

Radboud University Nijmegen

Categorization is the Problem

The Positioning of Nijmegen's Non-traditional Cultural Initiatives and Organizations
in the Cultural Sector.

Merel Van Bommel - s1030818

Master Kunst- & Cultuurwetenschappen Specialisatie: Kunstbeleid en Kunstbedrijf

Begeleider: dr. E.M van Meerkerk

Tweede lezer: J. Harings

Juli 2023

Woorden: 33952

Abstract

This master's thesis explores the positioning of non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen within the broader cultural sector. These initiatives defy conventional categorizations and go beyond the boundaries of established art institutions. Drawing on a multidisciplinary theoretical framework, this thesis examines the characteristics, values, and contexts of these organizations. Three case studies, (Hubert, P-Art, and The Mansion,) are analyzed in-depth through semi-structured interviews. The collected data is coded based on my *theoretical model's* categorized characteristics, which include their organizational framework, functions and aims, (artistic) content and programming, network and relationships, space, audience, and finances. The findings reveal that the case studies exhibit varying degrees of non-traditional characteristics, with each organization facing unique tensions and challenges within the broader cultural sector. The research highlights the complexities of the non-traditional phenomenon, the need for nuanced understanding, and the policy implications for these organizations. This thesis contributes to the ongoing dialogue on non-traditional cultural initiatives, emphasizing the importance of interdisciplinary research. Furthermore, it highlights the challenges of categorizing non-traditional organizations and the shift toward legitimizing art based on its societal value. The research underscores the need to revisit cultural policies to better support and integrate non-traditional organizations and emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary research in bridging the cultural and social sectors.

Acknowledgements

Ik startte mijn thesistrject anderhalf jaar geleden met de intentie om het in een halfjaar af te krijgen. Uiteindelijk deed ik er drie keer zo lang over. Rome is niet gebouwd in één dag, en mijn scriptie duidelijk ook niet. Toch heb ik geen spijt van mijn keuze voor het onderwerp. Ik sta namelijk te popelen om de kennis die ik opgedaan heb via dit onderzoek toe te kunnen passen in ‘de échte wereld’.

Ik wil een aantal mensen bedanken. Eerst en vooral mijn begeleider dr. Edwin van Meerkerk, anderhalf jaar lang kreeg ik erg fijne, flexibele begeleiding. U heeft de perfecte balans gevonden tussen aanmoedigen en inhoudelijk meedenken en kon me daarom geen betere begeleider wensen. Ook wil de mensen van Hubert, P-Art en The Mansion bedanken, zonder jullie was deze scriptie er niet! Het delen van jullie ervaringen was niet alleen onmisbaar voor het uitvoeren van mijn onderzoek, maar gaf mij ook enorm veel zin om helemaal in het onderwerp te duiken.

Vervolgens wil ik the pickle sisters, het quadruple A-team bedanken: Anna, Anne, Anouk en Adil, bedankt voor de nodige afleiding en het aanhoren van mijn scriptie stress momenten. Anna en Anouk, bedankt voor het last-minute proofreaden. Ira en Denise, bedankt voor de vele avonden in de Regenboog.

Als allerlaatste wil ik Mika bedanken voor de steun en het vertrouwen in mijn kunnen en het dealen met mijn vele avonden deadlinestress. Je bent de allerliefste partner.

Content

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Content.....	5
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	8
1. Research Question.....	9
2. Justification Theoretical Framework.....	10
3. Methodology.....	12
4. Structure of the Thesis.....	13
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework.....	14
1. Naming the Phenomenon.....	14
1.1 The Phenomenon Through a Policy Lens: The Creative Hub.....	14
1.2 The Phenomenon Through a Spatial Lens: Art Spaces and Cultural Clusters....	16
1.3. Naming the Phenomenon: Conclusion.....	19
2. Contexts.....	20
2.1. Political Context.....	21
The Cultural Commons.....	23
2.2. Societal Context.....	25
Cultural Democracy vs The Democratization of Culture.....	25
The Participation Society and the Transnational.....	26
2.3. Socio-Artistic Context.....	27
General Shift Cultural Sector.....	27
Shift Role of Art and the Artist.....	29
The Audience.....	31
2.4. Policy Context.....	32
2.5. The Phenomenon: What is it not?.....	36
Characteristics that can Indicate Higher Degrees of Institutionalization.....	36
3. Bringing Together the Characteristics from the Definitions and the Contexts.....	39
Chapter 3: Research Methodology.....	46
Chapter 4: Analysis.....	50
1. P-Art.....	50
Short Introduction.....	50
Organizational Framework and Approach.....	51
Function, Activities, Goals and Aims.....	52
(Artistic) Content and Programming.....	54
Relationships and Network.....	55
Spatial.....	56
The Audience.....	56
Finances.....	57
2. Hubert.....	58
Short introduction.....	58
Organizational Framework and Approach.....	59

Function, Activities, Goals and Aims.....	61
(Artistic) Content and Programming.....	62
Relationships and Network.....	63
Spatial.....	64
The Audience.....	66
Finances.....	67
3. The Mansion.....	69
Short Introduction.....	69
Organizational Framework and Approach.....	70
Function, Activities, Goals and Aims.....	73
(Artistic) Content and Programming.....	75
Relationships and Network.....	77
Spatial.....	79
The Audience.....	80
Finances.....	81
4. Comparing the Case Studies to Each Other and the Theoretical Model.....	83
4.1. Organizational Framework and Approach.....	84
Discussion.....	84
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	86
Conclusion.....	87
4.2. Function, Activities, Goals and Aims.....	88
Discussion.....	89
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	91
Conclusion.....	92
4.3. (Artistic) Content and Programming:.....	93
Discussion.....	93
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	95
Conclusion.....	97
4.4. Relationships and Network.....	97
Discussion.....	98
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	100
Conclusion.....	101
4.5. Spatial.....	102
Discussion.....	102
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	104
Conclusion.....	105
4.6. The Audience.....	106
Discussion.....	106
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	109
Conclusion.....	109
4.7. Finances.....	109
Discussion.....	110
New Characteristics and Tensions.....	111
Conclusion.....	112

Chapter 5: Results and Discussion	113
1. Reflections on the Results and Theoretical Model.....	113
2. Understanding the Tensions' Meaning at the Broader Level.....	114
3. Defining and Not Defining the Non-traditional and Traditional:.....	117
Chapter 6: Conclusion	120
1. Research Question.....	120
What is written in the academic literature on the non-traditional phenomenon and which characteristics are attributed to it?.....	120
How do these non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen look at their audience, artistic production and their societal role?.....	122
“How do the visions of these organizations measure up against the cultural policy of the city of Nijmegen?”.....	123
2. Implications for the Academic Context and the Cultural Sector.....	124
3. Reflection on Theory and Method and Advice for Future Research.....	125
Works Cited List	128

Chapter 1: Introduction

After graduating from high school and moving to the city, I began to explore the cultural life that urban areas have to offer. Through visits to various institutions, organizations, and events, I discovered a diverse range of cultural initiatives. Some of these initiatives, which I will refer to as "non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives," defy categorization within the traditional boxes of the established art world. What sets them apart is their multidisciplinary nature and ability to bring together local artists and audiences and create public spaces where art and culture are experienced, interacted with, and participated in. These initiatives prioritize the societal benefits of art, viewing it as a means to foster community rather than as an institution focused on presenting art to an audience. Lastly, while their focus is local, they are part of a global phenomenon that is a result of changes in the cultural zeitgeist.

Throughout history, the government's view on the role of art tends to shift between art for art's sake and art as a vehicle for societal value. According to Erik Hitters, in the 1950s and 1960s, arts subsidization was legitimized by focusing on the role it can play in societal reform, specifically in terms of social inequality (60, 132). Hitters notes that this art view recognizes diverse preferences and favors pluralism (132). In the 1980s, supply and demand were used as the basis for judging art's value (62). Concretely, art either depended on its commercial success or on the preferences of the elites who set the tone for good taste (172). With such shifts, the audience's role and influence changed too, changing from a passive audience that consumed what museums and theaters program, to a participating and co-creating audience who demands a voice in what is presented. This shift is also reflected in the new definition of what a museum is according to the ICOM¹. They define museums as in

¹ International Council of Museums

service of society, accessible and open to the public, fostering diversity and operating with the participation of communities (“ICOM announces”).

The current Dutch cultural policy focuses on this shift as well, with their 2021-2024 slogan “Culture for everyone.” (“Kunst- en cultuurbeleid”). On the worth of culture, the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science notes that “the arts and heritage allow us to see our own through different eyes. ... Thanks to their images and stories, we can critically test and develop our own representation of the world²” (Rijksoverheid 3). The focus of this cultural policy is thus one of art and its societal worth. Non-traditional organizations are a big part of our cities’ cultural sector which makes them increasingly interesting for local policymakers. Yet, because they are hard to define and not easily placed into traditional boxes, it is harder for non-traditional organizations to benefit from policies specifically tailored to traditional organizations.

1. Research Question

The main question that I answer in my master thesis is: *“How do non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen position themselves in relation to the cultural sector?”* I answer this question by addressing three subquestions. Firstly, “What is written in academic literature on the non-traditional phenomenon and which characteristics are attributed to it?” Secondly, “How do these non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen look at their audience, artistic production and their societal role?” Finally, “How do the (possible) policy and visions of these organizations measure up against the cultural policy on audience and culture of the city of Nijmegen?”

² “De kunsten en het erfgoed laten ons het eige en met andere ogen zien. ... Dankzij hun beelden en verhalen kunnen we onze eigen voorstelling van de wereld kritisch toetsen en ontwikkelen”

To address these questions, I have established a theoretical framework that serves as the foundation of my analysis. The literature I explore comprises articles that discuss manifestations of the non-traditional phenomenon as well as articles that examine the contextual factors influencing this phenomenon. Specifically, I focus on the political, societal, socio-artistic, and policy contexts. From this theoretical framework, I identify several non-traditional characteristics. These characteristics are organized into seven categories: organizational framework and approach, function, (artistic) content and programming, relationships and network, spatial characteristics, audience, and finances. My *theoretical model*, consisting of these seven categories and associated characteristics, is employed to analyze the case studies. It is not the goal to create a new box that attempts to push non-traditional initiatives into a static definition. The model serves as an assessment framework. These criteria help recognize patterns in these initiatives and identify gaps in the theory.

2. Justification Theoretical Framework

Since the turn of the century, there has been a growing interest in the study of organizations that operate outside the established institutional frameworks of the cultural sector. This phenomenon has been examined from several perspectives within academia. However, there is a lack of interdisciplinary sources on the phenomenon. In bringing together these different voices I aim to provide a more comprehensive view. In addition, it is important to note that for my thesis, I focus on Nijmegen, looking from a Dutch perspective. As a result, a substantial amount of the literature focuses on the Dutch cultural context of the phenomenon. However, I also included literature from other Western authors, as the phenomenon is both local and global. In my search for sources, I primarily encountered texts focussing on local

UK context. However, this could be due to the nature of the research, as the phenomenon is tied to local cities and policy, and therefore authors could favor writing in the local language.

Several authors have explored a particular phenomenon and have examined its various aspects from their unique viewpoints. Boswinkel and van Meerkerk focus on analyzing the Dutch creative hub within the context of cultural policy and define this creative hub as city-based buildings that generally house artists' and designers' studios, fringe businesses, cafés, and exhibition spaces" (3). Dovey et al. characterize British creative hubs as "a fast-changing and vibrant activity" (7) and are reluctant to define it precisely. The phenomenon has also been discussed through an urban planning lens. Grodach labels them art spaces and considers them flexible and multifunctional spaces that can serve multiple purposes (74) while Mommaas describes them as "places left over after planning" turned into cultural spaces (508), which he defines through possible characteristics rather than a definition. Otte and Gielen use the term "cultural commons," a broader term that approaches the phenomenon from a socio-cultural standpoint, focusing on the implications it has for democracy and society instead of developing a definition.

The theoretical framework continues by touching upon the political, societal, socio-artistic, and policy contexts in which the phenomenon has taken shape. It is not the goal to analyze these contexts and look at their effects, but rather to use them as frameworks for examining how non-traditional organizations in Nijmegen position themselves within this zeitgeist. And, whether this can provide insights into how these initiatives can be approached academically in the future.

The political context delves deeper into the cultural commons and its relevance for the phenomenon, touching upon the effects of globalization and migration (Otte and Gielen, Minnaert), common spaces (Stravides), and bottom-up initiatives (Joye). The societal context explains the shift from the democratization of culture to cultural democracy (Hadley,

Minnaert), the participation society (Lijster et al.), and the transnational (Joye). The socio-artistic context is characterized by three shifts: a general shift in the cultural sector that marks a change in the hierarchical model of cultural valuation (Janssen and Verboord); a shift stressing the societal role of art and artists (Coumans and Cleveringa, Minneart, Hadley); and a shift that marks the increased importance of the audience (Elffers, Grigar). The policy context delves into the policy paradox that emerged through tensions between the local and national and top-down and bottom-up forms of organization (Lijster et al.), as well as the effects of the aforementioned contexts on cultural policy.

3. Methodology

To make the selection for my case studies, I chose cultural organizations that primarily concern themselves with art while having a social objective. Since I chose Nijmegen as the geographical context, I already had a good overview of my different options. To have a broader scope, I browsed Ugendera³ and cultural (policy) reports and overviews from the municipality. It was important to select three not-too-similar case studies, so I looked for diversity in age, audience, size, and discipline. I chose and analyzed Hubert, P-Art, and The Mansion. I have conducted semi-structured interviews, supplemented by field notes and information from their websites. I interviewed two people from each organization, except for Hubert. Their functions differ from one organization to another, so I was unable to interview people with the same functions. Instead, I focused on interviewing people with functions as managers, directors, founders, or leaders. The field notes describe what I saw as objectively as possible. They were written within half an hour of leaving the premises. I coded the information obtained through my interviews based on my *theoretical model*, to use it in my

³ Website for arts and culture events, news and reviews in Nijmegen

analysis. A more detailed paragraph on the method of analysis can be read in the analysis chapter.

4. Structure of the Thesis

This introduction is followed by six chapters: the second chapter, expanding on the theoretical framework I have discussed previously, concludes with an overview of my *theoretical model*, composed by the characteristics mentioned in this chapter. The third chapter presents the methodological conditions under which the research took place. The fourth chapter contains the analysis and is outlined in two parts. Firstly, I discuss each case study separately, following the structure of the seven categories individually. Then, I compare the case studies to each other and the *theoretical model*. Each paragraph entails another category, facilitating a discussion on how the organizations' characteristics relate to the *theoretical model* and each other, followed by a discussion on new characteristics and tensions. Chapter five reflects and discusses the results of the analysis and the *theoretical model*. It delves further into the tensions and their implications for the broader cultural sector, as well as what it means to define or not define traditionality and non-traditionality. Lastly, in chapter six I answer my research questions, discuss implications for the academic context and cultural sector, reflect on my chosen theory and method, and give advice for future research.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

1. Naming the Phenomenon

In recent years, more literature on organizations and initiatives that deviate from traditional notions and norms has been published. However, there is a lack of comprehensive research on this phenomenon⁴, particularly in defining these initiatives and establishing specific criteria. Nevertheless, several authors have addressed related concepts and ideas that are closely tied to my topic. Either by describing elements inherent to the phenomenon or by discussing relevant terms within the context in which it emerged and continues to exist. In the following section, I will provide a brief overview of these concepts and how they are defined by the authors. The terms "creative hub"⁵, "cultural clusters," and "art spaces" are frequently used to refer to -part of- the phenomenon. This section aims to explore the works of selected authors who directly reference these initiatives and discuss defining characteristics.

1.1 The Phenomenon Through a Policy Lens: The Creative Hub

The creative hub is a phenomenon that has emerged in cities all over the world. However, it is hard to define due to nuances caused by its national and cultural contexts. Boswinkel and van Meerkerk discuss the creative hubs in the Dutch cultural policy context. They define them as “city-based buildings or areas that had a previous function as an industry ... and are now being used by artists and other creatives ... Creative hubs in the Netherlands generally house artists’ and designers’ studios, fringe businesses like printing workshops and small breweries, a café, and exhibition spaces” (3). In addition, they state that these creative hubs often emerge “from a bottom-up, community-driven initiative in an area that has been more or less

⁴ When referring to “the phenomenon” I point to the general increase in non-traditional cultural organizations and the related cultural zeitgeist.

⁵ Creative Broedplaats in Dutch

abandoned by local policy”, that is then transformed by organizing cultural activities such as exhibitions, performances, and small festivals (ibid.). What follows is municipal - and therefore often monetary - recognition of the initiative, eventually leading to the gentrification of a neighborhood (ibid.). Taking that cycle into account, they note that “culture-led urban regeneration has become part of the ‘toolbox’ of city administrations” (2). According to them, this makes for a policy paradox that I will discuss further in the section on policy context.

The creative hub in the UK has a long history of urban regeneration policy as a reaction to industrial decline, going as far back as the 1970s (Pratt 2). The innovative possibilities of the creative economy were explored, leading to a boom in creative hubs (3). A few years ago, the British Council published a Creative Hub Toolkit (“Creative Hub”). There is in the eyes of the government, an established attempt at defining the creative hub on a national level. In 2016, the British Council published the report “Creative Hubs: Lighthouses for the New Urban Economy”, written by, amongst others, Prof. Jon Dovey and Prof Andy Pratt. They note that the creative hub can mean different things due to the nature of hubs being characterized by “a fast changing and vibrant activity” (7). In addition, they refer to the connotation of “a dynamic bringing together of diverse talents, disciplines and skills to intensify innovation” that these hubs have (ibid.). While they do not give a definition themselves, they refer to what policymakers in the UK have defined it as, and therefore also discuss the phenomenon through a cultural policy lens. They claim that hubs are places that offer work, participation, and consumption with activities that spread beyond their physical building, across a variety of local institutions and networks (ibid.). Dovey et al. further point to the British Council’s Creative Hub Toolkit that distinguishes six types of hubs, which, according to the authors, “enable[s] practitioners to fit their process (creative activity) to a context (regional community)” (8).

In short, Dovey et al.'s report gives insight into how a national government has attempted to create cultural policy around a phenomenon that is so dynamic and context-bound. This explicitly ties to their conclusion. They note that both policy and practice should start from the perspective that creative hubs are inherently diverse in range and specialization and therefore constantly coevolving with their contexts (9).

A few years after his contribution to the report, Pratt published an article evaluating creative hubs and critically discussing their characteristics. Pratt's article is a critical evaluation of how creative hubs have been defined. He argues that in discussions about the creative hubs, by focusing on aspects of physical proximity, the creatives residing in the hubs are ignored (2). According to him, this is due to the dominance of economic theory, which considers "social and spatial relations of (cultural) production as insignificant" (ibid.). They lack the recognition that creative hubs exist within society, ultimately reflecting social, economic, and structural problems within them (3).

Lastly, Pratt points to the issue of governance: due to the hubs' diversity of practices and identities of workers and artists, a multiplicity of value claims is produced (5). In conclusion, Pratt expresses that the diversity of practices is a character of the norm, arguing for "more studies to concentrate on the particularity of creative hubs, the social, political, and economic contexts, and their diverse users" (6).

1.2 The Phenomenon Through a Spatial Lens: Art Spaces and Cultural Clusters

While Boswinkel and van Meerkerk as well as Pratt discuss the phenomenon through a policy lens, Carl Grodach and Hans Mommaas focus on the aspect of space, cultural economy, through the lens of urban planning. Both authors discuss the tension that develops as a result of policy that focuses on creating space for cultural production and creativity.

Mommaas' article explores the conflicted relationship between economic, social, and spatial interests and sentiments that culture and creativity bring to cities. He emphasizes the need for a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics involved, particularly the interaction between culture and commerce. Similarly, Grodach develops the tension between economy and community. He discusses art spaces and their connection to the cultural economy, defined as "those products, services, and establishments that relate to education and entertainment and are of high symbolic value" (75). The creative economy positions the arts as an instrument for enhancing neighborhoods and has been critiqued as justifying gentrification and neglecting production systems and labor force dynamics (76). Mommaas indicates the uncertainties and conflicts the creative economy introduces to the legitimization of art. In contrast, Grodach suggests incorporating community-based arts into the definition of the cultural economy "as a means of empowerment and improvement for existing places and populations", rather than treating it solely "as an amenity or industrial subsector" (ibid.). By doing so, the creative economy can easily be tied to a local "place-based cultural planning approach" that can "address issues of social inclusion and development" (ibid.).

Mommaas and Grodach each investigate manifestations of the phenomenon; five cultural clusters and twelve art spaces respectively. By doing so, the characteristics they discuss in their analysis make up a significant part of my *theoretical model*. What follows is a discussion of these characteristics.

Grodach defines art spaces as flexible and multifunctional spaces that can serve as performance spaces, galleries, art schools, incubators, resource centers, and outreach centers that "present a more eclectic range of work from traditional folk art to the experimental" (74). He specifies that they are usually community-based, either working with or assisting local artists, a particular minority group, or the neighborhood or city in which they operate (75).

In addition, he indicates that art spaces can achieve economic and community development through local revitalization, facilitating artistic and cultural opportunities for marginalized groups, incubating and stimulating new talent and creativity, building a community center for artists, and lastly through building social capital and collective identity (76). The latter ties in with Pratt's argument for an inclusion of the social nature of cultural work, in the discussion on creative hubs.

Mommaas describes the phenomenon as cultural clusters, defining these as "mixtures of cultural functions and activities, from production to presentation and consumption and from theater and the visual arts to pop music and new media, are grouped in a great variety of spatial forms" (507). Mommaas points out that cultural clusters start as ploaps; "places left over after planning" (508). Informal groups or cultural producers turn them into alternative cultural sites or are part of a plan by cultural wanting to enhance their market position or by urban planners wanting "to revitalize urban quarters or to strengthen the local 'creative economy'" (ibid.). Lastly, he mentions the "flexible, ad hoc character" of his case studies (528). He refers to what Mintzberg and McHugh have called adhocracy, signifying adaptability to constantly changing circumstances (ibid.).

As previously assessed by Pratt, the diversity of practices is a character of the norm, making it vital to delve deeper into the particularities of creative hubs. Mommaas introduces seven core characteristics to describe and distinguish the particularities of cultural clusters. These characteristics include (1) the 'horizontal' portfolio of activities and their level of intracluster collaboration and integration, (2) the 'vertical' portfolio of the cultural functions involved, (3) the organizational framework, (4) the financial regimes, (5) the balance open/flexible vs identified in terms of space and cultural programs, (6) the top-down or bottom-up planning, and lastly, (7) the position of the clusters in a shifting spatial-cum-cultural urban field (514-516). Mommaas emphasizes a flexible definition,

considering scales of tension rather than binary distinctions. Placement on the scale of tensions can be seen as a distribution on a non-binary field. Mommaas indicated that the case studies lean more towards one option as opposed to the other. He discusses characteristics of a non-traditional phenomenon, yet his framework does not make a clear distinction between what are exclusively non-traditional characteristics. This suggests that making a clear distinction between what is non-traditional and not is hard and that cultural institutions fall somewhere on the scale between non-traditional and institutionalized and might have characteristics of both.

