy represented by political parties in the parliament. This "external" perspective concerns first and foremost the Foundation’s relations to state cultural policy.

The combination of these perspectives can be illustrated through the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. The Foundation’s operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. internally (head office, board, ad hoc group, program responsible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. applicants and those who receive support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. state level actors contributing conditions for operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product/result</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual project support profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual production and imparting of art and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small staff, high use of external consultants, technical support highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of organizational goals, degree of cooperation with environment, decision-making processes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideologies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. creativity/ground breaking/development; foundation as facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. traditional cultural policy (instrumentality, existing cultural institutions, program areas); foundation as architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. The foundation’s relations to state cultural policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Parliament level actors, including government and ministry of culture, political parties in parliament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Products/results**                                                    | a. independent foundation  
|                                                                        | b. state controlled foundation  
|                                                                        | c. mixed model?                                                                                     |
| **Organizational structure**                                           | Demands on how organization should be developed?                                                    |
| **Processes**                                                          | a. expectations towards independence in decision-making  
|                                                                        | b. expectations toward cooperation with existing state institutions in decision-making              |
| **Ideologies**                                                         | a. state as facilitator (ground breaking, development, creativity)  
|                                                                        | b. state as architect (traditional cultural policy)                                                  |

The legitimacy of the state as an actor within the field of cultural policy

Legitimation processes are central to all kinds of activities. Legitimacy is «the property of a situation or behavior that is defined by a set of social norms as correct or appropriate» (Scott 1998:307). Meyer and Rowan (in Scott 1991:170) think of organizational legitimacy as the degree of cultural support an organization receives from its environment, and they present the following understanding of how legitimacy is achieved:

«The legitimacy of a given organization is negatively affected by the number of different authorities sovereign over it and by the diversity of inconsistency of their accounts as how it is to function».

The degree of ”agreement” in the environment of an organization in regard to the organization’s goals and operations is central to the question of legitimacy.

An important background for our evaluation is the state’s (as the government’s and the ministry of culture’s) legitimacy as an actor within cultural policy at the time when the Foundation was established. To what degree did the government receive support from political parties in the parliament for its decision to establish the Foundation? What impact has the debate about the closure of the employees’ funds had on the establishment and further development of the Foundation? We also want to study the state’s various attempts to control the Foundation. Has the state, through its governing attempts (such as through changing the composition of the Foundation’s board) been able to influence relations of legitimacy between the Foundation, national politicians within the field of cultural policy, and various producers of art and culture? To what degree has the state’s attempt to control the Foundation’s operations influenced relations between the state (as the ministry of culture and the cultural council) and the Foundation?

We will study the degree to which the Foundation achieves legitimacy in its environments. The Foundation’s environments consist first and foremost of political authorities and of potential and actual applicants for economic support. It is possible that the controversial political background for the establishment of the Foundation has created a special need for legitimation.
One available method to create legitimacy in an organization’s environments can be the production of goods and results that are actually requested by the environments. It is however also necessary for an organization to seek support in its environments through such methods as choice of organizational structure, processes and ideologies (Brunsson 1989:4-6). We will try to include various methods for achieving legitimacy in our analysis.

We expect that the Foundation culture of the future will be busy finding processes that can create and increase its legitimacy. By doing so, the Foundation can succeed in achieving a position as a respected and well-established actor within the field of cultural policy. We expect the Foundation to use various organizational tools in order to secure legitimacy and institutionalization. We do know that the Foundation relates the question of legitimacy to such organizational means as parallel quality evaluations and the principle of public openness. From the state’s point of view, the Foundation is not required to have a policy of openness. The Foundation has however chosen to «work under as open conditions as possible, in the spirit of the principle of public openness».¹⁶ For the evaluation project, it will be an empirical question whether or not the Foundation manages to operate in agreement with the principle of public openness. The evaluation will look at the question of whether the Foundation has succeeded in employing these and other means in order to secure legitimacy in its environments.

¹⁶ For the exception to the principle of public openness, see Stiftelsesförordnande, bilaga til regeringsbeslut 1994-06-23, nr 65. For the Foundation’s decision to work according to the principle of public openness, see pressemelding fra Stiftelsen framtids kultur, 16.11.94, bilag 4, styremøteprotokoll fra 15.11.94, and protocol from board meeting 1:1995. The board meeting protocol is exempt from public inspection (see protocol from board meeting 3:1998).
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