1.3. Naming the Phenomenon: Conclusion

In the previous paragraphs, I discussed several concepts that describe the non-traditional phenomenon to an extent. It should be noted that art spaces and cultural clusters often tend to refer to groups of organizations, while my research focuses on singular organizations. Nevertheless, since I argue that non-traditional organizations are part of a general phenomenon, the themes and characteristics of these broader concepts are still relevant. The terms creative hub, art space, and cultural clusters and how they are defined point to four main themes I consider important for defining the phenomenon.

Firstly, that of space, in the broad sense of the word. Space is mostly mentioned in relation to spatial policy, the literal spaces that these phenomena occupy. I am interested in how my interviewees define space and from which perspective(s) they approach them. The second theme is that of the diversity of functions, be it, the artistic, the commercial, the residential, or something in between. The third theme is that of community and social relations. Although not always explicitly mentioned, networks of people and community formation are either mentioned or implied but not elaborated on. This lack of in-depth analysis of the social nature of cultural work has been elucidated by Pratt, who has pointed

out that this is due to the economic and policy lens from which the literature approaches the subject. And the last theme is the dynamic co-evolution of these initiatives with their context, resulting in a diversity of practices.

I argue that the cultural places mentioned by the authors in this chapter are an example of what I consider these non-traditional initiatives to be. However, to truly grasp what the phenomenon is, it is fruitful to step outside these already existing and defined concepts of the creative hub, art space, and cultural cluster and perhaps consider a broader zeitgeist rather than a physical manifestation of the phenomenon. It is, therefore, most productive to bring all characteristics together and look at them not as binary characteristics of a zeitgeist, but as a field in which these characteristics are distributed.

In addition, the literature I have discussed thus far is the literature that mostly looks at the phenomenon through a policy and economic lens. Because of this perspective, the phenomenon is mostly defined in a tangible way, by defining it as literal spaces with specific characteristics. As a result, the phenomenon is defined very tightly within those frameworks. Characteristics that fall outside the scope of these frameworks are left in the middle. I argue that to fully grasp what this phenomenon is about, the rigidity of these frameworks needs to be loosened. In my research, I do not look at the phenomenon from one academic lens or perspective, but instead look at how and in which contexts the phenomenon is talked about academically. Subsequently, I can use the ideas that are present in the academic discussion to see in what ways these ideas manifest themselves in the context of Nijmegen.

2. Contexts

In this section, I discuss the political, societal, socio-artistic, and policy contexts that have led to or can substantiate the reason for the emergence of these non-traditional organizations.

When it comes to the contexts that are important to discuss to fully understand the

phenomenon at hand, I do not directly discuss the economic context. However, I indirectly discuss certain important economic aspects, as they are tied to politics and therefore also policy. It is also important to note that while I have roughly divided up the contexts into the categories below, there inevitably is some overlap, as these contexts are often also informed and influenced by one another.

2.1. Political Context

The authors discussed until now have looked at the phenomenon in a top-down manner through the lens of policy and urban planning. In contrast, Hanka Otte and Pascal Gielen have a more empirical approach with multiple articles on the phenomenon's social perspective, through the lens of the commons, which I will explain later. Ultimately, they argue that due to the nature of the commons and its bottom-up approach, the phenomenon is inherently political. Otte and Gielen's research is relevant as they do not entirely follow the classical research framework, which is fitting for a theme that transcends traditional cultural frameworks. The Culture Commons Quest Office, which both authors are involved in, views their research as "a quest in which reality is not only studied and described but also co-created on the border of imagination and reality", resulting in not only academic output but also artistic and other types of output ("About CCQO"). The concept of the cultural commons thus partly challenges a purely academic perspective on the matter.

Two important aspects for the creation of this new type of organization are a top-down governing approach resulting in policy creation and, secondly, austerity. Otte and Gielen point to the revival of community art, cultural programs that directly serve communities by for instance deploying artists to brighten up the neighborhood (buildings) with art, and other projects that bring people and communities into contact with each other through (making) art ("When Politics"). From the 1990s onwards, this idea that art

contributes to a stable and creative society was the inspiration for a socio-artistic project-based policy that granted subsidies and “stimulated the private sector to support such projects in and with society” (270). By doing so, community art was brought “into a legally regulated or civic domain” (271).

This view supports the legitimization of public funding for community art, as it benefits the population. Due to austerity measures in the last decades, local social cohesion spaces such as primary schools, community centers, and other communal spaces have been closed. As a result, artists have taken over years later to address the gaps that have emerged in the community's social cohesion (272). Aside from the temporality and therefore cost-efficiency of these artists, through art, they generate a positive story, which is useful to support local politics (273).

Otte and Gielen attribute the use of community art for social cohesion to a longing for a homogeneous community, a ‘we’-feeling (273). Differences are bridged through the socialization of a group of people within the dominant cultural order (*ibid.*). However, globalization, digitalization, and migration created “majority-minority societies, in which the majority of the population belongs to a minority”, an idea shared by Minnaert (Otte and Gielen 273, Minnaert 79). As a result, an imagined mono-cultural nation emerges, as imposed by the original homogeneous majority, which is now a minority, through political power and cultural policy (274). This shift’s consequences are discussed in the societal context section.

According to Otte and Gielen, this political context leads to artists being deployed to serve this cultural-political ideology, and subsidies are retracted if the artists or their art are deemed too political (273), as that would compromise the mono-cultural discourse. Ultimately they question the power dynamics at play within cultural politics. In sum, “artists who also express their political engagement outside of the museum and community artists

who not only concern themselves with the social domain but also with policy, are soon deprived from sponsors, subsidies, or institutional support” (278).

Having said that, Otte and Gielen write that while public funding for community art is easily legitimized, governments are finding it difficult to legitimize support for the rest of the sector, as it is no longer seen by everyone as a public concern (270). In conclusion, the austerity measures, the focus on community art, and the top-down approach to cultural politics make for a climate where cultural organizations have to, or want to do things differently (277).

The Cultural Commons

In the last few years, the commons have become trendy, and depending on the context, associated with other concepts and also translated into other languages, ultimately making their exact meaning open for interpretation. The cultural commons stem from the concept of the commons. Stravos Stravides mentions that “‘common spaces’ emerge in the contemporary metropolis as sites open to public use in which, however, rules and forms of use do not depend upon and are not controlled by a prevailing authority” (Stravides 2). Boswinkel and van Meerkerk note that the commons are often interpreted in two ways. As mentioned by Stravides, as a more neutral term the commons refers to “a place of which ownership and use are shared”; while a more political interpretation advocates for “bottom-up democracy and self-organization” (3).

Adding the word ‘cultural’ to the commons complicates this further. The CCQO⁶ sees “culture as a sensemaking praxis at the base of society that gives meaning to one’s own life, as well as to artistic, ecological, economic, political and social practices” (“About CCQO”). According to Otte and Gielen commonism has the capacity to present “alternative forms of

⁶ The Culture Commons Quests Office

economy, politics, and living together that are rooted in cultural foundations in a broader sense on the basis of culture” (“Commoning Art” 145). They emphasize that art and culture influence democracy and, more broadly, society (ibid.). They, therefore, have a more political agenda through which they discuss the concept.

Before delving into the cultural commons I briefly explain how the terms commons and commoning are defined in the cultural context as formulated by Otte and Gielen. The commons and commoning are interwoven. While the commons is a noun, commoning is a verb, a process. Otte and Gielen write that commoning is “generating and making freely available new material or immaterial goods and services themselves” (“when politics” 278). The commons exist due to commoning, and culture is an example of that, as it is in principle freely available (“gemeen cultuurbeleid” 9).

Otte and Gielen argue that commoning practices often occur out of the need to bypass gatekeepers (278). According to them, one can only operate in the commons respecting reciprocity. By operating in the commons, one thus generates new commons, ergo, the process of commoning (ibid.). In addition, Joye points out that the common urgency has its basis in an underrepresentation of different groups in cultural organizations as well as a lack and cutback of accessible meeting, creation, and community space (9). Otte and Gielen argue that commoning practices are therefore always political (“Gemeen Beleid” 10). Furthermore, Joye indicates that initiators are often activists, artists, and active citizens who create communities that operate outside of existing frameworks, creating new ways of doing and thinking (9). Stravides adds that “commoning practices importantly produce new relations between people” (2). Here again, the community is, therefore, an important characteristic, in addition to a bottom-up approach. I will therefore further contextualize the commons in the part about societal context below.

2.2. Societal Context

Cultural Democracy vs The Democratization of Culture

Broadly speaking, the biggest shift that contributes to the societal context in which these non-traditional organizations emerge is an ongoing move from the democratization of culture toward cultural democracy. Hadley notes that the democratization of culture is a process “where the 'official' culture, typically represented by large and well-funded institutions, is made accessible to non-participating communities, often in the belief that it will do them good” (31). Otte and Gielen have a similar view, as they describe democratic participation, where “culture is primarily seen as ‘high’ culture, or as the only acceptable culture that can lead to the edification of the masses” (141). By contrast, “cultural democracy arises when communities produce and communicate their own forms of critical culture” (Hadley 31). Hadley does not specify what he means by “critical” culture but notes that a cultural democracy has a reflective approach that produces “questioning or 'wrong' forms of participation ... where the given frame of the participatory process is challenged or exceeded by the participant” (ibid.).

The societal shift from the first to the latter also explains the socio-cultural shift from an arts-lover tradition to a social justice tradition, discussed in paragraph 2.3 (44). First, I will explain in greater detail what the democratization of culture to the cultural democracy shift entails.

The democratization of culture is rooted in Modernity where universalism dominated, which consequently created universal norms, ethnocentrism, and an approved, usually ‘high’ culture (44). The individual is placed at the center, yet democratic participation serves to strengthen the identity and legitimacy of the nation-state as previously mentioned in the debate around community art (Otte and Gielen 241). Culture is transferred from the center to the periphery, the focus lays on supply, and society’s hierarchy is vertical (Hadley 44). The

democratization of culture is ultimately a top-down approach to culture, where the goal is to bring the culture of an elite to the general population. Hadley recites Langsted, noting that “the policy of the democratization of culture is based on the unspoken assumption that only one culture exists in any given society” (qtd. in Hadley 32).

Cultural democracy, on the other hand, is more of a bottom-up approach. It is rooted in Postmodernity, where relativism is most dominant and where norms are seen as social constructs (Hadley 44). In addition, multiculturalist societies are prevalent which makes for multiple legitimate expressions of these cultures (ibid.). Minnaert argues that cultural democracy points to the act of balance. While culture entails differences as well as similarities between people, democracy signifies the power of a chosen parliament (79). Cultural democracy can thus be complimentary as well as contrary (79). Minnaert notes that “in the first case, attention to cultural minorities may be a measure of the proper functioning of democracy. In the second case, ... art can critically question the existing power structures and expose the shortcomings of democracy” (79). Hadley adds that culture transfers in a network of independently connected units, in a horizontal hierarchy and that the interest of culture lies mostly in its reception, with individual opportunity being centralized (44).

The Participation Society and the Transnational

This cultural citizenship indicates two other societal factors. The first is the idea of a participation society, which refers to the shift that requires a more proactive role of citizens. This is a shift to moral citizenship that gives a cultural interpretation of what a good citizen is or does, in this case feeling responsible towards one’s community and surroundings (4). Lijster et al. argue that this “translates into subsidies for cultural participation and community art projects that have to integrate individuals in already existing communities, create new

communities or bridge communities” (4). This ties back into the political context surrounding community art.

The second concept is that of the transnational, meaning to go beyond national boundaries. According to Joye, modern communication and mobility enhance the accessibility to peers worldwide, nourishing transnational collaboration (30). Minnaert notes that the European Union’s definition of cultural democracy is focused on shared responsibility and accessibility as opposed to consumption (81). This shared responsibility implies a shared issue. Lijster et al. fill this in by arguing that “in order to face contemporary cultural, ecological and economic problems that are increasingly transnational in nature, one must start from the level where these kinds of issues are immediately experienced; the local level of specific regions and neighborhoods” (10). Due to globalism, local grassroots initiatives have the ability to form transnational networks, described as a glocal approach (Joye 30). Lijster et al. state that this approach is more powerful and sustainable “than ‘forced’ and artificially created cooperations of larger institutions” (10). However, a transnational approach creates a policy paradox that I will expand on in the policy section.

2.3. Socio-Artistic Context

There are three major shifts I will explore. Firstly, there is a general shift in the cultural sector, secondly there is a shift in the societal role of art and artists. Lastly, there is a shift in how the audience is viewed.

General Shift Cultural Sector

The discussion on the democratization of culture and cultural democracy considers the broad definition of culture as encompassing art, beliefs, knowledge, behaviors, practices, etc.

Naturally, this trickles down to the specific aspects of culture, such as art and popular culture. I argue that the aspects that led to a shift towards cultural democracy also contributed to another important shift in the cultural sector.

This shift regards the authority of institutional gatekeepers, and with them, a change in the hierarchical model of cultural valuation. Janssen and Verboord argue that this development is caused by two things. Firstly, they note that internet users tend to seek out information given by other internet users, which leads to bottom-up practices of cultural selection and evaluation (15). Secondly, they explain that since the 1960s, Western societies have gone through substantial changes. They point to the democratization of higher education and the emancipation of minorities (15). Subsequently, traditional cultural hierarchy crumbled, which “enabled social climbers and minorities to ‘import’ their tastes into higher circles and to bestow prestige upon their preferred genres” (15). In addition, the individualization of society has made people less likely to adopt collective taste patterns and follow the judgment of cultural experts in favor of taste authenticity (15). Traditionally, institutionally embedded experts such as cultural mediators and critics legitimize the culture of the higher-status groups through their cultural authority (15). Therefore, the power dynamic has shifted and allowed for a broader valorization of culture that is fitting for a shift toward cultural democracy.

Currently, The Netherlands has a national, subsidized standard program⁷, with additional local subsidies that mostly go to established institutions⁸ (Lijster et al.). While the national system mostly focuses on a national top to subsidize and thus sets a certain standard, local policy makes choices on which initiatives and organizations to support, and which regulations to put in place.

⁷ the BIS

⁸ specifically, their buildings

This top-down approach attracts a higher educated white audience and works from the principle that art and culture are “something to enjoy on an individual level instead of with inherent civil or political value” (2). In turn, more and more grassroots activities and cultural spaces are initiated as alternatives that seem more accessible compared to established cultural institutions (10). These initiatives are often “small independent organizations, temporary projects and associations embedded in local (often urban) settings and therefore equipped to sense the needs and concerns of specific communities” (Lijster et al.). They are often flexible enough to enter into networked, transnational relationships and place importance on horizontal networks as opposed to vertical ones (ibid.). Young artists specifically create alliances with each other and prefer to work and create in horizontal networks as opposed to climbing the institutions’ hierarchy (Coumans and Cleveringa 5).

In the 21st century, the cultural economy has grown and led to cultural clusters. In addition, the label ‘cultural’ or ‘creative’ is applied more freely to districts, clusters, neighborhoods, and hubs: “denoting on the one hand a description, or on the other hand, an aspiration” (Pratt 1). Cultural clustering thus points both to the use of culture as urban regeneration (Mommaas 508) as well as the openness for temporary alliances with like-minded individuals and artistic organizations, sharing strategic goals, resources, knowledge, and ideas (Lijster et al.). The latter also fits within the way the cultural commons operate.

Shift Role of Art and the Artist

Anke Coumans and Sikko Cleveringa remark that art is not only used to physically enhance the city as mentioned by Mommaas, but there is also a need to involve an artistic perspective in other areas of life. For issues concerning housing, youth, disasters, etc., governments and societal sectors like to include artists (5). Artists are subsequently used as translators between

societal events and people. This points to a refocus on audiences which I will discuss later. In this context, it is interesting to analyze how non-traditional initiatives position themselves toward this trend. With public or community money going towards artists or art, the societal value of the art in question is scrutinized, introducing the expectation that one thinks about art's worth in society (Minnaert 80). The idea that art has to give account to society is an idea that has been supported by many but also sparked controversy. In 2019, the ICOM proposed a new museum definition that reads as follows:

“Museums are democratizing, inclusive and polyphonic spaces for critical dialogue about the pasts and the futures. Acknowledging and addressing the conflicts and challenges of the present... Museums ... are participatory and transparent, and work in active partnership with and for diverse communities to collect, preserve, research, interpret, exhibit, and enhance understandings of the world, aiming to contribute to human dignity and social justice, global equality and planetary wellbeing” (“ICOM announces”).

The definition was turned down by the majority and ultimately replaced by a less political alternative. While not accepted, the fact that an activist definition was proposed in the first place, points to a shift in our thinking about the role of art. As I mentioned before, there is thus a clear departure from an arts-lover tradition towards a social justice tradition. Hadley discusses the effect of this shift from Modernity to Postmodernity on culture and consumption (44). Concretely, this entails a more subjective judgment of taste, a secular view where art is subject to shifts in taste, with multiple realities depending on the context of its perceivment (44).

The Audience

From all the above, it is apparent that the audience is an important factor in the zeitgeist that has enabled the non-traditional cultural institutions phenomenon. People are centered in the cultural context of the time. However, the shift to cultural democracy and its focus on a participation society as well as the centrality of community within the cultural commons, make the concept of the audience blurry and unstable. With more participation and engagement comes co-creation, and ultimately a shift in who is a maker and who is the audience.

Art is clearly for the benefit of the people regardless of one's position in the process; whether it is facilitator, creator, participator, or consumer, one is part of the audience. Hadley points to the shift from a passive to an active audience, from contemplative receiving to more participatory (44). Grigar adds that a new type of audience has emerged, "one represented by young visitors demanding a truly participatory and engaging role of art institutions which foster learning through interaction" (127). This is in line with the trend that the audience's experience becomes increasingly important (Elffers). The audience-centric approach becomes apparent in the Dutch national vision for culture⁹. The Minister for Culture¹⁰ at the time, stated that "Like the Culture Council, I make room for more genres that reach a wider, more varied audience."¹¹

Interestingly, while some authors briefly mention the trend that the audience becomes more important, a deeper discussion on who the (new) audience is exactly, remains absent. The focus, therefore, lays mostly on the increased attention to the development of the idea of the audience. In the next part, I will discuss this audience development policy as well as the general cultural policy context further.

⁹ Uitgangspunten Cultuurbeleid 2021-2024, published in 2019

¹⁰ Ingrid van Engelshoven

¹¹ "Net als de Raad voor Cultuur maak ik plek voor meer genres die een breder, gevarieerder publiek bereiken."

2.4. Policy Context

The audience, cultural policy, and democratization of art come together in Steven Hadley's book *Audience Development and Cultural Policy*, published in 2021 in the context of the English cultural field. The book examines the relationship of audience development to cultural policy and offers a different perspective on how the practice of audience development is connected to ideas of democratic access to culture. As explained in the previous paragraph, there is a shift going on toward a cultural democracy, in which active cultural citizenship is encouraged and audiences are expected to be active and participating.

This comes with a cultural democracy policy, which is a “more participatory (or populist) approach in the definition and provision of culture” where it is the government's responsibility “to provide equal opportunities for citizens to be culturally active on their own terms” (qtd. in Hadley 34). As mentioned before, one of the ways in which this is evident in policy is the use of community art as a policy instrument. From all this, the emergence of audience development in policy is therefore not surprising.

Hadley questions what “an audience for the arts” implies and how “an audience” is constructed. According to him, the power asymmetry that is implied by the creation of an audience serves to create narratives that legitimize the cultural sector. Hadley eventually concludes that “the discursive role of audience development performs a legitimating function both for the democratization of culture and for the wider field of English cultural policy” (233). In addition, he notes that “it becomes legitimate to have an undemocratic cultural policy (considered here in terms of the demographics of consumption) so long as it is in the process of being democratised” (ibid.). The political and policy discourse around the audience has thus become more present, both on a national and local level.

Anja Mølle Lindelof also discusses the term ‘audience development’ She notes that “from an institutional perspective it seems that the audience development discourse has

forced institutions to start rethinking the ways in which they engage with audiences more systematically in their institutional practice” (205). While a top-down method is still favored in established institutions, Mara Cerquetti exposes a possible shift. Cerquetti examines the literature on audience development in the context of museums. She asserts that “social responsibility and accountability towards communities become crucial issues for museums” (33).

In their article about the commons, Gielen and Otte discuss the concept of participatory democracy, closely linked to the term participation society discussed in the societal section. Although a tautology, they argue that the concept “expresses the hope for more - or more meaningful - participation in decision-making processes” (141). They explain this renewed focus on participation in society is attributed to government programs that encourage cultural initiatives in the hope that they foster a more inclusive society, promote active citizenship, and thus benefit participative democracy (*ibid.*). I argue that the national discourse about the audience and participation speaks to a wish for commoning. This is interesting, as this top-down approach is at odds with the commons. However, this tension also speaks to the room for possibility. Janna Reinsma discusses the relationship between the audience and the commons. She quotes Erik Uitenbogaard, who argues that art institutions often work top-down, focusing on supply rather than demand despite efforts to be more diverse and inclusive (15). Commoning, therefore, offers a chance to play a role in changing that top-down programming (*ibid.*).

While the national discourse and policy can help illustrate the tension at hand between how the commons function and the top-down way in which policy operates, it is not the national policy that is most relevant for the non-traditional organizations, but the local. Van Herpen emphasizes that pop music venues or venues programming multiple and

cross-disciplinary arts, receive far less subsidy per inhabitant in comparison to institutions such as libraries, city theaters, and museums¹² (qtd. in Thijs Lijster, Gielen and Otte 3).

Lijster, et al. discuss the policy paradox that emerges due to the tension between the local and national, caused by globalization. According to Lijster et al., both the national and municipal Dutch cultural policy systems prefer established institutions, creating a blindspot for grassroots initiatives (3). Secondly, “municipalities mostly have the responsibility over buildings and stages, while the national government determines the programming and support of companies” (ibid.). A policy shift from organizing the consumption of art to facilitating space for art has become evident at a local level (Mommaas 508).

However, since policy in general emphasizes established institutions, there is less attention paid to smaller-scale initiatives. Lijster, et al. point out that on the one hand, they have a harder time meeting the rigid and inflexible criteria to qualify for specific subsidies. And on the other hand, these initiatives also often have specific demands not met by subsidy systems, which do not take into account their informal, horizontal, and international way of doing. Moreover, Joye concludes that such “bottom-up initiatives rely on the goodwill and trust of policymakers to recognize their potential and assist them in navigating the knot of subsidy streams and regulations” (31). To fully realize the potential of these initiatives, a shift in policymaking at the local level is needed. This shift should involve moving away from a solely redistributive role within a vertically organized public arts sector, toward operating on a more comprehensive level, as proposed by Mommaas (508). This would entail an acknowledgment of horizontally articulated linkages of thinking and acting (ibid.).

As I mentioned in the paragraph on the commons, concepts like the cultural commons ultimately raise the question about the value(s) of culture. Governments and public institutions need to account for the public value they provide (qtd. in van Meerkerk 234).

Cultural policy concerns public support for the cultural sector. The value of culture and art,

¹² which receive 75% of the cultural budget

therefore, plays an important role in this support. De Zwart and Musch note that this value is often measured from cultural, spatial, social, or economic perspectives (57). However, they quote Holden who argues for a broader understanding of cultural value as a basis for cultural policy (qtd. in 57). They advocate for a more inclusive definition of value in which cultural value encompasses more than just the products and actions originating from the sector (ibid.). They add that this value is not always quantifiable as there is a wide spectrum of identities, rituals, traditions, structures, facilities, contexts, and the associated processes in which they are created (57). Cultural democracy emphasizes the social aspects of art and culture and thus a shift in how cultural organizations legitimize themselves is therefore to be expected.

In conclusion, the shift toward a global, multicultural society that brought with it a shift from an arts-lover tradition to a social justice tradition builds up tension within cultural policy. On the one hand, local governments are in favor of non-traditional cultural initiatives and what they contribute locally, but on the other hand cultural policy, especially Dutch cultural policy, is very rigid with little room for improvisation.

One should therefore ask whether the cultural policy climate even allows for such initiatives to exist and flourish in the first place. As Otte and Gielen have put it, a cultural policy that supports the commons starts from trusting that people will use their freedom responsibly and can give shape to how they want to organize their life and work (“gemeen beleid” 10). However, they also point out that common cultural policy does not necessarily guarantee a democratic and inclusive use of the commons (“gemeen cultuurbeleid” 10-11). Common policy mainly works on the principle of shared difference, creating a bridge without wanting to integrate or homogenize differences and ensuring the democratic public use of common resources (11).

2.5. The Phenomenon: What is it not?

There is no research about traditional organizations as a specific category, as this is the norm. Yet, by choosing non-traditional organizations to describe my case studies, I make a distinction between non-traditional and traditional. I consider traditional organizations to have high degrees of institutionalization. Ewa Grigar writes that cultural sociologists view art institutions, such as galleries or museums, as integral parts of an institutionalized cultural system (126). She adds that this system “has been shaped to cultivate and promote socio-cultural values of a given society” (126). Organizations such as theaters, operas, archives, libraries, museums, galleries, etc., are commonly referred to as traditional cultural institutions (Kangas and Vestheim 272). I argue that it is important to emphasize that we consider the degree of institutionalization, not whether a single organization is considered a cultural institution. Kangas and Vestheim put it as follows:

“Every single organisation in the cultural field should by its characteristics and functions contribute to the full understanding of the concept of ‘cultural institution’, but each single organisation is not by itself complete and complex enough to be named an institution in general terms” (271).

This nuance is important for my further analysis, as I do not view non-traditional and traditional as absolute terms, which I will discuss more in chapter five.

Characteristics that can Indicate Higher Degrees of Institutionalization

Some of the characteristics mentioned by the authors about non-traditional organizations have direct opposites that one would expect in organizations with higher degrees of institutionalization. For example, the authors Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, and Dovey et al. all indicate that non-traditional organizations put more importance on horizontal networks as opposed to vertical ones. Traditional organizations do the opposite. Aside from these

characteristics, some are not mentioned in the literature on my phenomenon. I will therefore briefly discuss those in this paragraph. I later refer to a conference paper by Rodner et al. that touches on institutionalization within the arts. In addition, I refer to Kangas and Vestheim's article on institutionalism in cultural context. And lastly, I mention Janssen and Verboord's views on cultural mediators and gatekeepers. An extensive discussion on the topic lies outside the scope of this thesis. The explanation I provide here serves to illustrate a norm that helps strengthen my discussion on non-traditional organizations and is thus not entirely complete.

Kangas and Vestheim mention certain characteristics of traditional organizations. They write that typically, institutions are relatively permanent (272). In addition, the authors note that institutions receive a large proportion of the yearly state budgets set aside for cultural purposes (269). Thirdly, they write that formal power in traditional organizations is expressed in the form of hierarchy and the role and organization structure (272).

In the 1980s, DiMaggio and Powell had already criticized traditional cultural organizations for their entrenched conservatism and bureaucratic nature. They characterized institutions as being focused on self-preservation, lacking innovation, and displaying resistance towards new ideas in artistic and cultural content, as well as management and organization (qtd. in Kangas and Vestheim 269). Traditional cultural organizations rely on legitimization to substantiate their position and relevancy. Moreover, according to Rodner et al., multiple studies suggest that the legitimization and value of art itself rely on the "embedding of individuals, organizations, interests and values within institutional logics" (3). They refer to Becker, who stated that in the art world, the process of creating value or legitimizing discourses and practices depends on collaborative endeavors and shared perspectives on what is considered art (qtd. in 3). In addition, they add that cultural organizations effectively convey these "socially constructed truths" to a broader audience by

institutionalizing their physical spaces and exerting power through their discourses (3).

Lastly, Rodner et al. mention that through this embeddedness, organizations, institutions, and individuals secure their credibility and enduring presence within their respective domains (ibid.).

This embedded legitimization manifests itself among other things through cultural mediators. Janssen and Verboord define cultural mediators or gatekeepers as “all professional experts involved in the selection and valuation of cultural products - talent scouts, agents, publishers, film or music producers, curators and theater programmers” (8). The authors argue that their assessment of cultural products influence their reputation, and subsequently, that of the organization they are working for (9). Gatekeepers, therefore, take into account institutional quality indicators, such as the reputation of the organization that has presented a work or artist and past critical evaluations of the artist's work (ibid.). In addition, they pay attention to cultural coverage of other media and rely on genre classifications and conventions to inform their decision-making processes (ibid.). In conclusion, traditional organizations operate in a long-standing system where they position themselves as legitimate by showing and selecting art they deem of quality. This quality is affirmed by cultural mediators, who earn their legitimacy by basing their opinions on the reputations, practices, and truths of said organizations.

Lastly, in the Dutch context, there have been three important national policy documents published from the ministry's initiative (van Meerkerk). These codes are the Fair Practice Code and the Code Governance Cultuur which make institutions and the industry responsible for better reimbursement and organizational governance, and the Code Diversiteit en Inclusie to encourage the representation of underrepresented groups. These codes have been broadly accepted as an acceptable standard by the government and funds. It is expected by some funds that these codes are respected by the organizations who apply for them. I have

noticed that most traditional organizations mention these codes on their websites and or year plans.

Lastly, I want to point to a few characteristics that I have not found explicitly discussed in academic sources, but that either can be derived from the sources I have discussed or are considered common knowledge. As mentioned before, traditional organizations that have formal structures and hierarchies (Lijster et al.), often have established themselves over a longer period and often receive substantial funding. Due to these things, we can state that they are stable and can therefore provide reliable contracts with a steady income for employees. Secondly, traditional organizations have institutionalized their legitimization, and embedded their interests and values within institutional logic (Rodner et al. 3). An example would be the countless, often national, umbrella associations that protect the interests of organizations in the same discipline. Thirdly, Rodner et al. also mentioned the institutionalizing of their physical spaces (3). Traditional organizations have permanent physical locations, often explicitly built for the purpose of said organization.

3. Bringing Together the Characteristics from the Definitions and the Contexts

From the body of literature, it becomes apparent that this phenomenon has been studied through three major fields, the cultural policy field, the urban planning field and the cultural commons field. Most authors discuss the characteristics by simply naming and describing them. The exception to this is Hans Mommaas, who offers a clear framework in which the characteristics are approached as scales or a degree to which an organization can measure up to the characteristics rather than a set, static quality. As mentioned before, Mommaas chose a spatial, cultural economy lens through which he discussed the phenomenon, and therefore mostly touches upon characteristics related to the function of the organizations, their

organizational framework, and their financial and spatial aspects. As a result, (artistic) content and programming and the organization's audience and network are indirectly, or not represented. In addition, Mommaas' characteristics are based on cultural clusters, which is narrower than my scope while at the same time focusing on the clustering of multiple organizations, initiatives, and entities. For that reason, I will not take over this framework, but use it as an inspiration to model my own.

To do so, I distinguished seven categories of characteristics, with the note that characteristics overlap and might fit in one of the other categories as well. I have divided all characteristics into these categories. The characteristics themselves come from the authors I discussed in this theoretical chapter. Some characteristics have been explored by multiple authors. The first category is the organizational framework and approach, or how the organization is structured and what its work methods and processes are. Secondly, I chose the category of function, answering the question of what the activities, goals, and aims are of these organizations, and what they do. The third category is that of (artistic) content and programming, answering who and what is programmed, and why. The fourth category concerns relationships and networks and describes what the networks of these organizations look like and what is gained from these relationships. The spatial characteristics form the fifth category and relate to the organization's relation to space. The sixth category is that of audience, for characteristics relating to what the audience of the organizations is, and how they are viewed. Lastly, there is the finances category or the financial approach of the organizations.

Each category has a column with more non-traditional characteristics and more institutionalized characteristics. The first column is thus made-up of the characteristics that have been attributed to the phenomenon by the authors I have discussed. The institutionalized characteristics are gathered from the same sources or from the additional

sources that I discussed in paragraph 2.4. *The Phenomenon: What is it not?*. In my discussion on Mommaas' framework in my theoretical framework I pointed out that while the characteristics Mommaas mentioned were based on case studies of cultural clusters, some of the characteristics describe a more institutionalized organization. I have chosen to therefore put them in the 'institutionalized' column. It is important to not see the columns as two absolutes, but as a gradation that can say something about the degree to which these characteristics are present in my case studies.

When looking at the characteristics in the separate categories, notably, some authors are spread out over most of them, while others are concentrated in a few categories. Grodach approaches the organizations with quite a broad scope, looking at it from a spatial, creative economy urban planning perspective. It is therefore no surprise that the characteristics he mentions are in the function, audience, and spatial categories, as well as (artistic) content programming. However, the financial, relationships/network, and organizational framework is not discussed. This gap is filled by Lijster et al.

In addition, some categories have very few characteristics as opposed to others. This overview will be the framework that I will use when analyzing the interviews. I am curious to see whether any knowledge gaps can be filled with the information from the interviews, as well as what the differences and similarities are between the case studies when it comes to the representation of specific categories.

The next few pages include my theoretical tables.

ORGANIZATIONAL (FRAMEWORK/APPROACH)	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small, informal organizations that Lack strict and hierarchical organizational structure (Lijster et al.) • No long-term strategic plans but a shared creation of general organizational value frameworks (Lijster et al.) • Room for experimentation and individual initiatives (Lijster et al.) • No clear management, irregular meetings between participants and local governments and taking a responsibility for the collective maintenance and promotion of the sites (Mommaas) • Adhocracy: flexible adhoc character allows for ability to deal with constantly changing conditions and circumstances (Mommaas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big, formal organization with clear hierarchical organizational structure (Lijster et al.) • Strong, central management team (Mommaas) • Long-term strategic plans based on a set formal, vision. Often accompanied by extensive and detailed policy documents and year plans. (Lijster et al.) • High levels of professionalization in management through role and organization structures (Kangas and Vestheim) • Fair Practice Code, Code Diversiteit & Inclusie and Governance Code Cultuur are taken into account (van Meerkerk). • Salaried employment and stable work • Organizations that have been functioning over long periods of time (Kengas and Vastheim)

FUNCTION (ACTIVITY/GOALS/AIMS)	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on multisectorality, cultural hybridity and crossovers (Mommaas) • Diversity of creative activity: work, production, presentation and consumption (Mommaas, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk, Dovey et al., de Zwart and Musch) • Diversity in variants: co-working studio, centre, network, cluster, online platform, alternative (Dovey et al.) • Stimulate new talent and creativity (Grodach) • Facilitate mentoring and peer(-to-peer) learning (Grodach) • Facilitate building artistic and business skills (Grodach) • Venue for outreach and community involvement (Grodach) • Projects with a bottom-up approach which have developed from a contingent coming together of vernacular tactics (Mommaas) • Projects and services that address global challenges and/or community issues (Lijster et al.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on specific arts and/or design sector (Mommaas) • Monofunctional cluster organised around concentration of conventional consumption and/or presentation functions (Momaas) • Projects which have developed as part of a conscious 'top-down' planning strategy tending to the input of local administration (Mommaas) • Can be easily identified as theatre, opera, library, museum, archive, gallery or other traditional cultural space (Kangas and Vestheim)

(ARTISTIC) CONTENTS /PROGRAMMING	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cultural democracy: broad(er) programming, from traditional to experimental and from low to high art, from amateur to professional (de Zwart and Musch, Grodach) ● Diversity disciplines (Dovey et al., Mommaas) ● Do not primarily refer to the (national) artistic canon (Lijster et al.) ● No permanent collection or resident company/artists (Grodach) ● Work closely with local artists (Grodach) ● Social justice tradition (Hadley) ● ‘Bottom-up’ practices of selecting and evaluating culture (Janssen and Verboord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programming is established months if not years ahead, little room for flexibility. ● Arts lover tradition (Hadley) ● Importance is put on the roles and opinions of cultural mediators, which results in the programming of artists whose art has been legitimized through these mediators (Janssen and Verboord) ● Conservative attitude towards innovation and new ideas in artistic and cultural content (Kangas and Vestheim)

RELATIONSHIPS/NETWORK	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Importance is put on horizontal networks as opposed to vertical ones (Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, Dovey et al.) ● Rhizome-like network structures that emerge and operate outside of traditional infrastructure (Lijster et al.) ● Networked, transnational relationships (Lijster et al., Joye) ● Knowledge and information exchange / mutual social support with network (Pratt, Lijster et al., Joye) ● Temporary alliances with likeminded organizations sharing resources, knowledge, goals and ideas (Lijster et al.) ● Embedded in local (often urban) setting and therefore equipped to sense the needs and concerns of specific communities (Lijster et al.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Affiliated with/member of a (national umbrella) association protecting the interests of organizations in the same discipline ● Importance is put on vertical networks as opposed to horizontal ones (Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, Dovey et al.)

SPATIAL	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in (former) industrial area/building (Musch and de Zwart, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk) • Self-consciously position themselves towards the margins of the city, maintaining something of an alternative, bohemian atmosphere. (Mommaas) • Flexible and multifunctional spaces may at once serve as performance space, gallery, art school, incubator, resource center, and outreach center (Grodach) • Open and flexible space, constantly adapting to changes in the wider cultural and urban field (Mommaas) • Physical co-location of activities (Pratt, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk) • Serve as Neighborhood anchors or amenities (Grodach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situated more towards the centre of the city. It is there that they are most able to link in with the flow of cultural tourists (Mommaas) • Space is static and rarely used for multiple purposes. (Grodach) • Permanent physical location, often explicitly build for the purpose of the organization.

AUDIENCE	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No wide audience but community-based, focusing on the specific neighborhood or city in which they are located (Grodach) • Opportunities for marginalized groups to participate in the arts (Grodach) • Audience is active, may participate and co-create (Hadley, Grigar) • Cultural Democracy: bottom-up approach: communities produce and communicate their own forms of culture, hegemonic culture is not prioritized (Hadley). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is wide, broad audience with a national scope, no subgroups are prioritized (Grodach) • Democratization of culture: 'official' culture, typically represented by large and well-funded institutions, is made accessible to non-participating communities, top-down approach (Hadley, Grigar) • Audience is passive, silent and contemplative in their reception (Hadley)

FINANCES	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely more on own networks and forms of funding and crowdsourcing (Boswinkel and van Meerkerk) • Financial independence means: Relying on public support as a passing stage towards a more private/independent existence (Mommaas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial independence means: Remaining public sector projects (Mommaas) • Receive a large proportion of the yearly cultural local and/or national funds and budgets (Kangas and Vestheim)
Hybrid	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • hybrid public-private models, based on a mixture of resources and management relations (public funding, entrance fees, lease contracts, sponsorship money, heritage funds) (Momaas) 	

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

As of January 2022, Nijmegen has 179,100 inhabitants, which makes it the tenth biggest city in the Netherlands. In 2019, the city council adopted the *Cultuurvisie: Groei!* The three main points are firstly: Art and Culture for and by everyone, secondly: Increasing the attractiveness of Nijmegen through culture, and thirdly: Space for innovation and creativity (Gemeente Nijmegen). A culture subsidy scheme is tasked with the implementation of the cultural vision and has six categories with one of them being the basis, a group of five cultural institutions that the city of Nijmegen considers their foundational cultural institutions (“Subsidieregeling”). These are pop podium Doornroosje, cultural center De Lindenberg, arthouse and cultural podium LUX, museum Het Valkhof-Kam, the library Openbare Bibliotheek Gelderland Zuid, and city theatre and concert hall Stadsschouwburg Nijmegen & Concertgebouw De Vereeniging.

In 2019, consultancy firm Blueyard was commissioned by the Nijmegen city council to conduct an exploration of 'the state of culture' in the city. In their report, they note fifteen observations, I will briefly mention some of them. They write that Nijmegen “is especially strong in (pop) music festivals and film” and that “the city is also strong in literature and language projects” (3). In contrast, they note that the city is less strong in the visual arts, specifically contemporary and that the initiatives that do exist mostly operate in the margins or a very narrow niche (ibid.). Blueyard also indicated that a lot happens on a small scale, but a broad 'base'. They point out that as a result, a lot of initiatives remain under the radar and do not grow further (ibid.).

The conceptual model that I have discussed previously will serve as a base for analyzing my case studies. Nijmegen has plenty of organizations one could consider non-traditional. I paid attention to not select too similar case studies to ensure I would have a

broader perspective on what can be non-traditional and avoid blind spots. I contacted four organizations, of which three replied to my request. These three are organizations of which I had personally attended events of, being The Mansion¹³, P-Art, and Hubert. The Mansion differs from P-Art and Hubert as they focus on art forms originating from subcultures. They have a strong emphasis on the societal and cultural history tied to these subcultures in addition to a general social mission. P-Art's main event is linked to a global event and organization, and focuses on education, public space, and has a strong focus on working together with a lot of people. Lastly, Hubert is more of a cultural breeding ground and combines more commercial endeavors with an artistic mission.

Since I had already met people of these organizations before, I scheduled the meetings informally¹⁴. For The Mansion and P-Art, I interviewed two people at the same time, whereas for Hubert I only interviewed one person. The interviews were semi-structured and conducted in Dutch. In preparation, I created a list of open-ended questions I wanted to ask. In general, the interviews followed the structure of my question, but not all questions were explicitly asked, as they had sometimes been answered previously. Some questions were asked as a follow-up on an answer the interviewee(s) had given for a different question. Occasionally, I asked follow-up questions. The interviews were held on location, which allowed me to also briefly make note of the surroundings. This resulted in field notes that are added as an appendix. The interviews lasted 50 minutes, 70 minutes, and 116 minutes respectively, and were all recorded and transcribed.

- Can you briefly introduce yourself and the organization?
- Can you elaborate on your role in the organization?

¹³ One of my interviewees at The Mansion is someone I know personally. We have discussed their work, what they do and their vision on culture on numerous occasions. I have not used any statements or other information that I have not been given directly in the interview or through The Mansion's publicly accessible information. However, these previous experiences have undoubtedly, unconsciously influenced my interpretation and therefore analysis of the data. Nevertheless, I have been careful to support the claims I make in my analysis by referring to what was said during the interviews and other tangible data.

¹⁴ Through WhatsApp

- How would you describe the organization?
- What does a typical day/week look like at your organization?
- What does your organization do? What kind of activities does the organization organize?
- Can you tell a bit about how the organization came to be?
- What is the organizational structure like? Who else works for the organization, and can you tell us about their tasks/responsibilities?
- Can you tell a bit about your audience? Who falls under them, what stands out?
- How did your organization end up in this place?
- Has the organization been in other places?
- What does the ideal location look like for your organization?
- With which groups, authorities, organizations and people do you have contact? How does this contact go? In other words, what does your network look like?
- What are your most important contacts? Why?
- Are there contacts that could be better or that you miss?
- What do you have contact with X about / what does contact with X look like?
- Looking back at what the organization was like in the first year, what stands out compared to today?
- Can you talk a little about where you see the organization in 1, 5 and 10 years?

After transcribing my interviews, I started coding. Part of the goal of this research is to see whether the characteristics I have distilled from the literature on non-traditional organizations match the characteristics of my case studies. *The theoretical model* I created from my theoretical chapter left me with seven categories. I used these categories as a base for coding my interviews. I, therefore, started with deductive coding based on the categories. In the coding manual for qualitative researchers, Saldaña distinguishes two ways to code excerpts from data. He discusses “lumper” coding, where bigger lumps of data get attributed to a code, and “splitter” coding, where the data is split into smaller codable moments (24). My interviews are all long and include a lot of anecdotes. The eventual results of the coding need to give a clear overview of the important aspects of the case study for each category. I am not interested in uncovering small details or the underlying power dynamics in the discourse. The

context in which my interviewees talk about subjects that fall under the categories is most important. For these reasons, the bulk of my coding was lump coded. The first coding was done on paper, attributing a color to each category. I marked the excerpts and phrases that say or imply something about or refer to each category. I went through my interviews twice and copied all the pieces of text I marked and pasted them into a document under their respective case study and category. This resulted in an overview of what each interview(duo) said about every category. In addition, I also kept another document in which I noted down some initial things that struck me for each interview. During the second read, I also added some quotes to the document that, to me, indicated something about the values present in each interview.

When the document was finished, I started analyzing each case study, one category at a time. I read all the pieces of text I had collected for the category and analyzed them. I focused on themes and patterns that emerged from the selection. I rearranged the pieces in groups so that I ended up with groups of excerpts and phrases that together formed sub-themes or indicated a pattern. Some phrases ended up in multiple sub-themes or pattern clusters. Then, I used these as key points in my analysis. I did this for all seven categories for each case study. In addition, I went through my field notes and incorporated these findings into the applicable categories. Lastly, I checked the list of things that struck me and the quotes to refer to values and checked if they contributed to the points I discussed for each category and incorporated them if needed.

Chapter 4: Analysis

In the following paragraphs I will discuss the findings of my case studies, based on the defined categories. Afterward, I will discuss similarities and differences between the case studies, and how I would range them between non-traditional and institutionalized, based on the specifics of each characteristic in my conceptual model. Simultaneously, I will discuss possible characteristics that have not been incorporated into my *theoretical model* as well as tensions that I came across.

1. P-Art

Short Introduction

The Foundation P-Art is a non-profit organization that seeks to inspire the public through various national and international art projects. On their website, they indicate that they aim to bring art to the public through artistic events, community art projects, performances, and placemaking in public spaces. P-Art collaborates with cultural institutions, schools, businesses, healthcare institutions, shops, and restaurants in the cities where they carry out their projects. They organize workshops, art festivals, art education for schools, murals, symposiums, lectures, and more. According to their website, the ‘P’ in P-Art stands for their focal points: People, Public, Performance, Placemaking, and Professionalism. Their biggest event is The Big Draw¹⁵, which they use to connect people through low-threshold drawing, community art, performances, and placemaking.

¹⁵ The Big Draw is not an original idea. It was first organized in 2000 by the Campaign for Drawing in London and has since spread to many big cities worldwide. P-Art represents and organizes the Dutch delegation.

Organizational Framework and Approach

When it comes to the organization framework of P-Art, a few things are notable, namely their team, functions, internal cooperation, planning, and organizational stability. The interviewees use active language and focus mainly on who works for P-Art and what the employees' tasks are. Person A suggests showing me a PowerPoint presentation "on how the organization is structured". They define P-Art as a collaborative organization in 'swarm' form, consisting of two organizers, independent professionals, volunteers, and the board. While the interviewees are both called organizers on the PowerPoint, they both define themselves differently. Person A presents themselves as "officially" director, indicating that they used to work as international business manager and they are the contact person on the website. While I am told that "it's not that we have a creative director and business director", person A clearly has taken on the role of business director as confirmed by tasks such as writing plans, requesting subsidies, contacting cultural partners in advance, financial administration, and preparatory work. The business director¹⁶ emphasizes that they have no trouble with the organizational part, saying: "We can just arrange a lot of things. A lot of business things, commercial things are no problem for us." Person B mentions that they are co-organizer¹⁷, and says they mostly do the volunteer-coordination, education, and creative aspects. The co-organizer comes into play when plans are rolled out. They take care of "lots of cross-year projects ... projects that also come to life in-between." This gives an indication that they are quite flexible in their plans, which is supported by the remark that "one year we do [things], another year we don't, ... we really just do what we feel like." Project plans are also created in collaboration with cultural partners or artists. The only long-term strategic plan, as opposed to the event plan, is the renovation of their space. They focus mostly on resources, referring to the possibilities it brings; flexible workspaces and a rentable meeting room to cover costs.

¹⁶ For the sake of legibility, I will refer to person A as the business director.

¹⁷ For the sake of legibility, I will refer to person B as the co-organizer.

Even though the interviewees indicate they have defined tasks and responsibilities they say that: “everyone does what is necessary when it is necessary.” The business director tells me they can do everything together, and complement each other’s skills. Lastly, they briefly go over work stability. Nobody has a salary, even though for the business director it is a full-time job. They also say that when it comes to the independent professionals, there are no set hours. They specify that they fly them in and out when it is needed, based on the project. Volunteers are mostly deployed during The Big Draw festival.

Overall, P-Art has a very small core team, with one person doing most of the business side of things. Although there is a clear structure within the organization, as shown by the PowerPoint, there is room for deviation. This makes sense given the flexibility the independent professionals and volunteers bring and the lack of formally established employment. Lastly, the duality of having a clear structure and defined tasks while simultaneously not providing a stable, consistent income through a salary system is noteworthy.

Function, Activities, Goals and Aims

The core vision of P-Art is “making art visible and accessible to everyone.” Vital to this is organizing activities in the public space. While they briefly show me their official vision, mission, and goal, the interviewees focus on their projects and initiatives. They realize their vision by connecting and facilitating the public, artists, and the artistic field as a whole¹⁸. This is evidenced by the different projects they have coordinated such as the Big Draw Festival - which combines art and performances in the city (presentation) with workshops (participation) - or Mode Monster¹⁹ and performances during NEC soccer matches. Children

¹⁸ The category of function is due to P-Art’s vision, closely linked to network and audience, so unsurprisingly, when talking about what P-Art does, a lot of target groups are mentioned as well as people and organizations they partner with. The specifics will be discussed in more depth in their respective paragraphs.

¹⁹ translated as “Fashion Monster”

and teens are part of their focus group, offering them workshops that are either held outside or at the more established cultural organizations of the city, as they feel this lowers the threshold to visit these places later. Additionally, they will²⁰ target corporate businesses. Firstly, by renting out a meeting space that allows them to brainstorm with artists. Their second project focuses on installing artrooms, or “pr playgrounds”, within corporate businesses, so employees can relax or get inspired. With all the projects and initiatives they (co-)organize, they exchange artists between cities, and across country borders, effectually broadening opportunities for artists. Aside from initiatives that focus on artistic participation, they also started a trajectory to teach artists and cultural entrepreneurs skills to become commercially successful. In addition, they included flexible workplaces for cultural entrepreneurs in their renovation plan. The function of their location will serve multiple functions: work, consumption, production, and presentation, while also serving as a place for “experimentation.”

They talk about past, present, and future projects. They are not discussed in any particular order, which suggests they go with the flow and do not necessarily find it important to have a set planning, but rather do things organically, as the opportunities or ideas present themselves. In addition, future projects, regardless of whether they have already confirmed details with partners, are discussed as “we are going to.” This shows a strong belief and confidence in their organization and ability to do things. In addition, this suggests they have either rarely encountered failing projects or do not necessarily dwell on things that do not work out. There is only one occasion where they explicitly discuss doubt; namely, a project with an institute for the blind for which getting funding seemed to be quite hard.

²⁰ Both projects are still in the process of being set up.

(Artistic) Content and Programming

P-Art focuses on participation, and less on solely presentation. It is therefore not surprising that they do not focus on who or what they program specifically, or go into detail about their artistic contents and vision. They say that for The Big Draw, they work with themes; an international theme and a national theme or city. The theme of inclusivity and diversity seems present. They mention an inclusive model drawing club, an educative curriculum called “power of otherness”, a symposium for female comic artists, and initiatives to make drawing for blind people more interesting.

The discipline of drawing is most prominent within their organization, evidenced by the fact they have experts in specific niches, such as animation and manga. However, drawing “also means [drawing] with sounds or with dance or with light, performances, all kinds of things that are tangentially related to drawing.” Fashion is another important discipline they mention as, aside from Mode Monster, they emphasize it through their NEC initiative. They plan for three well-known drummers to play during the competition, remarking “that’s art too.” In addition, they are thinking of connecting the Mode Monster project as well by doing something with NEC clothes.

As mentioned before, P-Art’s vision is to make art accessible. In order to do that, they recognize that this affects what art you show when. In the context of the NEC initiative, they remark that “you go looking for low-threshold art, because of course it’s not possible to arrive there with high art.”

From their answers, I can deduce that they see art as a vehicle for connection. For example, they mention two instances where they brought children and teens together with the elderly through graffiti and wire and nail drawing techniques. This connection can also be seen more broadly, facilitating the connection between people and art, and artists and people, which I talked about previously.

Relationships and Network

P-Art's network is large and they indicate that they easily "find" people. Their network can be categorized into cultural partners, educational institutions, and artists, but also inner-city entrepreneurs, corporate businesses, and sponsors. When talking about the independent professionals they work with, it stands out that, aside from mentioning what the professionals do for P-Art, my interviewees also highlight the importance of the resulting network.

A notable aspect of P-Art's network is that they go beyond borders and do so deliberately. They cross city borders and effectively create one big national network. This is also this year's theme for The Big Draw²¹ which will: "connect all cities in the Netherlands from Nijmegen." It does not stop there, their network also reaches international levels. This is partly due to The Big Draw being an international festival, but also independent efforts fueled by the conviction that there is an "advantage of not staying within frameworks for programming [as] the whole world is at your feet." They do not go into detail about what the international projects specifically entail content-wise, but emphasize the importance for the artists: "exchanges from there to here and from here to there, so then people also end up here in Japan and in Korea."

P-Art is aware of its dependence on its network saying that "it is important that your network is also healthy." Aiding their network is one of their driving factors. They noticed seeing cultural entrepreneurs and artists in their network struggle with money and thus organized an initiative to teach them economic skills. In addition, they bring children to more established institutions to help "cultural institutions to be seen and then lower the threshold [for the children] to go." The exchange of networks between cities and countries is another prime example of network aid.

²¹ The theme for The Big Draw 2023 is "connect the dots".

Spatial

The interviewees indicate multiple times that they find it important to program initiatives outside, in public spaces so “other people passing by can join.” Given that they program for the general public, public space thus works in their favor. They also note that for projects with neighborhoods outside the city center, they go to those neighborhoods, or do the projects in nature. They also program at other cultural institutions.

Their own location is also important. It is located in the city center, in a building that, based on my observation, had been an abandoned warehouse before P-Art moved in. When I visited them, the location was still not inhabitable, with growing weeds, and no plumbing or heating. I saw a few sofas, disco lights left over from a party, and one big table with some chairs around it, as well as a large piece of paper with doodles, serving as tablecloth. The inside of the building was either removed at one point or never finished. A big, glass dome front serves as the only natural light source and as an exposition wall for passersby. The interviewees tell me about the renovation plans that they had handed in to the municipality just days earlier. They say this will be the place where they are going to experiment, program, make new educational curricula, think of new activities, and hold international expositions and performances. They note that the reason for this new location is that they needed a space to place the International Dutch Drawing Center. Thus, when their plans are accepted the renovations can start to create the multifunctional, flexible space they have in mind.

The Audience

P-Art focuses on reaching as many people as possible. They note that, in addition, they have additional target groups they organize things for specifically. This focus may change now and then, but in the interview, they mention children, young people, the elderly, blind people, and specific neighborhoods outside the city center. My interviewees indicate that the reason they

started The Big Draw in The Netherlands was that they experienced its reach in another country. They mention that the nature of the event ensured that you can reach everyone in the city. As a result, they find it important to organize outside. Specifically for The Big Draw, they want to keep it as accessible as possible, by having the event be walk-in rather than ticket-based. This is emphasized when discussing the impact Covid-19 had on the spontaneity of visitors. For them, the attraction of programming outside is that people just walking by are easily intrigued to stay and watch or participate in workshops. Therefore, they reach people that are not specifically art lovers and who would not buy a ticket in advance. They stress the goal of reaching “people who normally do not come into contact with art.” Another example of this is the previously mentioned collaboration with NEC, where they will present art to the soccer crowd.

Notably, they seem to deliberately bring art into the habitat of their audience or meet them where the audience is comfortable; The Big Draw in the city, the NEC project in the soccer stadium, people outside the city center are met in their neighborhood, the pr-playground project in their offices and children in their after-school care. This seems to work well for them, as they point out that programming for the big public, with a few target groups, has always been their thing.

Finances

The interviewees do not put a lot of emphasis on the financial aspects of P-Art. They mention that they get their income through subsidies and sponsoring. They get subsidized by the municipality, the province, and the culture participation fund. In addition, they are sponsored in the form of art materials. They also raise money through crowdsourcing and from the cultural partners that they work with. The business director specifies that they write all the funding requests, as they have noticed that writing from passion has proven to work better

than outsourcing this task. The interviewees do not explicitly or implicitly mention that they struggle with funding. They do, however, indicate that the decision to have the meeting room in their new location to be rented out to businesses is necessary to afford the rent of the location. In the organizational framework section, I discussed that P-Art has a clear organizational structure, but that they do not work with salaries as most of the professionals they work with are called upon when they are needed. Both the business director and the co-organizer give no indication or mention that they like that setup or that they would like to see it differently. When talking about their expenses they note the outgoing money goes “of course the artists.”

As previously mentioned, P-Art places a lot of importance on its network, as evidenced by among other things the financial independence workshop for cultural entrepreneurs and artists. The business director tells me that they were allowed to give it for free a few times and then they will pass it on to other cities “so then everyone benefits again.” This again underlines that P-Art sees its network as part of the organization, and therefore also sees the importance of sharing resources. Lastly, they remark that once the renovations have started they should work on a “friends of club.”

2. Hubert

Short introduction

Hubert was founded in 2019 and is located in neighborhood district De Hazenkamp in Nijmegen. On their website, they write that they are a “meeting place for makers and audiences.” In addition, they consider themselves as a cultural breeding ground “that makes art and culture available and accessible through various projects” and therefore “aim to make art and culture play a bigger role in everyone's life.” Hubert has a large cafe with dining

options and hosts a variety of events. Examples include parties and festivals, markets, lectures, screenings, music, and more. Hubert has the WIEBERT initiative, which “develops and organises all kinds of shows in various art disciplines.” They do this by facilitating the “talent development of young, regional makers, giving these makers a stage” and guiding them “in concept development and performance, by providing space and technology and financial support.” Aside from these projects, they recently became responsible for the Nijmeegse Kunstnacht²².

Organizational Framework and Approach

Of all the categories, my interviewee for Hubert spends the most time discussing Hubert’s organizational framework. This makes sense as they are in the middle of a transition from “unorganized and ad-hoc to a bit more organized.” Professionalizing is mentioned a few times. The reasons for this transition are attributed to the growth of the organization and the added work overburdening everyone. Additionally, more people involved, made for an increase in contact moments and things to remember. They, therefore, argue that “for everything to be remembered properly and run effectively”, they need to become more professional.” With this transition, there will also be changes in the hierarchy of the organization which “has always been very flat.” They explain that they have noticed the need for more distance between the executive team and the strategic team. The interviewee spends some time discussing how they foresee this change. They illustrate that they were mostly focusing on short-term task execution, and only occasionally long-term planning, paired with a lot of meetings. Ideally, they would like to work with cycles of a meeting followed by two weeks of task execution. It makes sense that the person I interviewed showed a lot of insight and went into detail about the specifics of how they work and want to work, as they are

²² Nijmeegse Kunstnacht is an arts festival that takes place every year in September.

responsible for the organization's strategy. What is also notable is that they use a lot of jargon like; "8 FTE, "full-time", "main company," "governance model," "supervisory board," "body," "marketing," "business plan," "strategy," "operational" and "objectives." This demonstrates the focus on professionalization and strategic plans for the organization.

My interviewee mentions they prefer having "people who work permanently with us." The reason for this is twofold; they see it as an investment in the people and as a way to ensure stability among the team. Occasionally, they work with freelancers. Having salaried employees cost money, interestingly, the reason I was given for only speaking with one person, is that it was a busy time and they did not have the hours for another person to join the interview. It seems they pay attention to ensuring their employees do not overwork. Aside from briefly explaining the roles of the three founders, and that they have approximately 8 to 12 people working for them, the interviewee does not go into detail about the specific tasks of the employees. Although the note that they "always worked pretty flat and everyone brings something in and everyone is always there" in addition to the previous sections suggest that their tasks are not clearly defined.

Entrepreneurship is brought up a few times. They mention that they have a main enterprise Hubert group, with foundation Hubert, and foundation Kunstnacht. My interviewee is very clear that they see themselves as a more entrepreneurial organization. They specify a clear distinction between the enterprise, which does the commercial part, mainly Horeca, and their foundation which focuses on the cultural aspect. The category of finances comes up quite regularly with the organizational parts, especially financial stability. They explain that funds and subsidy systems are not set up for long-term support of organizations like theirs. This creates uncertainty, both for the organization and the employees, as they have to reinvent themselves every two years in hopes of acquiring the next two years of financial support.

They feel there is a lack of recognition and therefore livelihood for non-traditional organizations²³.

Lastly, I want to point out my interviewee's awareness of the zeitgeist. When asked about the future of Hubert, they say they would need to rethink in thirty years what the zeitgeist is then and adjust. While this was said about the far future, they are in motion and dynamic at present. This is evidenced by the constant change of activities they organize and the way they talk about their space, as open and full of potential.

Function, Activities, Goals and Aims

In the context of a younger audience, my interviewee indicate they started Hubert because they noticed a “hole” in what the cultural sector has to offer in Nijmegen. They mention that the main goal of Hubert is to accessibly offer art and culture to a broad audience by immersing them in new experiences. The interviewee emphasizes wanting to keep it as accessible as possible, yet does not explicitly specify what this accessibility entails. They reiterate this by talking about how through the Kunstnacht they try to make art and culture “tangible and perceptible throughout the city, for a very broad audience.” I argue that to my interviewee, accessibility is about creating an environment where people do not necessarily go to experience art and culture, but where they can come across it, without the pressures and expectations a museum or theater brings. My interviewee affirms this idea stating they want to introduce people to the sector, by, for instance, giving them a “small experience” while drinking “an accessible²⁴ beer”. Food and drink play a big part in providing this low-threshold atmosphere, evidenced by the big café-terrace they have, as well as the parties and festivals they organize and facilitate. In addition, the interviewee notes that they will open a restaurant that will also function as a café, coffee bar, and nightclub. When talking

²³ Since entrepreneurship and finances are so closely linked, I will further discuss this aspect in the part on finances.

²⁴ The interviewee mentions a ‘toegankelijk biertje’, referring to their audience's comfort zone of having a drink as part of their normal leisure time.

about what they organize, my interviewee tends to use diminutives²⁵, that roughly translate to “small experience, small parties/festivals, small markets, small tastings, small concerts, small things.” This is interesting as these activities are not necessarily small in scale, yet using these words add to the lowkey vibe that fits the accessible and “not too serious” image my interviewee wants for the organization.

Aside from the regular food and drink opportunities Hubert also organizes smaller events such as clothing, record, and plant markets as well as tastings. They also used to have a neighborhood garden and allow neighbors to organize events at their location. In addition, they note that they also organize activities in collaboration with partners²⁶. The example they give is a buddy project that links refugees and citizens through a dinner. The projects they organize are thus not strictly artistic or cultural. However, my interviewee distinguishes and notes that their programming consists of twelve activities a year, with four being visual arts and four theater. Furthermore, they highlight the importance of making their own programming. Their art project Wiebert has the function of guiding and supporting beginning local artists in presenting their art to the public as well as offering residencies during which these makers can use Hubert as their workplace.

Interestingly, my interviewee argues that they are a cultural organization with a well-being objective without expanding on the specifics of these objectives aside from mentioning their collaboration with societal organizations and the societal themes²⁷ in their cultural projects.

(Artistic) Content and Programming

As established before Hubert does not specialize in solely artistic or cultural activities or a specific discipline. They also do not focus on setting a specific standard for the artistic

²⁵The interviewee uses the -(k)je version of the Dutch words, for example “ervaringkje”

²⁶ Partners are part of their network and will be further discussed in the network section.

²⁷ This will be discussed in more detail in the section on content and programming.

programming they have as evidenced by the spectrum of events ranging from festivals to expositions. They mention art projects, expositions, theater, and (pop)concerts when talking about the foundation Hubert and are also responsible for the art festival Kunstnacht. This broad range is in line with wanting to keep their events accessible, by offering events with an artistic touch and specific art events. My interviewee clarifies that they do not want classical, boring expositions lasting a few weeks with a handful of visitors a day. Instead, they opt for a one-day show or incorporate the exposition in events such as parties.

My interviewee mentions they want to show art that excites, that fits with their organization, specifically current social themes such as gender issues, mental health, and homelessness. They are inspired by the multimedia platform Spuiten en Slikken, known for uncovering taboos. They do not elaborate on their programmer(s) but the website gives more information on Wiebert, which focuses on young, local makers. Wiebert consists of shows and residencies. The shows function as a stage for creators looking for an opportunity to experiment and develop within their discipline or try something outside it. The residencies are presented on the website as short working periods on Hubert's property, in which a different maker will do an art intervention each time. Their website explicitly states artists can apply themselves, which suggests a more bottom-up approach when it comes to deciding whom to program. However, during the interview, this process is not mentioned.

Relationships and Network

My interviewee notes that their network consists mostly of organizations in the cultural field and event sector as well as the social field. Through the Kunstnacht, Hubert knows the whole city and cultural field. There are a few organizations that are briefly named such as Buddy to Buddy, foundation Quiet, de Vlegel, Subcultuur, Terra, Doornroosje, and Paak. This selection encompasses both societal organizations, major cultural players, and small cafés.

One collaboration with another organization is elaborated on. My interviewee says a bigger established organization had contacted them because they wanted to appeal more to a younger audience. They noted they were asked to think of programming but noticed that the organization in question had a hard time letting go of their own organizational framework and standards. While they had asked Hubert to bring new insight and help them out, it was hard for them to be open to Hubert's approach. At the same time, they like working together with bigger, established organizations, as they can learn a lot from them in terms of the organization's governance and structure. Lastly, my interviewee briefly mentions encounters they had with people from the municipality. The interviewee is not overtly positive or negative about these experiences but rather discusses these in a matter-of-fact, neutral manner. In general, little time is spent talking about Hubert's network, even when discussing other aspects. The person that is mentioned as taking mostly care of the network did not participate in the interview, which could explain why it is not brought up a lot.

Spatial

When looking for a location for Hubert, my interviewee notes they saw a free spot in a "dilapidated warehouse." They remember other people asking if they could rent part of it, but they wanted to avoid a division of plots, as a fixed atmosphere was not what they were looking for. Instead, they opted to start a café for income.

Hubert is situated on an industrial site in a residential neighborhood outside the city center. Its location is not immediately apparent from the street, requiring one to walk on the site, pass a few buildings, and turn a corner before seeing containers brightened with graffiti, indicating the existence of a creative location. The containers surround a terrace made up of a few mismatched tables and chairs, wooden reels, and a few decorative pieces. A tarp covers a smaller section of the terrace. I visited on a Tuesday afternoon, and there were no visitors.

The building, is a big open, mostly empty hangar with a graffitied old public transport bus, plants, some disco lights, a bar, and big decorative plant chandeliers. There is a stage, which is converted into another terrace. The furniture is a mixture of everything. My interviewee suggested walking to another, warmed building. The other building has a small office space where one other Hubert employee was working. My interviewee refers again to structural recognition, mentioning the heating issue a few times. They mention the image that people in organizations like Hubert walk around with big coats, and state that it is because they do not have heating. They avoid financial investments in the space as they do not know if they can stay for a long time. At the same time, they recognize the concessions structural support might bring, as financial support often comes with terms and conditions that could jeopardize an organization's identity.

When discussing their ideal space, my interviewee mentions the city theatre. In their opinion, it is the city's building and should therefore cater to the whole city, not just a select group. Aside from the events they organize themselves, they also allow local residents to organize events in their space. In addition, they mention that during the lockdown they worked on a community garden. What their organization needs in the future depends on how they grow. If they become an established organization, they need space in a prominent location, a creative office, with contemporary resources like heating and decent coffee. If they stay in a location like a hangar, they feel they run the risk of getting stuck and losing their dynamism and flexibility.

My interviewee is convinced that the location influences their visitors. They call Hubert a hidden space, a bit more sheltered, with less of a controlling body, something they note was felt during the covid-regulations. "Maybe you are not necessarily allowed more, but the moment there are no eyes on you, you may feel that you are allowed to be a bit freer,"

says my interviewee. They observe that people who visit from the center or normally wear a blouse or dress-shirt at work, dress a bit more loosely here.

The Audience

The interviewee extensively discusses the audience. They mostly focus on a younger audience and people who normally do not necessarily gravitate towards artistic or cultural activities, such as festival visitors. In addition, they also try to attract what my interviewee calls “more difficult target audiences” such as the elderly or people with a different background. The goal is to bring them all together. They note that, while a lot of organizations focus on one specific target group, Hubert tries to have a broader scope and aims for more diversity by having a broad range of activities with different target audiences. They see that through these events, those different people find their way to their regular café and meet in that way.

Overall, their audience is on average 27 years old, with the bulk of the visitors being between 25 and 35, with relatively more women. My interviewee mentions these are often people who are looking for new things and who are in the prime of their life. Aside from the average age range, their events are also visited by younger and older people. In addition, the interviewee mentions they have a lot of visitors who come by themselves intending to meet other people.

The interviewee has a more personal philosophy toward the visitors, mentioning they notice quite a few people who often return and that they try to talk to them and get to know them. Through doing so, they met an older man who now has a volunteer job with Hubert. In addition, they mention couples who have met through Hubert and started families. My interviewee remarks that it is beautiful how they can impact people's lives in that way and emphasize the importance of this bond with visitors. Aside from regular visitors, they also

talk about the importance of having community support, as they are located in the middle of the neighborhood. While they do not explicitly facilitate neighborhood drinks, they “try to invite neighbors to the regular programming and are open to things they want to organize.”

Finances

As discussed in the organizational section, the interviewee focuses a lot on entrepreneurship, and in the spatial section, structural recognition was mentioned. The interviewee has studied business economics and philosophy, they say this allows them to strive for growth but with a deeper goal instead of solely focusing on profit maximization. It is therefore no surprise that the theme of finances comes up throughout the whole interview.

Getting funding from the state funds is a challenge due to their multidisciplinary character, with four theater and four visual art events there is too little to apply for a performing arts or visual arts fund. They express that the categorization within the cultural sector "gets in their way" and insist that it might be time to create a new category. Instead of focusing on one aspect like a more traditional organization, this category could be for more overarching organizations that typically also have room for different initiatives, both within and outside the cultural field. They feel this should change both nationally and locally at the level of the municipality, reflecting the zeitgeist better. From the municipality, they would like more clarity on what this new category of organization would entail. The reason why the interviewee wants this is because of the financial insecurities they deal with in the current system. They do not have the assurance that they will receive subsidies after their current two-year funding. They mention a system where, like more established organizations, they receive subsidies and are evaluated every few years to check if they still meet the standards that they need to receive the subsidies, instead of the other way around. In addition, they argue that while there is always some fund they could work with and get, this means they

spend a lot of time looking at and reinventing themselves as an organization every two years. Concretely, for Hubert, the insecurity of financial support means it is harder to offer stability to their employees and create sustainable long-term plans. The focus on this uncertainty makes sense given they are aiming for a more organized and stable organizational framework.

This lack of structural recognition and resources also affects their space. The interviewee argues that if they would know that they can stay in their location for the coming decade, they could make a business plan to be able to afford renovations and earn back the invested money. However, they also realize that this would put pressure on their programming and its flexibility, as they need to plan well to be able to pay off the renovations. While the interviewee expresses the downside of such a change, they do not seem to be completely opposed to it, stating that "we should not be afraid that the informal will disappear... we will just have to think again, what is the zeitgeist of today?"

The interviewee expresses their wish for more stability and professionalization in their organization. Yet, they notice the tension this creates between the flexibility and low-key, accessible atmosphere they pride themselves on and the aversion they have towards things that are set in their ways. I question whether this focus on professionalization is more so something they feel is necessary to get financial stability and recognition, rather than something they really want for the organization. They react to this tension by looking for financial stability by being more entrepreneurial. For Hubert, this meant creating a company under the Hubert organization that solely focuses on the drink and food part of their activities and organizing more commercial events, such as parties. The interviewee immediately acknowledges this does not give them a lot of support base in terms of audience but that it is mostly necessary to have the money to be able to pay for things such as (marketing) campaigns. As a result, they can focus on getting as many customers to their café and parties,

which gives them the money to spend freely on cultural projects. The downside is that the interests of the commercial and cultural parts of Hubert might not always line up. On the other hand, the freedom of more financial independence is something they appreciate as subsidy money often needs to be accounted for in advance, in a detailed plan. While the interviewee says this entrepreneurial philosophy allows them more influence and growth, they note that it is not ideal, as it could be interpreted that organizations like Hubert can operate solely on the free market and do not need structural recognition.

Overall, Hubert is aware of the tensions between financial independence and structural recognition and seems to have, for the moment, found solace in adding a commercial aspect to their organization. However, the interviewee feels this is not ideal as they seek a solution in systemic change while recognizing that what might work for Hubert might not work for other similar organizations. Eventually, they conclude that formalizing as a group, "a unity of multiplicity," might be the best solution.

3. The Mansion

Short Introduction

The Mansion is a hiphop platform established in 2021. According to their website, they focus on the artistic development of new talent and equality of opportunity in (art) education and society. They state that they want hip-hop culture to get the recognition it deserves, both in the cultural field as well as in (art) education. Hiphop culture serves as the basis for the way they operate. They work according to the 'each one teach one' principle, work to create safe places (cyphers²⁸) and have a coaching approach. They hope to put those concepts to wider educational and social use (*The Mansion*).

²⁸ A cypher is a hip-hop term to refer to a dance circle where people take turns to dance in the centre.

The Mansion's team exists out of "experienced professionals" giving young people the space to develop and participate in activities and grow their skillset. In addition, they encourage them to come up with ideas of their own and execute them. The Mansion can be approached for workshops, mostly given by the youth themselves. The workshops they offer are; rap, dance, photography, personal journaling, storytelling, creative writing and theatre, afro dance and poppin' and breakdance.

Organizational Framework and Approach

When asked to talk about their organization, both interviewees talk about themselves instead of from the perspective of The Mansion. Instead of their tasks in the organization they talk about what they do in life in general. Both interviewees have other jobs, as a social worker and an art educator respectively. The social worker who works with young people in an institution says "the creatives" are assigned to them which they can combine with the Mansion. The art educator adds, "Qualitatively, we can do [our job] super well because we both work in other places too and therefore, you are constantly tying everything together." The distinction between them as people and them as The Mansion representatives barely exists. The Mansion equals the people who are involved in the Mansion, and therefore, the people in The Mansion fill in what the Mansion is. The social worker concludes that everything they do can be brought into The Mansion: their network, their friends and family, their experience and interests, and their other work. From this, I gather that the boundary between their work for the Mansion and their other jobs is blurry as well²⁹. This blurring of boundaries goes beyond their professional and personal lives. The perspective of the art educator when it comes to the municipality is that both The Mansion and the municipality want the same, namely; to facilitate the benefits of art for its citizens. They, therefore, wish

²⁹ I want to make the note that discussing the categories of the organizational framework and network separately is quite hard. This is due to The Mansion's blurry organizational boundary, which leads to their network being an integral part of their organization. I will discuss this point further in the network section.

the municipality would not adhere to this rigid separation. While they can easily explain and get across why The Mansion is worthy of receiving subsidies, they struggle to put it to paper and understand the language of the municipality. They express the wish for the municipal employee's help.

The Mansion experiences hindrances when coming into contact with more formal and traditional structures. This has to do with how they perceive hierarchy; they associate it with "a need for control," especially forms that need to be filled in to receive subsidies and grants. Moreover, they do not see the benefit of formal documentation in their day-to-day activities. The art educator asks themselves why they should write it all down, saying: "I don't feel like it at all, no time for it either." When I gave them copies of the research consent forms, they found a random cupboard and stuffed it in a drawer with some random art supplies. While they might not like to spend a lot of time on documentation, they emphasize that if other people in The Mansion wish to do so, they can. The reason for this aversion towards control and formalization has to do with the two core values they mention: trust and improvisation. They mention trust a couple of times as an important aspect of how they operate. They see the need for control as being at odds with working from a place of trust. To them, trust allows people to do more. This trust-based approach is reflected in the roles in the organization, which I will elaborate on later. Both interviewees specify that while they might be formally in charge, they strive to operate more and more in the background and focus on "facilitating, supporting, and coaching" rather than organizing, citing examples of initiatives organized by interns.

The interviewees mention and illustrate a few times that they do not work hierarchically or according to a traditional structure. While they feel others feel the need to categorize them either as an artistic or social organization, my interviewees feel strongly about having them on equal footing. This is where their aversion to hierarchy trickles down

into the way things are organized. They argue that due to the nature of social issues, you are bound to come across people who want to express themselves. They feel this can be used to induce change. This line of thinking inspires them “to work more democratically” as it is just about doing justice to someone's needs and working together. They explain that the rigidity of traditional organizations makes it difficult to come up with changes or new ideas. This is incompatible with their second core value; freestyle and improvisation. They observe that being able to improvise instead of shutting down when things inevitably go wrong, is a good skill to have. They argue it allows people to feel the space to do things their way, enhancing their self-confidence. Their focus on improvisation might also have something to do with the lack of long-term planning and their program flexibility³⁰. Overall, they value the freedom to explore what works best and avoid telling people to do something in a certain way.

My interviewees give the impression that at The Mansion, they work with a more "living in the present and we'll see" approach. Both interviewees indicate they dislike working according to traditional structures by “writing plans and executing them.” They would rather have an idea, implement it, and consider their options in the moment. This makes for a flexible and dynamic organization, stating that “of course, we are all in constant motion together.” As they both have other jobs, they do not work a typical 9 to 5 with consistent office days or hours and are mostly calling and messaging different people throughout the day, while on the move, and in the evening.

As for the roles in the organization, the social worker is named as the founder, while the art educator notes “the title we have now come up with for me is creative producer.” While they mention these titles, they say they prefer not to use “such terminology.” Their responsibilities and tasks are not clearly defined besides facilitating, watching, and thinking along, ensuring the young people themselves devise and implement as much as possible.

³⁰ These will be discussed in their respective section

Who works for The Mansion is dynamic, depending on what there is to do. The interviewees remark that aside from them, they have four fixed people with a few set tasks and activities they work on, interns, and a fixed pool of about ten workshop leaders. When it comes to the interns, they comment “there's no real plan behind that, I'll be honest.” They clarify that the interns usually join for six months to a year, mainly based on the intuition of whether they will fit in well and whether there is something to do. Interns play a crucial role in shaping The Mansion, but their exact roles are not predetermined. They specify they had different interns who all brought different skills and ideas. They also mention that they let interns take on responsibility for their tasks and their learning process.

Function, Activities, Goals and Aims

The art educator shows three sentences they felt summarized their goals and aims well. I have briefly mentioned them in the introduction but will expand on them a bit more in this section. The first goes as follows: “The Mansion is a hip-hop platform focused on the artistic development of new talent that, in the process, is committed to equity in (arts) education and society.” The development of new talent is something The Mansion finds important. My interviewees note that most of the young people who come here are involved in music, dance, photography, film, podcasts, and more. They explain that some of them like to share their knowledge and therefore teach their peers. In addition, the interviewees underline that when it comes to talent development, every individual has different needs, signaling they try to give some low-threshold training as well. In addition, The Mansion is also a space for professional talent development as they offer internships. Interns are encouraged to fill in their internship however they like instead of getting an assignment.

The ideas in the following sentence are discussed thoroughly. “The basic principles of hip-hop culture 'each one teach one,' creation of safe spaces (cyphers), and coaching ground

attitude, are valuable concepts to use more broadly educationally and socially.” As mentioned in the previous paragraph, The Mansion works according to a peer-to-peer teaching principle where people learn from each other rather than from one central teacher. They feel strongly about it. When asked about the use of cyphers, the art educator specifies as follows: 'we use it as a kind of metaphor to invite people to participate, to show themselves, and to adopt an inquisitive and experimenting attitude instead of a teacher determining what you need to know/learn.' As established in the section on the organization framework, my interviewees profile themselves as facilitators rather than organizers. They pride themselves on how social they are and on their focus on inspiring and motivating each other. Additionally, they focus on offering space, connections, and resources, trying to make The Mansion into an open door and stepping stone. This is achieved through student-centered internships and by leveraging their extensive network in the cultural sector.

The social and educational aspects of The Mansion are seen as the most important. Art is viewed as a vehicle, a tool, but not necessarily a final product. The art educator explains that the municipality has asked them whether they are an artistic or social organization. They argue they are both, stating “art is education, is living together, and learning together.”

The last sentence of their vision pertains to the relationship between their organization and the wider cultural sector. It reads as follows: “we want hip-hop culture to get the recognition it deserves ... both in the cultural field and stages and in (arts) education.” The focus on and identifying as hip-hop platform is interesting, as their activities are much broader, ranging from lectures on black identity in the museum sector to workshops on photography and journaling. As I will talk about later, The Mansion also says their activities and platform are for everyone, and the people who work there are diverse in their backgrounds and identities. This, in combination with their 'go with the flow' planning, 'let

people organize what they want' mentality and dynamic nature of their organization, probably contribute to a broadening of the disciplines they offer, beyond what is traditionally considered hip-hop culture. The social worker talks about another reason why they started The Mansion in the first place. They say that young people want to be heard and seen. Nijmegen has a pop podium, they add, yet it is hard to get booked, so The Mansion created their own podium to fill this gap.

Lastly, my interviewees say something noteworthy, namely that they do not have diversity as an aim or goal but as something that is a given. This could point to some of The Mansion's values as being intrinsic to the people that work there rather than a shared agreement that it is something they as an organization should care about and work on to maintain.

(Artistic) Content and Programming

As previously mentioned, my interviewees see art more as a vehicle or tool and therefore do not spend a lot of time going into detail about the contents of their artistic activities. In addition, there is no set planning. Throughout the interview, my interviewees both mention what events they have organized and are still working on. The disciplines and themes of these events are diverse. The Mansion participated with a few dancers and rappers at The Kunstnacht, where they collaborated with musicians from Music Meeting. They add that they have a few recurring activities such as open mics, a podcast where artists and people who work in the cultural sector are interviewed, and talent nights in collaboration with New Rootz. In addition, they note that they are working on a dance theatre production, for which they will also have costuming and music. The production is made in collaboration with choreographer Percy Kruythoff. They emphasize that he is "a very well-known name in the dance world ... so it is real talent" This, I assume, was said as a refutation to some of the

prejudices they feel they get, as they previously stated that people think “we just do whatever” as a reaction to their organizational methods. There is a realization that they work and program in a different way from most organizations. This is something they are simultaneously proud of, but it is also something that makes them feel they have to justify a bit. What is indicative is, is that as a reaction to being able to perform and collaborate successfully during the Kunstnacht together with Music Meeting, the social worker said they felt the moment signified them being taken seriously.

The social worker talks about one of the projects they focus on with the teenagers he works with. They have come up with their version of BNN VARA’s Barz, a platform inviting rappers to do studio sessions and talk about their music. They called it Paperclip sessions, and the premise is that they film a video clip and record an upcoming rapper from each neighborhood, combined with an interview for the podcast.

I have listed the types of workshops The Mansion offers in the introduction, and my interviewees do not elaborate on them a lot. However, they do note that they pay attention to offering (societal) context when giving the workshops, especially for the disciplines that originated from marginalized communities. They mention the importance of touching on the ties to colonial history and slavery, as well as the differences and similarities between cultures. The connection to social movements and society is a priority for them, which fits perfectly with what my interviewees previously stated about not separating the artistic and social aspects of their organization. In the past, they have organized two more societally relevant events on black identity. One of them was the Museum of Black Futures in collaboration with the Black Achievement Month, an evening where black activists, scholars, and artists sat together to discuss what a (black) museum could look like if colonialism never happened.

Lastly, I want to point out that they continuously link people between projects³¹. The person working on the podcasts also works on the costuming for the theatre production. The person organizing the open mics does the music for the production. They have multiple interns who are involved or participate in projects outside their internship, in their free time.

Relationships and Network

Throughout the interview, The Mansion's network and collaborations are constantly referenced. This is no surprise given the interviewees' tendencies to blur the lines between the Mansion and their other jobs, the people who work for The Mansion, and those who merely collaborate with them. The art educator explains that they just meet new people and connect them to The Mansion and gives an example of convincing one of their students to participate as a judge in The Mansion's talent night. Both interviewees have a broad, horizontal network and note that their networks complement each other. The art educator said, "you create your own work and choose your own people to go with it." This is a good summary of how The Mansion operates. The Mansion is a community so the people who work there are The Mansion. Moreover, whether someone from their professional network, friends, or family, they are all potentially part of The Mansion, saying it is "not at all fixed." Furthermore, they say that "anyone we like can just come and sit here and just work on their stuff." By doing so they want to foster involvement and exchange that leads to inspiring or motivating each other. From this, we can conclude that the boundaries between The Mansion and their network are very blurred. To them, anyone who contributes in any shape or form is part of it. They, therefore, have a very strong sense of being a community rather than an organization.

This horizontal network and tendency to work together with and involve many people can be summarized as a drive for connection. This connection manifests itself not only in

³¹ This is something that also relates to the aspect of their relationships and networks, which I will discuss in the next section.

getting many people involved in The Mansion but also between people themselves and between The Mansion and other organizations. The social worker points out that they are constantly working on connections. They explain that one of the benefits of these connections is the resources The Mansion does not have, such as podia or practice rooms. In addition, they discuss an instance of connection that arose between The Mansion dancers and Music Meeting musicians during Kunstnacht. They recall that they really "clicked" during their performance, which resulted in them making plans to work together in the future.

As mentioned before, The Mansion prides itself on the diversity of its people. The interviewees say that, while a cliché, "you reap what you sow" holds some truth. They argue that, while everyone is so different in terms of background, there is no judgment or feelings of superiority, resulting in a general openness toward each other. Additionally, they emphasize that The Mansion was created "from a need of people themselves and not from large institutions," which again shows how people-oriented they are.

The organizations they mention can be roughly divided into three categories, although some organizations have aspects of each of the three: social organizations, cultural organizations, and educational institutions. The more social organizations include the institution where the social worker works and Bindkracht 10. The social worker points out that as an organization, they complement each other well. While they both focus on young people, The Mansion has the creative aspect that Bindkracht 10 does not have and is flexible in cooperating. In addition, they have worked together with Waalhalla, the Black Achievement Month, and New Rootz, all socio-cultural in nature. As for the purely cultural organizations, they mention Hubert and Music Meeting, of which they explicitly mention they like working with them as they have a similar mentality, being less traditional and elitist. Lux and Theater aan de Rijn are also mentioned. They also discuss an established organization with whom they had a personal issue in the past and express that it has been

difficult to persuade them to put aside past differences. They feel this is a pity, as the interviewees argue they could strengthen each other. Finally, the art educator works for the HAN and says that because of this, high schools can easily find them for workshops.

Spatial

The Mansion is located outside the city center, in the industrial area that houses DIY stores, a thrift shop, a distribution center, municipal waste processing, and more. They rent a few rooms in an office building. The building has an open feeling and still feels quite modern, well-maintained, and equipped with modern facilities. I was there Wednesday morning, and the building was quite empty. A few stickers and posters related to The Mansion decorate the doors of the rooms that belong to them. Overall, the space feels very organized. Aside from some clutter on the tables, there is no mess or personal items that would indicate they have settled or made the spaces their own. It feels very temporary as if they could easily move all their stuff in a few hours. Upstairs, were more rooms, one of which is used as a recording studio, and the other is more of a living room area, with some sofas and plants, a filing cabinet with workshop clutter, and two hairdressing stations.

The reason why their location does not feel very lived in is probably because they do not have an office culture at The Mansion. My two interviewees do a lot of their work while on their way to their other jobs or at odd hours of the day. According to them, the offices are mostly used for hosting meetings, like for their interview. We arrived together and left together. In addition, they note that the space is also used for the interns to have a place to work. They rarely hold events at their location. The interviewees indicate that they tend to use the facilities of the organizations they collaborate with. The location they are in is more of an office, so it does not lend itself to performances. Having to go elsewhere is not seen as an urgent problem. They remark that their current location is more like a "nest from which

everyone can fly out and return." They do note that in the future, they would prefer a space where they can have performances, given their dependence on other organizations. When asked about what The Mansion would look like in the future, they would love to have a pop podium, studios, and a dance studio, but also a temporary emergency accommodation for young people who, for some reason, got kicked out by their parents.

They have not been at their location for a long time, so it makes sense that it does not feel very lived in yet. The social worker commented that their previous location was small and looked run-down and did not inspire them. Eventually, they were allowed to build a small studio at the location they rented, which helped create a more enjoyable space where the young people liked hanging out. Eventually, they were contacted by one of the social organizations that the social worker used to work with, with the question if they wanted to share the new office building where they were moving. Thus, ending up in this office building.

The Audience

Just like the line between The Mansion and their network is blurry, the line between the people involved in The Mansion and their audience is blurry as well. This is mostly due to their social and educational focus. A person going to the open mic might be the same person helping with the podcast or giving workshops to students. In addition, the events and projects they organize are interactive and focus mostly on the process rather than working towards a final result, making it even harder to determine who is a participant and who is an audience member. The interviewees themselves do not clearly define or acknowledge a difference between the two. Since the Mansion profiles itself as a place where people can develop their talents and skills, interns learning to put on projects, young people teaching workshops, and

the participants in the talent development projects and events are all part of The Mansion's audience.

The social worker also adds that they want to be a place where young people feel at ease and can freely learn and be themselves. Because this will encourage them to bring their friends. When I asked directly who would fall under their audience, they said, "we are very open ... to all people in the city." To them, the platform is carried by young people, and thus they say The Mansion is built by their audience. For The Mansion, the people they work with, their network, and their audience are all interlinked and overlapping.

They do admit that since most of their activity is organized by young people, they mostly attract their peers, but they emphasize that, in essence, their events are for everyone. With all the different output The Mansion generates, their reach goes further than the young people. The social worker says that many young people have been sent by their parents because they discovered The Mansion first.

Finances

The interviewees mention that they have to work with a "severely restricted budget." Which they find challenging. They indicate that for the years 2023 and 2024, they have an annual budget of roughly €100,000. Both my interviewees are paid ten hours per week, but they say they probably work double. They do not mind, as they can easily combine it with their other work and find overlap. In addition to their set hours, the money they have goes towards compensating the people who give the workshops. Furthermore, the theatre production they are working on is also an expense. The choreographers they work with are paid, and the dancers and other young people who work on photography, costuming, writing, etc., all receive a small sum. They emphasize it is important to them to pay these people where possible. The art educator states, "we want to get rid of that too, don't we? That in that

cultural sector everyone should just do it for the fun.” The interviewees believe that since they are bringing something substantial into the world, they should be reimbursed.

Slowly, they are realizing that they need core funding. They add that this realization adds to their need to professionalize more. Their biggest source of self-earned income is currently the workshops they give in high schools. They are raising their prices as they realize they can use it as a revenue model. Furthermore, they are thinking of starting to charge small entrance fees for their other events. Additionally, the art educator questions whether the HAN should not pay them, as they serve as a training site for all these interns.

When it comes to subsidies and funds, they confess that raising and applying for them is a point of concern. Currently, their biggest source of income is from subsidies, which makes them dependent. At the time of the interview, they receive €50,000 a year in subsidies from the municipality but need to find another way to fund the other €50,000 they need. They say they are very grateful that the municipality funds them, and that by doing so, they acknowledge that organizations like The Mansion are beneficial. However, the art educator states that “what you have to do to explain that, yes, that drives me personally to despair.” As mentioned in the organizational framework, The Mansion does not care much for the formal way of doing things and even actively positions itself as being the opposite of traditional systems. It is therefore no surprise that they struggle with the administrative aspect of subsidies and funding. This is not to say they cannot explain why they deserve funding though. They indicate that they have given oral presentations about what The Mansion does and that the government officials usually react enthusiastically. It is more that there is some kind of disconnect caused by having to fill in paperwork in a certain way.

4. Comparing the Case Studies to Each Other and the *Theoretical Model*

Now that I have discussed the case studies and each category separately, this section marks the second stage of my analysis. For each category, I compare the case studies to each other, and to the *theoretical model*. I discuss whether the characteristics of the case studies lean more toward the non-traditional, the institutionalized characteristics, or whether they fall more in the middle. Some characteristics are not applicable, either due to the nature of the organization or because they have not touched upon the subject during their interview.

Additionally, I will point out characteristics that are not present in the *theoretical model*.

From that, I conclude whether the case study leans towards non-traditional, institutionalized, or the middle for each category. It is not the goal to count exactly how many non-traditional, institutionalized, or extra characteristics each case study has, nor is it the goal to determine the exact degree to which they meet these characteristics. As mentioned before, I consider the non-traditional to the institutionalized line as more of a spectrum and will therefore gauge if the case studies lean more towards one end as opposed to the other for each particular category.

4.1. Organizational Framework and Approach

ORGANIZATIONAL (FRAMEWORK/APPROACH)	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small, informal organizations that Lack strict and hierarchical organizational structure (Lijster et al.) • No long-term strategic plans but a shared creation of general organizational value frameworks (Lijster et al.) • Room for experimentation and individual initiatives (Lijster et al.) • No clear management, irregular meetings between participants and local governments and taking a responsibility for the collective maintenance and promotion of the sites (Mommaas) • Adhocracy: flexible ad-hoc character allows for ability to deal with constantly changing conditions and circumstances (Mommaas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big, formal organization with clear hierarchical organizational structure (Lijster et al.) • Strong, central management team (Mommaas) • Long-term strategic plans based on a set formal, vision. Often accompanied by extensive and detailed policy documents and year plans. (Lijster et al.) • High levels of professionalization in management through role and organization structures (Kangas and Vestheim) • Fair Practice Code, Code Diversiteit & Inclusie, and Governance Code Cultuur are taken into account (van Meerkerk). • Salaried employment and stable work • Organizations that have been functioning over long periods of time (Kengas and Vastheim)

Discussion

As established in the separate analysis of P-Art, they are a small organization with two organizers, a board, and, whenever needed, independent professionals and volunteers. The interviewees consider P-Art to be a collaborative organization in swarm form. This organizational structure lacks hierarchy formally, although informally, the interviewees effectively lead the organization. They each have their (unofficial) tasks and complement each other where necessary. I argue they lean most towards what Lijster et al. describe as a small, informal organization that lacks a strict and hierarchical organizational structure. When it comes to discussing plans, there was no indication of concrete strategic changes beyond superficial mentions of the opportunities and resources this would bring to the organization. I would, therefore, argue that P-Art does not lean toward long-term strategic plans but toward a

shared creation of general organizational value frameworks (Lijster et al.). The existence of these value frameworks is evidenced by the organizers doing what is necessary when it is necessary, and the declaration that they tend to organize what they want. The latter is also a sign that P-Art allows room for experimentation and individual initiatives (Lijster et al.). The organizers mention past, present, and upcoming projects and argue they happen organically, motivated by a 'just seeing what will happen' philosophy. While this is more of an aspect of the category of activities and not the organization's structure, it indicates that the organization's structure allows for experimentation and initiative. It also signifies flexibility, although I would not consider them to work fully ad hoc (Mommaas). P-Art goes with the flow, but given the amount and magnitude of some of their events, they have elements of a formal system in place, as indicated by the plans they write and make.

At the time of the interview, Hubert was going through a shift from a flat, unorganized, and ad hoc structure to a more organized one. This makes determining where they would be situated in the non-traditional to institutionalized field complex, as the analysis is mostly based on the prognosis of my interviewee. However, whether they have reached their goal or not, they are professionalizing and my interviewee spends a lot of time discussing this organizational strategy, which gives an indication regardless. They will not be considered non-traditional as they are actively moving away from their ad hoc (Mommaas) situation and have a long-term strategic plan and vision (Lijster et al.). They indicate a need for more structure, clearer hierarchy, and specific distinction between the executive and strategic teams. In addition, there is already a structure in place that separates the more commercial enterprise part from the artistic and cultural foundation parts. This all points to growth toward a clear hierarchical organizational structure (Lijster et al.) and the professionalization of management through role and organization structures (Kangas and

Vestheim). Lastly, Hubert has permanent full and half-time employees and emphasizes that they find job stability crucial.

On top of having an informal organizational approach, The Mansion actively distances itself from hierarchy and formalities. The interviewees express a dislike for traditional structures. They, therefore, adhere to Lijster et al.'s characteristic of a small, informal organization that lacks a strict and hierarchical organizational structure. When it comes to shared general organizational value frameworks in favor of long-term strategic plans (Lijster et al.), they also fit this aspect. They operate in the present, doing something and reacting as it happens. Their organizational approach is exactly as Mommaas described: flexible and ad hoc. As for the value framework, when explaining how The Mansion works organizationally, they emphasize their values. As established in my analysis, they value trust and improvisation, work more democratically and focus on giving everyone involved the space to contribute in their own way. This translates into room for experimentation and individual initiatives (Lijster et al.).

New Characteristics and Tensions

A characteristic that has not been mentioned in the literature is the flexibility of the people involved in the organization. In the case of P-Art, they have a team of independent professionals and volunteers, that they “fly in” when needed. For The Mansion, this flexible team is taken further. There, the boundaries between who works ‘for’ The Mansion, and who is in their network, or interacts with them, are vague. Essentially, to them, anyone who contributes to The Mansion is part of it. People are constantly involved and encouraged to shape this involvement how they see fit. In addition, they also say that who works for The Mansion, is dynamic. This characteristic opposes what, in more institutionalized organizations, would look like a stable team, with permanent employees and clearly defined

tasks and responsibilities. In contrast, this is what Hubert is working toward. In their discussion of their organization, there is a strong sense of entrepreneurship. Interestingly, this aspect mostly falls under the category of finances. However, Hubert has made entrepreneurial choices that shaped its organizational structure. It is unclear whether this characteristic is non-traditional or more institutionalized. On the one hand, traditional organizations receive a lot of funding and subsidies. On the other hand, they have commercial aspects such as cafés and gift shops. In addition, 2008 marked a policy shift with entrepreneurial expectations for the cultural sector. Another noteworthy characteristic of The Mansion is the blurring of boundaries. Firstly, the blurring between the organization and the people who are involved in it, or specifically, the boundary between community and company, and secondly between the professional and personal selves of the community members, exemplified by the interviewees not distinguishing between themselves as The Mansion representatives, and their other identities. For The Mansion, everyone who is involved contributes in a way to the concept of The Mansion. In that sense, they also blur the boundaries between this category and that of networks and relationships. Lastly, in his discussion on cultural clusters, Mommaas discussed irregular meetings between participants and local governments, taking responsibility for the collective maintenance and promotion of the sites and a lack of clear management as characteristic. I have not discussed these in relation to my case studies as it is not entirely relevant given these characteristics are more relevant for cultural clusters as opposed to individual organizations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, The Mansion leans strongly towards non-traditional. P-Art, while less extreme, does so too. Hubert's organizational framework and approach characteristics, however, show higher degrees of institutionalization. Interestingly, for Hubert, discussion of

their organizational framework overlaps a lot with the category of finances. The Mansion has a point of tension when it comes to the categorical boundaries I have created. These tensions will be discussed in chapter five.

I discussed three new characteristics. The team of people involved in The Mansion and P-Art is flexible and dynamic, as opposed to Hubert's stable team with permanent employees. The second and third characteristics have to do with The Mansion's blurring of boundaries. Firstly, the boundary between people involved in the organization and the organization's network is not clearly identifiable. Secondly, the boundary between what they see as community and company is also vague.

4.2. Function, Activities, Goals and Aims

FUNCTION (ACTIVITY/GOALS/AIMS)	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emphasis on multisectorality, cultural hybridity and crossovers (Mommaas) ● Diversity of creative activity: work, production, presentation and consumption (Mommaas, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk, Dovey et al., de Zwart and Musch) ● Diversity in variants: co-working studio, centre, network, cluster, online platform, alternative (Dovey et al.) ● Stimulate new talent and creativity (Grodach) ● Facilitate mentoring and peer(-to-peer) learning (Grodach) ● Facilitate building artistic and business skills (Grodach) ● Venue for outreach and community involvement (Grodach) ● Projects with a bottom-up approach which have developed from a contingent coming together of vernacular tactics (Mommaas) ● Projects and services that address global challenges and/or community issues (Lijster et al.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus on specific arts and/or design sector (Mommaas) ● Monofunctional cluster organised around concentration of conventional consumption and/or presentation functions (Momaas) ● Projects which have developed as part of a conscious 'top-down' planning strategy tending to the input of local administration (Mommaas) ● Can be easily identified as theatre, opera, library, museum, archive, gallery or other traditional cultural space (Kangas and Vestheim)

Discussion

Non-traditional characteristics encompass a diversity of creative activities, as noted by Mommaas, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk, Dovey et al., and de Zwart and Musch. P-Art organizes presentation, consumption, production and participation events and offers workplaces. P-Art stimulates creativity (Grodach) through their workshops and other participatory projects such as the PR playground. While they do not mention programs that help artists in their creative process, they work on broadening opportunities for artists by connecting them with new networks. In addition, they offer entrepreneurial and business skill workshops, another characteristic mentioned by Grodach. Lastly, while not explicitly stated, they make an effort to start projects and services that address community issues and global challenges (Lijster et al.). As evidenced by the entrepreneurial workshop aiming to make their network more financially healthy and projects focusing on fast fashion, body positivity, and getting children outside.

Hubert has both a commercial and artistic goal due to the combination of their restaurant, café, party, and market aspects and their more artistic projects. These aspects are often combined during events. Hubert is therefore not a strictly artistic or cultural organization. In addition, they note that they are a cultural organization with a well-being objective, evidenced by, for example, the buddy project. Mommaas mentions that non-traditional organizations tend to emphasize multisectorality, cultural hybridity, and crossovers. While cultural hybridity is not present, multisectorality is. In addition, their diversity in activities also translates to production through Wiebert residencies and presentation and consumption (Mommaas, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk, Dovey et al., de Zwart and Musch). The Wiebert residencies and shows focus specifically on giving young, beginning artists the space for experimentation, stimulating new talent and creativity (Grodach). By extension, Hubert meets the characteristic of facilitating the building of artistic

and business skills partly (Grodach). Lastly, Hubert prefers to program art that tackles more taboo topics, mentioning mental health, gender issues, and homelessness. By doing so, they, although not fully, lean towards the characteristic of having projects and services that address global challenges and/or community issues (Lijster et al.).

Multisectorality and cultural hybridity (Mommaas), are very present in The Mansion. Firstly, they are adamant about being called both a cultural and social organization and see the two not as separate but as intertwined. They have a strong social work undertone. Secondly, the cultural hybridity is evidenced by the importance they put on cultural identity and working according to hip-hop principles. Moreover, they wish to incorporate and accredit hip-hop in the broader cultural sector. Diversity in the people they work with is a given and intrinsic value to them, further proving that cultural hybridity is built into the core of their organization. The diversity of creative activity (Mommaas, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk, Dovey et al., de Zwart and Musch) is also represented in The Mansion with events focusing on presentations, workshops, an educational aspect for interns, and talent development. Stimulating talent and creativity (Grodach) is one of The Mansion's core aspects. In addition, facilitating mentoring and peer(-to-peer) learning is also cited as a characteristic and something my interviewees put a lot of emphasis on. They have specified that they use a peer-to-peer and mentoring system and prefer an experimenting attitude over a student-teacher dynamic. Aside from this talent development and mentoring aspect that builds artistic skills (Grodach), they also facilitate learning opportunities for interns. Even though these are more professional skills rather than business skills (Grodach). Overall, the facilitation aspect is very strongly present in how The Mansion functions. Due to the social work aspect, they also lean toward being a venue for outreach and community involvement (Grodach). They focus on a marginalized group of young people and give them an outlet and voice. Moreover, in the future, they would like to be able to offer temporary accommodation

to those in need. As established before, The Mansion sees their whole network as part of its community, which makes for a flat organization. Because of their focus on facilitating and encouraging experimentation, projects arise organically based on the needs and initiatives of this community. In short, these are projects with a bottom-up approach that have developed from a contingent coming together of vernacular tactics (Mommaas). Lastly, Lijster et al. also note that non-traditional organizations tend to develop projects and services that address global challenges and/or community issues. This is also something The Mansion does and is most noticeable in their social work aspect. But it is also apparent in the organization of events related to black identity, and the importance they put on adding colonial history context in the workshops they teach.

New Characteristics and Tensions

Dovey et al. point out that the diversity in variants is a characteristic of non-traditional organizations. They give the following examples: co-working studio, center, network, cluster, online platform, or an alternative. As this characteristic relates to the whole spectrum of non-traditional organizations, and not individual ones, it does not make sense to discuss it in the case studies' respective paragraphs. Since I only chose three case studies, I cannot attest to the variety presented by Dovey.

A few characteristics are missing in the model. Firstly, accessibility is a theme in all three organizations. For P-Art this manifests in one of their main goals; making art visible and accessible to everyone. Hubert sees accessibility as curating an environment where people can come across art and culture, without the pressures and expectations more traditional organizations bring. For The Mansion, accessibility is facilitating the space, network, and resources to people, specifically young people, to engage in artistic and cultural activities. From this, we can state that an emphasis on projects that lower the threshold to

experience or participate in art and culture is a common characteristic. Another characteristic closely related to accessibility is the role of the organization in connecting and bridging. This characteristic also relates to the category of network and relationships as well as the audience. Both P-Art and The Mansion put a lot of emphasis on their networks. P-Art actively emphasizes the role they play in this, facilitating not only the opportunity for artists to present their work to different publics outside of their own network but also connecting new public to artists and other cultural organizations. The Mansion focuses on the connections and opportunities that emerge from collaborations. For Hubert, their café is the place where people of different backgrounds can come together.

Conclusion

In conclusion, with most of the non-traditional characteristics present, The Mansion leans strongly towards non-traditional. P-Art and Hubert both also lean towards non-traditional, with both a few characteristics not relevant or only partly.

I noted two new characteristics. Firstly, all three organizations have a goal of bringing art to audiences who normally do not engage with it. This is done by increasing the accessibility of engaging or involving oneself in art. What accessibility entails differs from one organization to the other. The second characteristic also applies to all three of the organizations. They all take on a role in connecting or building bridges between people.

4.3. (Artistic) Content and Programming:

(ARTISTIC) CONTENTS /PROGRAMMING	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cultural democracy: broad(er) programming, from traditional to experimental and from low to high art, from amateur to professional (de Zwart and Musch, Grodach) ● Diversity disciplines (Dovey et al., Mommaas) ● Do not primarily refer to the (national) artistic canon (Lijster et al.) ● No permanent collection or resident company/artists (Grodach) ● Work closely with local artists (Grodach) ● Social justice tradition (Hadley) ● ‘Bottom-up’ practices of selecting and evaluating culture (Janssen and Verboord) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programming is established months if not years ahead, little room for flexibility. ● Arts lover tradition (Hadley) ● Importance is put on the roles and opinions of cultural mediators, which results in the programming of artists whose art has been legitimized through these mediators (Janssen and Verboord) ● Conservative attitude towards innovation and new ideas in artistic and cultural content (Kangas and Vestheim)

Discussion

When it comes to artistic content and programming, P-Art offers a broad range of programs. They focus mostly on applied art, but contextualize it according to the audience. Overall, they aim to lower the threshold for the audience to consume and engage with the art through workshops. By doing so, they lean toward a cultural democracy perspective where a broader range of programming, from traditional to experimental, from low to high art, and from amateur to professional, coexist (de Zwart and Musch, Grodach). Dovey et al. and Mommaas point to the diversity in disciplines of non-traditional organizations. P-Art’s main focus is on the art of drawing, but they also include performance, sound, light, and fashion in their programming. Due to the nature of the chosen disciplines and the focus on experimentation and participation, P-Art does not tend to refer to the (national) artistic canon (Lijster et al.) and therefore leans toward being non-traditional. In addition, P-Art does not have a permanent collection or resident artists (Grodach). They prefer to exchange artists between cities and countries to push artists out of their local bubbles and work with local artists to

help them build a network. Non-traditional organizations tend to emerge in a social justice context (Hadley). Concretely, for P-Art, this manifests in themes of inclusivity and diversity in the activities they program and organize, with overall accessibility of and engagement with art by the public at the forefront of their mission.

Like P-Art, Hubert also aims to make experiencing art as accessible as possible. Their programming ranges from more commercial culture in the form of parties and DJs to art expositions, and Kunstnacht is a mix of both traditional and experimental. The discussion on what is programmed remains at the surface level, so it is hard to say if their normal programming also includes traditional forms aside from more experimental ones and if they make a distinction between more amateur and more professional programs. However, the diversity in disciplines is clear (Dovey et al., Mommaas). Kunstnacht is a multidisciplinary festival, and Hubert's own programming combines music with visual arts and theatre. They also emphasize that the diversity and range of their activities are what make them accessible. Hubert has short residencies for young, local artists, who get to make an artistic intervention in Hubert's space. While this could be considered a 'permanent' collection, Hubert has not indicated they conserve the works or consider them a collection. Therefore, I would argue that they do not operate traditionally when it comes to this characteristic. The social justice tradition context (Hadley) is also apparent for Hubert, as they see themselves as a cultural organization with a well-being objective. Little is said about the content of the art they program, except that they like programming art with societally relevant themes. They emphasize programming diversely to ensure accessibility.

The Mansion also offers diverse and broad programming (de Zwart and Musch, Grodach). They have workshops, open mic events, a podcast, and have facilitated a platform for young and beginning hip-hop artists, as well as a post-colonialist panel discussion. Additionally, they are working on a music and dance project with a renowned choreographer.

The diversity in disciplines is also clearly present (Dovey et al., Mommaas). While they primarily focus on hip-hop, they embrace a broader range of disciplines, including music, dance, theatre, fashion, photography, podcasting, and more, consequently, The Mansion does not refer to the (national) artistic canon (Lijster et al.). Additionally, they have no resident artists or a permanent collection (Grodach). Since they operate as a community and focus on giving young people opportunities, they collaborate closely with local artists (Grodach). The Mansion operates within the context of a social justice tradition (Hadley). The social work aspect and the emphasis on community and learning are prioritized above art with a capital A. They also tend to contextualize the art forms they work with, by addressing the societal and sometimes colonial context of art forms in their workshops and activities related to black identity. Lastly, The Mansion operates democratically and based on trust. This approach extends to the practices of selecting and evaluating culture, which is more bottom-up (Janssen and Verboord). The Mansion focuses on giving space to create and showcase work and relies on peer-to-peer training combined with mentoring to develop talent, which are bottom-up practices. Consequently, the quality of what is created is considered secondary to the process.

New Characteristics and Tensions

This process being more important than the end product is a general characteristic I have observed in all three of my case studies. Art is seen more as a vehicle or tool for personal or societal improvement and participation is an important aspect of it. This is most prominent with The Mansion and P-Art, and to a certain extent with Hubert too. Therefore, non-traditional organizations tend to lean toward creating and interacting with art as a tool for personal and societal improvement. Their legitimacy as cultural organizations is thus not based on artistic quality but on the value that art brings to society, something I will discuss more in the conclusion. Another characteristic that has been underreported in the literature is

favoring alternative ways of presenting art. Where traditional organizations tend to have specific spaces for the presentation of specific disciplines, non-traditional organizations like breaking with these norms. Hubert and P-Art both program in public spaces. Additionally, Hubert also tends to incorporate art within more commercial events. The Mansion mainly works with disciplines that by nature have less of a traditional way of presenting art. In addition, their hip-hop principles break with the audience-artists divide, another traditional norm. The two characteristics I discussed here overlap with the category of audience. The audience is a big motivator for why the case studies lean toward certain characteristics. This relates to what I discussed in the literature chapter on contexts, that the audience's importance has increased due to several factors. Lastly, I want to discuss Kangas and Vestheim who have noted that a conservative attitude toward innovation and new ideas in artistic and cultural content is a more traditional characteristic. In the literature on non-traditional organizations, no counter characteristic is mentioned, although it is implied through the characteristics that mention experimentation (Lijster et al.), new talent (Grodach), and a general consensus that non-traditional organizations imply the breaking of conservative ways. Therefore a progressive attitude towards innovation and new ideas in artistic and cultural content is a more general addition, albeit an obvious one. This progressive attitude is shared by the three case studies. Hubert actively supports experimental artists and states it is important to question in the future if the organization still fits the zeitgeist. P-Art and The Mansion both place a lot of importance on experimentation. In addition, P-Art has the philosophy of programming outside existing frameworks. The Mansion wants to introduce hip-hop culture to the sector and questions and reImagines ideas about the norms within it as evidenced by the event on The Museum of Black Futures.

Conclusion

Overall, all three case studies lean towards the non-traditional characteristics. The Mansion is, in comparison with P-Art and Hubert, the organization for which the characteristics were most applicable. That being said, P-Art and Hubert also both adhere to nearly all characteristics and therefore also lean strongly towards non-traditional.

I discussed three new characteristics. The Mansion, P-Art, and Hubert see art more as a vehicle or tool for personal or societal improvement. In addition, they all favor alternative ways of presenting art: from public space to incorporating it in commercial events. Lastly, they have a progressive attitude towards innovation and new ideas in artistic and cultural content.

4.4. Relationships and Network

RELATIONSHIPS/NETWORK	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Importance is put on horizontal networks as opposed to vertical ones (Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, Dovey et al.) ● Rhizome-like network structures that emerge and operate outside of traditional infrastructure (Lijster et al.) ● Networked, transnational relationships (Lijster et al., Joye) ● Knowledge and information exchange / mutual social support with network (Pratt, Lijster et al., Joye) ● Temporary alliances with likeminded organizations sharing resources, knowledge, goals and ideas (Lijster et al.) ● Embedded in local (often urban) setting and therefore equipped to sense the needs and concerns of specific communities (Lijster et al.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Affiliated with/member of a (national umbrella) association protecting the interests of organizations in the same discipline ● Importance is put on vertical networks as opposed to horizontal ones (Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, Dovey et al.)

Discussion

When it comes to non-traditional organizations' networks, Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, and Dovey et al. point to the importance these organizations put on their horizontal network as opposed to their vertical one. P-Art's network exists out of other cultural organizations, educational institutions, and artists, but also inner-city entrepreneurs, corporate businesses, and sponsors. In addition, they go beyond borders deliberately, connecting Dutch cities through The Big Draw, mostly by exchanging artists between cities. The independent professionals they work with, link their networks to P-Art's, creating a network that leans toward a more rhizomatic structure (Lijster et al.). They also cross national borders, having connections specifically in London through The Big Draw and Japan through their interest in manga and anime. While these transnational relationships (Lijster et al., Joye) are still in their early stages, P-Art indicates they want to expand these collaborations more, for instance through artist exchanges. What is notable is that P-Art stresses the importance of the network their network brings with them and is aware of this dependence on their network, wanting to keep it healthy. Furthermore, they have a mutually beneficial relationship with more established institutions, using their location in exchange for lowering the threshold for future visits by the audience they bring. All of this is in line with the informal exchange of information and mutual support among the network of non-traditional organizations (Pratt, Lijster et al., Joye).

Altogether, my interviewee for Hubert does not go into detail about their network, probably due to Hubert's designated network person not being present during the interview. However, a few things can still be distilled. Hubert's network consists mostly of organizations in the cultural field, the event sector as well as the social field. Especially through the Kunstnacht, they have contact with Nijmegen's whole cultural sector. In addition, they also collaborate with social organizations such as Buddy to Buddy. This indicates a

focus on building relationships and connections across different sectors. Overall, I would argue that Hubert's network leans more towards horizontal than vertical (Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, Dovey et al.). Besides not seeming to have trouble connecting to organizations and people for collaborations, Hubert also does not seem to depend a lot on their network. Moreover, they are aware of what they can bring to more established organizations. They recall a situation where an established organization reached out due to Hubert's younger audience. However, Hubert's approach clashed with how the established organization would normally do things, which Hubert found a pity since they were the ones to ask for advice. Even though their approaches might clash, the interviewee does emphasize that they learn a lot from collaborations with established organizations in terms of governance and structure. Hubert distinguishes itself by organizing a lot of different events, mostly by working together with others. For example, for a queer party, they work together with a queer-focused event organizer and queer artists. Hubert thus leans toward forming temporary alliances with like-minded organizations sharing resources, knowledge, goals, and ideas (Lijster et al.).

As mentioned before, The Mansion and their network are almost the same. Throughout the interview, their network and collaborations are constantly referenced. They mostly work together with social organizations, cultural organizations and educational institutions, and organizations that are a mix of both, specifically socio-cultural organizations. The interviewees describe their network as complementary and inclusive, where anyone they have ever met is potentially part of The Mansion. This suggests a focus on building horizontal connections rather than vertical hierarchies (Coumans and Cleveringa, Joye, Dovey et al.). Their network resembles a rhizome-like structure that operates outside of traditional infrastructure (Lijster et al.). This is evidenced by a blurring of the boundaries between The Mansion and their network, but also a blurring of the boundaries between the

people's professional and personal selves. Additionally, Professional networks, friends, and family are all mixed. The Mansion works as a constantly changing community initiating collaborations from this network. Exchanging knowledge and information and encouraging mutual social support is something The Mansion finds important (Pratt, Lijster et al., Joye). This is highlighted in their drive for connection. They stress that despite everyone's different background, there is mutual respect. By facilitating the space for these different people to interact and form connections, they foster brainstorming opportunities. This sentiment mostly carries over when it comes to organizations they work with, whether it is temporary or long-lasting. Due to their trusting and doing rather than planning philosophy, the organizations they work with are seen as partners in sharing knowledge, goals, and ideas (Lijster et al.). They note that sometimes these collaborations also lead to more collaborations down the line, as plans are initiated between the people involved. Furthermore, they acknowledge that these connections can offer resources (Lijster et al.) they not have, such as podia or practice rooms. Lastly, The Mansion was created "from a need of people themselves and not from large institutions." They focus on hip-hop culture and have a strong focus on young people, which makes them "equipped to sense the needs and concerns of specific communities" (Lijster et al.). This is even more enhanced due to their peer-to-peer and facilitating rather than organizing strategy.

New Characteristics and Tensions

An interesting thing I noticed with both P-Art and The Mansion is that when talking about their network, they focus a lot on what their network brings their network, rather than focusing on what the network brings their own organization in terms of content, programming, or resources. This characteristic is parallel with what I established in the section on content and programming, that non-traditional organizations tend to focus on art as

a social tool. An unmentioned characteristic that is present for all three organizations is that their networks are diverse in terms of sectors. Given the focus on the societal gain art brings, it is no surprise that these organizations have a lot of contact with social organizations. In addition, small businesses and the more commercial event sector are also represented and The Mansion and P-Art have educational institutions in their network. Lastly, I find it interesting that The Mansion views their organization, and by extension their network more as a community, with anyone contributing or involved being part of it. I argue that two major things contribute to this. Firstly, their nonhierarchical organizational framework and approach, values on trust and improvisation, result in activities being organized organically as opposed to carefully planned. Secondly, the lack of people officially working for and getting a wage from The Mansion. Their organizational and financial identity thus enable an atmosphere that facilitates a community feeling as opposed to a company feeling.

Conclusion

In conclusion, The Mansion leans strongly towards non-traditional. A few characteristics were not relevant or applicable to P-Art, but interestingly they are the only one that has networked, transnational relationships (Lijster et al., Joye). P-Art overall leans towards non-traditional, but not as strongly as The Mansion. Making a case for Hubert is a bit harder given the limited information that was given in the interview. For most of the characteristics, I was unable to substantiate whether they applied or not. Yet, I can say that the two institutionalized characteristics did not apply. Therefore I would put Hubert as slightly non-traditional.

I found three new characteristics. The mansion and P-Art focus on what their network can bring to their network, centering their network as opposed to their organization. Secondly, all three organizations have a network of partners that transcend the cultural sector,

with the social and educational sectors making up a significant part of it. Lastly, The Mansion's network is part of their community which contributes to The Mansion's blurry boundaries.

4.5. Spatial

SPATIAL	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in (former) industrial area/building (Musch and de Zwart, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk) • Self-consciously position themselves towards the margins of the city, maintaining something of an alternative, bohemian atmosphere. (Mommaas) • Flexible and multifunctional spaces may at once serve as performance space, gallery, art school, incubator, resource center, and outreach center (Grodach) • Open and flexible space, constantly adapting to changes in the wider cultural and urban field (Mommaas) • Physical co-location of activities (Pratt, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk) • Serve as Neighborhood anchors or amenities (Grodach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situated more towards the center of the city. It is there that they are most able to link in with the flow of cultural tourists (Mommaas) • Space is static and rarely used for multiple purposes. (Grodach) • Permanent physical location, often explicitly build for the purpose of the organization.

Discussion

P-Art is located in the city center, in an old warehouse that, before they moved in, was uninhabitable. The area they are in is thus not industrial, but their building is (Musch and de Zwart, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk). Non-traditional organizations are reported to self-consciously position themselves towards the margins of the city, maintaining something of an alternative, bohemian atmosphere (Mommaas). Since P-Art is located in the city center, they lean more towards institutionalized for this characteristic. When I visited there was no plumbing or heating. The renovation they are planning will add amenities as well as flexible

workplaces, a meeting room, an exhibition area, and include space for experimentation. They are therefore planning on having a space that is multifunctional and flexible (Grodach). Moreover, they note that the space will be used for programming, making new educational curricula, thinking of new activities, and holding international expositions and performances. This space will be a physical co-location of activities (Pratt, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk). Furthermore, it will provide P-Art with room to grow according to their needs and plans. Their space is therefore open and flexible and will allow them to adapt to changes in the wider cultural and urban field (Mommaas).

Hubert is located on an industrial site in a residential neighborhood outside the city center (Musch and de Zwart, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk). It is not visible from the street, requiring visitors to know in advance. They explicitly state that this more sheltered atmosphere is an asset, as it gives the impression of having less of a controlling body, allowing visitors to behave more loosely and free. Hubert, therefore, positions itself toward the margins of the city, leaning toward maintaining something of an alternative, bohemian atmosphere (Mommaas). However, when asked about their ideal space, they point to the city theatre, as it is the building of the city and should therefore program for the whole city. This would, however, weaken their free atmosphere. When it comes to their current premises, a few things are notable. Their inside space is a big, mostly empty hangar, with a bit of furniture, bar, stages, stand, and decor that can be easily rearranged to ensure flexibility. Hubert organizes a lot of different activities, from parties to markets to lectures to artistic performances and expositions, and they all take place on their terrain. In addition, they have room for resident artists to experiment. Hubert's space is a flexible and multifunctional space (Grodach) that houses a plethora of activities (Pratt, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk). Grodach notes that non-traditional organizations tend to serve as neighborhood anchors or amenities. While Hubert does not lean into this fully, they have a good relationship with their neighbors.

Hubert allows them to use their space for events and they facilitated a community garden during the corona crisis. In addition, some older people from the neighborhood volunteer.

The Mansion is also located outside the city center, but unlike Hubert, they are located in an industrial area (Musch and de Zwart, Boswinkel and van Meerkerk), surrounded by busy roads, warehouses, construction shops, and municipal waste processing instead of residential buildings. They are located in an office building so they have access to modern facilities. It is unclear whether they see their specific location as an asset or not. They see their location as a “nest from which everyone can fly out and return.” Their location does not seem to be used a lot, it does not appear lived in. They indicate it is mostly used for meetings and so interns have a place to go. They do have the space to organize some events there and have done so, but they mainly use the facilities of the organizations they collaborate with. So while their space is not necessarily approached as multifunctional, open, and flexible co-location of activities, it is also not static. However, ideally, they would like to have a space where they can hold performances, which they currently depend on other organizations for. They dream of having a physical embodiment of the concept of The Mansion, an embodiment of the community. This space would serve as a community center and have the facilities to create and present art.

New Characteristics and Tensions

There are some more characteristics related to each organization specifically that need to be discussed. Firstly, P-Art has a focus on public space. They program outside so the general public comes into contact with art and culture. In addition, they also organize workshops outside, specifically with kids. Furthermore, they organize at other cultural organizations and places outside the city center. The Mansion may not specifically program in public space, they do organize in multiple different locations, at other organizations. Hubert hosts most of

their events in-house, but they also organize two bigger events in public space³². Overall I can distill from this that non-traditional organizations tend to transcend their physical location. This is especially the case for The Mansion who, due to their community approach is not defined by their physical location, as they operate from their network and their resources. Secondly, while P-Art has renovation plans and expects to stay at their location for the foreseeable future, Hubert has no such guarantee and experiences this lack of clarity as an insecurity. The Mansion did not express how long they can stay in their location, but this is no surprise given they tend to prefer to operate mostly in the present. Since Hubert is making steps towards becoming more institutionalized organizationally, they feel they are stuck and purposely avoid financially investing in their space. This explains why they prefer a flexible and open space but are not necessarily adapting to changes in the wider cultural and urban field (Mommaas). They feel a certain tension as they explain that if they were to receive structural support, this would most likely mean they have to make concessions that could jeopardize their identity as a dynamic organization.

Conclusion

In conclusion, P-Art leans mostly towards being non-traditional when it comes to their spatial aspect. The same is true for Hubert, with the nuance that their space is an aspect of tension for them, created by their opposing dynamic mentality and their growth towards their more institutionalized organizational framework. The Mansion's relationship to their space is also a bit more complex. Their space does not seem to influence how they operate and most of the mentioned characteristics are not relevant for them. They rely more on their community and network. Their vision and identity do not manifest in a physical space as it does with P-Art and Hubert. I would argue that this sentiment is very non-traditional, as more institutionalized

³² Kunstnacht festival and Park Kronenburg Festival

organizations rely on a stable, permanent location in which all of their activity is incorporated. So even though The Mansion does not adhere to most of the non-traditional characteristics as mentioned in the literature, breaking away from their reliance on their physical location is strongly non-traditional.

I discussed one new characteristic. The Mansion and P-Art transcend their own physical location.

4.6. The Audience

AUDIENCE	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No wide audience but community-based, focusing on the specific neighborhood or city in which they are located (Grodach) • Opportunities for marginalized groups to participate in the arts (Grodach) • Audience is active, may participate and co-create (Hadley, Grigar) • Cultural Democracy: bottom-up approach: communities produce and communicate their own forms of culture, hegemonic culture is not prioritized (Hadley). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is wide, broad audience with a national scope, no subgroups are prioritized (Grodach) • Democratization of culture: 'official' culture, typically represented by large and well-funded institutions, is made accessible to non-participating communities, top-down approach (Hadley, Grigar) • Audience is passive, silent and contemplative in their reception (Hadley)

Discussion

When it comes to their audience, P-Art's goal is to reach as many people as possible. In addition, they have target groups they organize things specifically for, including children, young people, the elderly, blind people, and people in specific neighborhoods outside the city center. Grodach discusses that non-traditional organizations tend to have a community-based audience, focusing on the specific neighborhood or city in which they are located (Grodach). While P-Art indicates they want to reach as many people as possible, they do focus on specific subgroups that are underrepresented in the audience of traditional organizations.

P-Art focuses on facilitating the participation of these -sometimes- marginalized groups in the arts (Grodach). Hadley and Grigar point out that non-traditional audiences are more active and may participate or co-create. Since P-Art has a strong educational aspect, participation and creation are a big part of how they engage people with art. Lastly, Hadley points out that a cultural democracy recognizes multiple legitimate expressions of culture, avoiding the prioritization of "official" culture. For P-Art, this manifests itself in their focus on community art, such as murals, and their broad interpretation of drawing, willingness to engage with both pop culture and 'high' art, and involvement in non-Western art forms. While this suggests that they lean toward a more bottom-up approach to engaging and audience with art, they stress that their goal is to reach "people who normally do not come into contact with art," suggesting a more top-down approach. Furthermore, they do not focus on the content of their programming and how they select it, so it is unclear whether this is done from a bottom-up approach or not.

Unlike P-Art, Hubert does not necessarily want to reach as many people as possible. They mostly focus on young people who do not necessarily gravitate toward artistic or cultural activities but can be considered pleasure seekers. Additionally, they focus on other subgroups such as the elderly, queer folk, or people with different cultural backgrounds. So while they do not focus on the specific neighborhood or city in which they are located, they do focus on subgroups (Grodach). Similar to P-Art, most of these groups are not typically visitors of traditional cultural organizations. Therefore, Hubert leans towards facilitating the participation of these groups in the arts (Grodach). The context in which Hubert programs is very different from traditional organizations. Hubert programs in a free, festival-like atmosphere. Their audience is thus not expected to be passive, silent, and contemplative. However, what is programmed and how it is presented to the public exactly, is not elaborated upon, which makes it hard to judge whether participation and co-creation are happening

(Hadley, Grigar). Lastly, Hubert aims to lower the threshold to come into contact with art for people who normally do not. However, what they program is quite diverse, focusing on beginning artists and ranging from more commercial culture to more 'high' art. Their audience approach thus occupies a middle ground between cultural democracy and democratization of culture.

As discussed earlier, The Mansion's organization, audience, and community boundaries are blurry due to overlap caused by The Mansion's strong community feeling and social and educational aspects. In essence, their events are for everyone, however, they recognize that their events are mostly organized by young people, which attracts their peers. Their educational aspects also add to the subgroup of teens being a large portion of their audience. Additionally, a big part of what they do revolves around hip-hop culture, mostly attracting people interested in that culture. Altogether, The Mansion has a more community-based audience with a specific focus on a few subgroups (Grodach). Due to the social work aspect and the origin of hip-hop culture, The Mansion offers opportunities for marginalized groups to participate in the arts (Grodach). Hadley and Grigar have discussed that non-traditional audiences tend to be active and may even participate or co-create. The blur between community and audience in combination with their aim of facilitating learning and engaging with art within the organization, there is almost no passive audience. Moreover, the projects they facilitate emphasize the process rather than the outcome, further complicating the identification of participants versus spectators. What is created and organized is thus a result of what people in The Mansion's community initiate. The goal of The Mansion is for hip-hop culture, and by extension, the art they create within their community, to get recognition within the cultural sector. They lean toward an approach where communities produce and communicate their own forms of culture, as opposed to making 'official' culture accessible to non-participating communities (Hadley).

New Characteristics and Tensions

There is one characteristic that is not yet present in my model. Both P-Art and Hubert have the tendency to bring art into the spaces of the audience they want to reach. For P-Art, this is the city, through shop windows and walls, and the local soccer stadium. For Hubert, this is the café, the party, the festival. This is an overlapping characteristic that relates to both audience and space.

Conclusion

In conclusion, The Mansion leans toward a non-traditional audience and even does so strongly. For P-Art and Hubert on the other hand, the verdict is not as straightforward. Most of the non-traditional characteristics are relevant for Hubert and P-Art, but for some of them, they only adhere to parts of the characteristic. However, since the institutionalized characteristics do not apply to either of them, I would still argue for them leaning non-traditional as opposed to in the middle.

I noted one new audience-related characteristic. Both P-Art and Hubert bring and present art in the spaces of the audience they want to reach.

4.7. Finances

FINANCES	
Non-traditional	Institutionalized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely more on own networks and forms of funding and crowdsourcing (Boswinkel and van Meerkerk) • Financial independence means: Relying on public support as a passing stage towards a more private/independent existence (Mommaas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial independence means: Remaining public sector projects (Mommaas) • Receive a large proportion of the yearly cultural local and/or national funds and budgets (Kangas and Vestheim)

Hybrid

- hybrid public-private models, based on a mixture of resources and management relations (public funding, entrance fees, lease contracts, sponsorship money, heritage funds) (Momaas)

Discussion

Before diving into the finances part of this chapter I want to point out that the literature only superficially discussed the aspect or did not mention it altogether. This is probably because art and money are somewhat of a touchy subject. As a result, my model includes only a few characteristics and thus a limited understanding of what is non-traditional and what is not.

P-Art's income is mostly based on subsidies and (material) sponsoring and plans to offer a service where businesses can rent out a meeting room with an artist to brainstorm with. They do not indicate that they struggle with their income or would like to see change. From this, I would argue that they lean toward having a hybrid public-private model (Mommaas). However, P-Art also raises money through crowdsourcing and contributions from cultural partners they work with. While they may not rely on it, it does indicate they lean toward non-traditional as Boswinkel and van Meerkerk have noted that these organizations work with forms of funding and crowdsourcing in their network (Boswinkel and van Meerkerk).

Hubert receives some funding but indicates that it is a challenge due to the categorization in the cultural sector. Not because it is hard, but because they have to reinvent themselves every two years. This insecurity means they cannot easily make sustainable long-term plans and offer stability to their employees, which are things they value highly. They did not want to be dependent on subsidies and therefore became entrepreneurial. Concretely, this means they receive income from entrance fees and horeca. Based on this, Hubert pursues financial independence by relying on public support as a passing stage toward a more private/independent existence (Mommaas). However, while they recognize the

freedom financial independence brings, they note commercial and artistic interests do not always align. Furthermore, they do not want to create the illusion that organizations like them can survive solely on the free market.

The Mansion's budget consists mostly of municipal subsidies supplemented with income from the workshops they give. However, they have a budget deficit for which they are trying to find funds. Their financial professionalization is only just starting to kick in, with the interviewees suggesting they might make the workshops into a bigger revenue model and see if they can also raise money through small entrance fees and from the educational institutions they provide internship positions to. This indicates they are taking steps toward relying more on their own networks and forms of funding and crowdsourcing (Boswinkel and van Meerkerk). Like Hubert, The Mansion is therefore also relying on public support as a passing stage towards a more private/independent existence (Mommaas). Taking into account the nuance that they, like Hubert, do not want to fully relinquish public support. For The Mansion, most of their budget goes towards paying people involved, although they indicate the compensations would preferably be more. They refer to the idea that still prevails that in the cultural sector, people do things for fun and should therefore not be adequately compensated.

New Characteristics and Tensions

Since what was said during the interviews about finances was also limited, there are not many things left that point to unmentioned characteristics. However, for both The Mansion and Hubert, finances as a big tension point. The Mansion is the only one of my case studies that indicate applying for funding and subsidies is a point of concern for them. The reason for this is the administrative aspect that comes with it. The Mansion avoids formalization and professionalization where possible. This creates tension as their organizational approach is at

odds with funding and subsidy systems. This has resulted in a barrier for them to get the funding they need to keep existing, which they realize although a specific strategy to overcome this hurdle is still missing. In contrast, Hubert does not necessarily have a problem applying for and getting funding, but they express frustration with the system as getting long-term financial support is hard. For Hubert, this also creates tension with their organizational approach, but not in the way it does for The Mansion. Hubert is actively adapting a more institutionalized approach to their organization but does not have access to the financial stability that traditional organizations receive. Hubert points to the categorization of the cultural sector. Content-wise, they fall between the cracks for the state funds and thus seek a solution in the form of systemic change and calls for an advocacy group for organizations in the same situation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are significantly fewer characteristics for the financial category than other categories. The following judgment should therefore be considered with a grain of salt. Overall, P-Art leans slightly towards being non-traditional as they are financed through a hybrid public-private model but also make use of finance forms like crowdsourcing. The Mansion and Hubert also lean more non-traditional given they are making steps towards not relying solely on public funding.

Chapter 5: Results and Discussion

	P-Art	Hubert	The Mansion
Organizational Framework/Approach	Non-traditional	Institutionalized	Strongly Non-traditional
Function, Activities/Goals/Aims	Non-traditional	Non-traditional	Strongly Non-traditional
(Artistic) Content and Programming	Strongly Non-traditional	Strongly Non-traditional	Strongly Non-traditional
Relationships and Network	Non-traditional	Non-traditional	Strongly Non-traditional
Spatial	Non-traditional	Non-traditional	Strongly Non-traditional
The Audience	Non-traditional	Non-traditional	Strongly Non-traditional
Finances	Non-traditional	Non-traditional	Non-traditional

1. Reflections on the Results and *Theoretical Model*

It is important to note that the *theoretical model* I have is not a final, absolute model; rather, it provides an indication of the degree to which the chosen type of organization leans towards non-traditionality. Since I deliberately selected case studies that were expected to be overall non-traditional, it is not surprising that all but one category for one case study did not lean towards non-traditional. While the option existed for the case studies to fall in the middle for each category, this was never the case for my case studies. Some case studies exhibited a higher number of matching characteristics, or had characteristics as more strongly present, resulting in a strong alignment with non-traditionality. Others had fewer matching characteristics, or have the aspects less pronounced, resulting in them still leaning non-traditional, albeit not as strongly. None of the case studies had a category where there was an equal or near-equal amount of both non-traditional and traditional characteristics

present. It rarely occurred for a case study to have any traditional characteristics if they met non-traditional criteria.

Using the model as a basis to identify characteristics, I also discovered traits that were not extensively discussed in the literature on the non-traditional phenomenon. This does not mean that these characteristics are entirely new or have never been recognized but rather highlights areas that have been underreported in the explicit discussion of non-traditional organizations. Additionally, it should be kept in mind that the characteristics I identified may not necessarily apply to all non-traditional organizations.

In conclusion, all three organizations can be considered non-traditional to varying degrees, but the specific tensions they experience differ. As quoted in my theoretical framework, Pratt argued that diversity of practices is a defining characteristic of the phenomenon, which holds true for my case studies. The phenomenon can be defined as non-traditional and can be identified through a wide range of characteristics with each organization exhibiting different degrees of characteristic presence and manifestations of non-traditionality. This sentiment is similar to what van Meerkerk argued in his cultural entrepreneurship scorecard, which concluded that different organizations have varying balances between entrepreneurship factors (van Meerkerk, “Cultural Entrepreneurship”). Looking at characteristics and how they manifest thus allows for more nuance as opposed to trying to define organizations as strictly non-traditional.

2. Understanding the Tensions’ Meaning at the Broader Level

Through my analysis chapter, I uncovered and discussed intriguing tensions and nuances. In the following paragraph, I will revisit the tensions that are important to explore for their broader implications.

Both Hubert and The Mansion face challenges with the subsidy system, albeit for different reasons tied to their organizational approaches. Hubert is transitioning to a more traditional organizational framework. They express concerns about funding and emphasize the importance of financial support to legitimize their work. However, their organizational professionalization does not guarantee the same level of funding as traditional organizations. This disparity arises due to their content and programming, which transcend the cultural sector's disciplines and the sector itself. This demonstrates the difficulty faced by non-traditional organizations when adopting more traditional organizational methods, as it clashes with other aspects of their organization. The question remains whether the opposite holds true as well.

Unable to rely on stable governmental funding, Hubert embraced entrepreneurship to attain greater financial independence. This has shaped their organizational structure and introduced tension between their commercial and artistic interests. The entrepreneurial characteristic exemplifies the impossibility of strictly distinguishing between what is deemed traditional and institutionalized. Traditional organizations receive substantial funding and subsidies while often incorporating commercial aspects such as food and drink opportunities and gift shops. Additionally, in 2008, austerity measures and a policy shift compelled the sector to become more entrepreneurial. Consequently, entrepreneurship serves as both a solution to not conforming to traditional standards and an expectation imposed on cultural organizations and creators.

Moreover, this highlights the predicament faced by non-traditional organizations, as they find themselves effectively trapped within a system that favors large institutions with traditional organizational approaches (Lijster et al., van Meerkerk). Achieving long-term financial stability requires fitting into this mold. Since Hubert is still in the process of changing their organizational framework, it remains uncertain how this transformation will

impact other aspects of the organization. Only time will reveal if Hubert's move toward a traditional organizational approach will have a domino effect, aligning the other aspects closer to traditional, or if a different outcome will emerge.

The Mansion's frustration with the subsidy systems is rooted in its formality, which clashes with their informal organizational approach. The Mansion and their events are carried by the community, but they have realized that one can only do so much with a limited budget. At the same time, the absence of employees and stable positions, combined with a lack of hierarchy or structure, contributes to the dynamic community they have cultivated. Formalizing operations on paper contradicts their ad-hoc work ethic and values of trust. However, to grow and acquire more financial resources, they are forced to adapt to these formal systems.

Comparing Hubert and P-Art yields another interesting perspective. P-Art has a clear organizational structure with defined tasks, which would typically translate into stable jobs with salaries, but this is not the case. They primarily rely on independent professionals and volunteers for tasks beyond their capabilities. The key difference between Hubert and P-Art, once again, lies in their financial aspects. P-Art indicates no issues in finding funding or subsidies and does not seem to encounter difficulties when it comes to opposing interests in their entrepreneurial activities. However, they do acknowledge that if there is no funding available, they do not pursue certain activities or projects. Moreover, the insecurities associated with temporary and project-based funding do not seem to affect them as much, given the flexibility allowed by their organizational framework. Thus, P-Art's non-traditional organizational structure does not clash with their financial practices. This suggests that organizations with a non-traditional organizational framework can find ways to secure funding. This is provided their (artistic) content aligns with the priorities of the funding and subsidy systems and someone in the organization knows and can apply to these systems

effectively. This highlights another issue that Hubert has as they emphasize the importance of programming things themselves. The revenue generated from their commercial activities grants them freedom in this regard, while subsidies and funding come with terms and conditions. This leaves organizations the choice to either adjust what they program and organize according to top-down wishes or to find other ways of funding.

3. Defining and Not Defining the Non-traditional and Traditional:

I went into this thesis wanting to define the phenomenon. The utilization of categories facilitated the analysis of the case studies but also revealed the challenges inherent in categorization and definition. The term "non-traditional" proves useful as it implies a definition based on what deviates from tradition. It avoids a static definition based on the assumption that norms and deviations change over time and context. However, going beyond the label of non-traditional and providing a precise name proves to be challenging. The list of categories and characteristics that resulted from my research serves as a starting point for a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. Additionally, at the individual case study level, it can be used to gauge how strongly the organization leans toward being non-traditional in different areas and identifies tensions within the organization and the sector. Nevertheless, this categorization approach also has limitations. While analyzing the case studies using the model, I discovered that the categorization itself is problematic. During the review and discussion of the case study characteristics, I noticed a frequent overlap between different categories. The Mansion, strongly non-traditional, showcased the most prominent overlap between categories. This is not surprising considering the blurred and dynamic boundaries between their organization, network, and audience. From this, I deduce that characteristics

from non-traditional organizations are not easily categorized, emphasizing the importance of recognizing the bigger picture rather than focusing solely on specific aspects.

Classic academic research demands careful delineation of research, subjects, and scope. However, throughout my research, I experienced tension between my subject and the design and purpose of my research. By attempting to compartmentalize and define the phenomenon within static frameworks, I contradicted the main essence of non-traditionality, which defies and questions established frameworks. This becomes problematic when considering the functioning of the current cultural system. As previously noted, art is increasingly legitimized based on its social value (Hadley). As affirmed by Lijster et al. and supported by my analysis, non-traditional organizations often view art as a means for societal improvement. Consequently, their legitimacy as cultural organizations is built not solely on artistic quality but more and more on the value that art brings to society. This shift was already alluded to in my theoretical chapter and is an important aspect of the phenomenon's relation to the cultural sector and overall cultural policy. In the theoretical chapter, I also explained the policy paradox discussed by Lijster et al., which highlights the contradictory nature of addressing contemporary global issues through top-down policy-making (10). Concretely, they argue that global issues are most effectively addressed by beginning at the local level and empowering grassroots initiatives (*ibid.*). However, current cultural policy primarily focuses on larger, institutionalized organizations, leaving non-traditional ones with fewer resources. Hubert called for systemic change, echoing van Meerkerk's plea in a recently published article on system change in the cultural sector. Van Meerkerk confirms Lijster et al.'s observation and notes that "the entire cultural system in the Netherlands mainly favors larger organizations, and initiatives that organize themselves in other ways are left out of the system." The current policy has yet to be updated to effectively address vague and dynamic cultural phenomena.

This inherent paradox poses challenges for policymaking and academic inquiry. While a precise definition is necessary for effective policy development, the elusive and fluid nature of the phenomenon resists easy categorization. This tension underscores the need to navigate the complex interplay between defining and understanding the phenomenon while recognizing its dynamic and evolving nature. Moreover, it is not only the categorization within the cultural sector that complicates matters; there is also a rigid distinction between sectors. As established in the analysis chapter, all three case studies overlap with the social sector to some extent. Given the stark differences between cultural policy and social policy, this adds another layer of complexity. Therefore, Interdisciplinary research is necessary to study the intersection between these non-traditional organizations and the social sector and policy.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

1. Research Question

Throughout this thesis, I explored the emergence of non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen, aiming to understand their position within the cultural sector and the broader cultural zeitgeist. I posed the following research question: *“How do non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen position themselves in relation to the cultural sector in Nijmegen?”* To answer this main question, it has been divided into three sub-questions. 1: *“What is written in the academic literature on the non-traditional phenomenon and which characteristics are attributed to it?”*, 2: *“How do these non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen look at their audience, artistic production and their societal role?”* and 3: *“How do the visions of these organizations measure up against the cultural policy of the city of Nijmegen?”*

I emphasize that the sub-questions were formulated to steer my research toward addressing the main research question. However, as I progressed with my research, it became evident that my chosen subject demanded an open and comprehensive outlook that led to a broad but nuanced perspective. Consequently, the sub-questions do not align entirely with the trajectory of my research. Nonetheless, I will sequentially address these questions in this conclusion.

What is written in the academic literature on the non-traditional phenomenon and which characteristics are attributed to it?”

When I embarked on my thesis, I was aware that the phenomenon I intended to investigate lacked a precise name or definition. Consequently, I anticipated that the academic literature I would explore would encompass descriptions of various facets of the phenomenon, analyses

of case studies exemplifying the phenomenon, as well as literature elucidating the current cultural zeitgeist and the contextual transformations related to my chosen subject.

A few authors have written about the phenomenon, discussing specific manifestations related to it, which differ based on their perspectives. Different countries may use different terms to describe the phenomenon, but what stood out to me is the varying frameworks employed by these authors. Boswinkel and van Meerkerk analyze the Dutch creative hub through a cultural policy lens, while Pratt does the same for the UK context. Dovey et al. provide a report on cultural hubs in the UK while Grodach examines art spaces from an urban planning perspective, focusing on art and the tension it creates in the creative economy. Mommaas discusses ploaps and cultural spaces from an urban planning perspective, addressing their cultural, economic, social, and spatial dynamics. Otte and Gielen adopt the term "cultural commons" and approach the phenomenon from a more bottom-up, cultural sociology perspective with a political undertone.

In order to properly define the phenomenon, and non-traditionality by extension, I dedicated a paragraph to what the phenomenon is not. More specifically, what characteristics can be attributed to traditionality, or the norm. The political, societal, socio-artistic, and policy contexts illustrate the context in which the phenomenon arises. The political context examines the role of community art, austerity measures, and the top-down approach to cultural politics. It also explores the political backdrop that led to the emergence of the cultural commons and the idea of commoning as a political process. The societal context focuses on the shift from the democratization of culture to cultural democracy, touching on the concepts of the participation society and the transnational. The socio-artistic context discusses three major shifts: a shift in the cultural sector characterized by the democratization of culture and changes in the authority of institutional gatekeepers, a shift in the societal role of art and artists, involving them in various areas of life, and a shift in the perception of the

audience, emphasizing active participation and engagement. Lastly, the policy context addresses changes in audience policy, the tension between top-down approaches and the commons, and the policy paradox that is at play. It also briefly touches upon the relationship between cultural value and policy.

From this literature, I distilled characteristics that can be attributed to non-traditional organizations. These characteristics have been clearly categorized in my *theoretical model* which can be found on pages 42 to 45.

How do these non-traditional cultural organizations and initiatives in Nijmegen look at their audience, artistic production and their societal role?"

This question was intended to gain insight into the views, visions, customs, and practices of my case studies. However, after my literature research, it became clear that how they view their audience, artistic production, and societal role were only a small part of what contributed to their non-traditionality. Instead, I looked at the seven categories that I distilled from the literature and gained a broader understanding of the organization's views.

The organizations focus on broad programming and aim to make art accessible to the audience. P-Art emphasizes lowering the threshold for engagement with art through workshops from a cultural democracy perspective. Hubert also aims for accessibility, with a mix of commercial events and experimental art, while focusing on social issues. The Mansion prioritizes hip-hop and underrepresented disciplines, and programs democratically with a focus on community and learning. These organizations tend to lean towards using art as a tool for personal and societal improvement, emphasizing the process over the end product. They also favor alternative ways of presenting art and have a progressive attitude toward innovation and experimentation. Overall, they build legitimacy based on the value that art brings to society. Notably, these organizations blur boundaries; between the organization and

its members, between the organization and its network, between the organization('s members) and its audience, and between cultural and social organizations.

“How do the visions of these organizations measure up against the cultural policy of the city of Nijmegen?”

The course of my research has made it impossible to provide a specific answer to this question. During my investigation of cultural policy, I realized that the cultural policy of Nijmegen specifically, was not as relevant as I initially thought. Instead, I found broader relevance in discussing Dutch cultural policy and the sector's norms in relation to my organization. I have discussed these findings extensively in the previous chapter, in the paragraph *Understanding the Tensions' Meaning at the Broader Level and Defining* specifically. What follows is a summary.

The tensions that I distilled from the analysis illuminate specific insights into the complexities that non-traditional organizations face in the current cultural system. Most notable is that non-traditional organizations find themselves effectively trapped within the current system. Hubert and The Mansion face challenges with the subsidy system due to their different organizational approaches. Hubert's transition to a more traditional framework raises concerns about funding and clashes with their non-traditional content. Comparatively, The Mansion's informal organizational approach clashes with formal subsidy systems.

Organizations with a non-traditional organizational framework either need to adapt and program according to top-down wishes or find other ways of funding. In Addition, Hubert's transformation from having a non-traditional organizational framework to a more traditional one sheds light on the difficulty faced by non-traditional organizations when adopting more traditional organizational methods, as it clashes with other aspects of their organization.

2. Implications for the Academic Context and the Cultural Sector

I started my thesis journey with the intention of studying a phenomenon I initially labeled as non-traditional. This temporary term opened up a discussion on non-traditionality and traditionality, norms, and abnormality. While attempting to define non-traditionality, I found myself questioning what constitutes traditionality in cultural organizations. Norms are rarely studied as a separate category, they are only exposed by discussing and defining what is not the norm. Reviewing the works of scholars who discussed non-traditional aspects and shifts in the cultural sector helped illustrate the norm without explicitly defining it. This allowed me to form a rough understanding of what can be considered traditional based on what is established as non-traditional. However, this highlights a gap in the existing literature regarding the definition and exploration of traditional cultural organizations. Moreover, it raises the question of whether the non-traditional and the traditional are two sides of the same coin and, if and how they should be defined in relation to each other, and separately. Further research is needed to address these matters.

Aside from the academic implications of my research, I identified several findings that are of significance for the cultural sector and cultural policy as a whole. The research reveals the challenges inherent in categorizing and defining the non-traditional phenomenon. While the term "non-traditional" proves useful as it implies deviation from tradition, providing a precise name for the phenomenon proves to be challenging. The categorization approach used in the research highlights the limitations of categorizing non-traditional organizations, emphasizing the importance of recognizing the bigger picture rather than focusing solely on specific aspects. It also reveals how non-traditional organizations are ultimately disadvantaged by the current policy system, as policy is made based on precise definitions and categorization.

The research highlights that non-traditional organizations increasingly view art as a means for societal improvement, and built their legitimacy mostly on the value they bring to society. This addresses the policy paradox in cultural policy-making.³³ There is a need for systemic change to better support and integrate non-traditional organizations into the policy framework. The rigid distinction between cultural and social policy areas adds complexity to understanding and supporting non-traditional organizations. Rethinking these boundaries and making space for interdisciplinary policy can lead to a better understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by non-traditional organizations in both cultural and social contexts and better facilitate collaboration in both directions. This means that there is also a need for (interdisciplinary) research to explore the intersection between non-traditional organizations and the social sector and how and if cultural and social policies can effectively create a dynamic hybrid.

In conclusion, the research emphasizes the need for a nuanced understanding of the non-traditional phenomenon, recognition of its evolving nature, and the importance of revisiting (cultural) policies to effectively address the needs and contributions of non-traditional organizations in the cultural sector.

3. Reflection on Theory and Method and Advice for Future Research

As mentioned in the discussion of my sub-questions, my theoretical framework comprised articles that directly discuss the phenomenon and the context in which it is embedded. The latter was useful as an addition to the literature. It allowed me to gain a broad understanding

³³ As explained in chapter 5, paragraph 3: Defining and Not Defining the Non-traditional and Traditional

of the zeitgeist in which my phenomenon has emerged, contextualize the characteristics distilled from the specific articles and expand on as well as add to the characteristics. This approach allowed me to zoom out and consider a broad non-traditional phenomenon, rather than confining my research to the specific and predefined descriptions of the phenomenon provided by the authors I selected. The authors and concepts span multiple disciplines, which led to a broad overview encompassing multiple perspectives. However, since the phenomenon is relatively new and little has been written about it in general, most of the perspectives had one author or author pair that discussed the specific aspects that pertained to my phenomenon. As a result, there was little opportunity to critically consider multiple voices within their own discipline or perspective. In hindsight, this was not an issue as my research benefitted greatly from my interdisciplinary theoretical base.

The case studies I selected should not be considered representative of the entire city, country, or phenomenon. I focused on a small fraction of the organizations that constitute the non-traditional phenomenon. Nonetheless, this approach facilitated qualitative research, which contributed to delving into the tensions and intricacies of my phenomenon. The in-depth semi-structured interviews allowed my interviewees to reflect and philosophize more in comparison to defined survey questions. While it was not the case for Hubert, initially all interviews were to be held with two people per organization. This dynamic allowed the interviewees to complement each other or offer different perspectives. The downside of this method is that the actual reality might not correspond with what they choose to say or focus on.

In retrospect, what started as a well-defined subject generated more questions than my research was able to answer. It is a subject on which there is still much to explore. Aside from the question of whether and how the Dutch cultural system can adapt to accommodate both traditional and non-traditional organizations, other questions come to mind. It would be

interesting to see if there are differences between Nijmegen and other Dutch cities, as well as other countries. Considering the organization's age and the tension between its finances and organizational framework, it would also be useful to contemplate how Hubert and The Mansion will fare in five or ten years. Lastly, I have established that traditional organizations as a category have not been researched properly.

Works Cited List

- “About CCQO.” *Culture Commons Quest Office*, ccqo.eu/about-ccqo/. Accessed 21 Sept. 2022.
- Boswinkel Koen and Edwin van Meerkerk. “Creative hubs: an anomaly in cultural policy”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 2022.
- Cerquetti, Mara. “More Is Better! Current Issues and Challenges for Museum Audience Development: A Literature Review.” *Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2016, pp. 30-43.
- Cleveringa, Sikko and Anke Coumans. “Een Nieuwe Positie van Kunstenaars.” *Boekman*, vol. 31, no. 118, 2019, pp. 4-7.
- “Creative Hub Leader's Toolkit”, *Creative Economy British Council*, 2020, creativeeconomy.britishcouncil.org/resources/creative-hub-leaders-toolkit/. Accessed 3 Oct. 2022.
- De staat van Cultuur in Nijmegen: Bouwstenen voor een nieuwe cultuurvisie*. Blueyard, 16 May 2019, pp. 1-102.
- Dovey, Jonathan, et al. “Creative Hubs: Understanding the New Economy.” British Council, 2016.
- Elffers, Anna. “Het Nut en de Noodzaak van Publieksonderzoek.” *Cultuurmarketing*, 17 Jan. 2018, cultuurmarketing.nl/nut-en-noodzaak-van-publieksonderzoek. Accessed 17 Apr. 2022.
- Gemeente Nijmegen, *Groei. Cultuurvisie Nijmegen 2020*, 2020, p. 1-50.
- Grigar, Ewa. “Inventing the New Art World: On Art Institutions and Their Audience.” *Przeegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*, vol. 17, no.3, 2021, pp. 126-141.
- Grodach, Carl. “Art Spaces in Community and Economic Development: Connections to Neighborhoods, Artists, and the Cultural Economy.” *Journal of Planning Education*

and Research, vol. 31, no. 1, 2011, pp. 74–85.

Hadley, Steven. *Audience Development and Cultural Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.

“ICOM announces the alternative museum definition that will be subject to a vote”

International Council of Museums, 25 Jul. 2019, icom.museum/en/news/icom-approves-a-new-museum-definition/. Accessed 12 Jan. 2023.

Janssen, Susanne, and Marc Verboord. “Cultural Mediators and Gatekeepers.” *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences*. vol. 5, no. 2, 2015, pp. 440–446.

Joye, Sofie. “Nieuwstedelijke Grond.” *Boekman*, vol. 31, no. 118, 2019, pp 26-31.

Kangas, Anita and Geir Vestheim. “Institutionalism, cultural institutions and cultural policy in the Nordic countries.” *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidsskrift*, vol. 13, no.2, 2011, pp. 267-284.

“Kunst- en cultuurbeleid.” *Rijksoverheid*, www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/kunst-en-cultuur/kunst-en-cultuurbeleid. Accessed 23 Mar. 2023.

Lijster, Thijs et al. “Towards a cultural policy of trust: The Dutch approach from the perspective of a transnational civil domain.” *Cultural Policy in the polder: 25 Years Dutch Cultural Policy Act*, edited by van den Hoogen Quirijn and Edwin van Meerkerk, Amsterdam University Press, 2018, pp. 133-150.

Lindelof, Anja Mølle “Audience development and its blind spot: a quest for pleasure and play in the discussion of performing arts institutions.” *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2015, pp. 200-218.

Meerkerk, Edwin van. “Systeemverandering: Naar een flexibeler cultuurbestel.” *Boekman*, vol. 35 n. 135, 2023.

Meerkerk, Edwin van. "The Cultural Entrepreneurship Scorecard: An Instrument for Assessing Cultural Institutions." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*,

vol. 52, no. 4, 2022, pp. 231-248.

Minnaert, Toine. "Culturele democratie in internationaal perspectief." *Cultuur+Educatie*, vol. 21, no. 60, 2022, pp. 78-87.

Mommaas, Hans. "Cultural Clusters and the Post-industrial City: Towards the Remapping of Urban Cultural Policy." *Urban Studies*, vol. 41, no. 3, 2004, pp. 507-532.

Musch, Marcel, and Bart de Zwart. "Bloeiende broedplaatsen." *Boekman*, vol. 31, no. 119, 2019, pp. 54-57.

Otte, Hanka, and Pascal Gielen. "Commoning art as political companion. On the issue of participatory democracy." *Cultural Policies in Europe: a Participatory Turn*, edited by Félix Dupin-Meynard, 2020, pp. 141-154.

Otte, Hanka and Pascal Gielen. "Gemeen Cultuurbeleid" *Boekman*, vol. 31, no. 118, 2019, pp. 8-11.

Otte, Hanka and Pascal Gielen. "When politics becomes unavoidable: from community art to commoning art." *Commonism: a new aesthetics of the real*, edited by Dockx Nico and Pascal Gielen, Valiz, 2018, pp. 269-282.

"over." *P-Art*, www.p-art.world/over/. Accessed 6 June 2023.

"over ons." *Hubert Nijmegen*, [/hubertnijmegen.nl/over-ons/](http://hubertnijmegen.nl/over-ons/). Accessed 6 June 2023.

Pratt, Andy. "Creative hubs: A critical evaluation." *City, Culture and Society*, vol. 24, 2021, pp. 1-7.

Reinsma, Janna. "Culturele Commons, Vormgeven van Gedeeld Cultureel Goed." *Boekman*, vol. 31, no. 118, 2019, pp. 14-17.

Rijksoverheid, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. *Cultuurbrief 2018: Cultuur in een Open Samenleving*. Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, 12 Mar. 2018.

Rodner, Victoria et al. "Institutional placeholders: Alternative Art Spaces Transcend the

Institutional Logics of the Art World.” *Academy of Marketing Annual Conference*, Jul 2016, Newcastle. Unpublished conference paper. Northumbria University Newcastle UK, Newcastle. www.academia.edu/23767084/Institutional_placeholders_Alternative_Art_Spaces_Transcend_the_Institutional_Logics_of_the_Art_World.

Saldaña, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. 3rd ed., London; Sage, 2016.

Stravides, Stavros. *Common Space: The City as Commons*. Zed Books, 2016.

“Subsidieregeling Cultuur Nijmegen 2021.” *Overheid NL*, www.lokaleregelgeving.overheid.nl/CVDR661692/1. Accessed 3 June 2023.

“The Culture Commons Quest Office.” *Culture Commons Quest Office*, 4 Dec. 2020, ccqo.eu/2020/12/04/the-culture-commons-quest-office/. Accessed 21 Sept. 2022.

The Mansion Nimma. The Mansion, www.themansionnimma.nl/. Accessed 6 June 2023.

Interviews

The Mansion. Personal interview. 14 Dec 2022.

Hubert. Personal interview. 24 Jan 2023.

P-Art. Personal interview. 19 Jan 2023.