

ARTS MANAGEMENT NETWORK

Arts Management Network - an international network for arts and business. The website as well as the quarterly newsletter became popular among professionals in the arts and the creative sector. With its global perspective, Arts Management Network is read by academics, students, researchers, regional and national authorities, business people and journalists from more than 190 countries.

artsmanagement.net

JUDIT BOLLA

The principal investigator of this study, Judit Bolla, created this article as part of the MA program Master of Arts in Arts Management at the HKU University of the Arts Utrecht and at the Open University of London.

Coping Strategies of British Theatre Venues

A study by Judit Bolla

Abstract

The financial crisis had a meaningful impact on cultural and creative industries all over the world. As a consequence of the crisis there is a crucial change in the governmental policies concerning the European cultural sector. The operations of many cultural organizations, such as theatre venues, depend deeply on the cultural policies that the government makes; hence theatre venues also experienced the effect of the changes. The critical alteration in the cultural policies of theatre venues meant a cut in their public funding that their local administration put into effect. Therefore, the focus point of the article is the artistic and financial reaction of theatre venues to the financial shortage in their subsidy. The article approaches both Dutch and British theatre fields and it includes a comparison of the Dutch and British theatre venues in respect of the artistic and financial strategies they chose to cope with the financial difficulties. First of all, the article examines the impacts of the financial crisis in the artistic strategy of the two fields, namely, it indicates the extent of the artistic limitation. Furthermore, the reader will know how the two theatrical worlds give an artistic and financial response to the same problem, and how they treat it differently in their artistic and financial operation. Analyzing the British and the Dutch theatre fields at the same time leads to awareness of the changes that can be learned by the Dutch theatre venues from the British theatre venues. The article, which is based on the research findings, is conspicuous in four scopes: programming, collaboration, audience, and the connection with their municipality. The conclusion of the research and the main discussion of the article is that in the British theatre field the relationship with the audience and the local administration is significantly stronger than in the Dutch field. Furthermore, British theatre venues are more entrepreneurial, artistically and financially. For these reasons, the last section is an advisory report that has been made to the Dutch theatre venues which includes all the advice that the venues can use to learn from the coping strategies of theatre organizations in England. Thanks to the advisory report, they can develop their artistic and financial entrepreneurship. However, Dutch theatre venues have realized their situation in the changed theatrical field and recognized new opportunities. In doing so, Dutch theatre venues have started to apply some of the artistic and financial considerations that the British model already follows.

Keywords: financial strategy, cultural entrepreneurship, public subsidy, cultural policy

Introduction

There is a relationship between art and economy. Several statements seem to underpin the assumed linkage. Klammer (1996) stresses, that art gets priced, for instance, when a painter tries to sell paintings. In general, the artistic community distrusts the operation of money and market, because they represent the value of art, such as the aesthetics, in the price-value and the income that it generates. However, the price of art is also the best indicator of the aesthetic value. It means that money is actually playing a meaningful role in the world of art, because, for example, the painter expects that the painting will be sold at a high price. What is more, Throsby (2003) reflects on his belief that it is possible to place economic value on the nonmarket output of the arts. For this reason he argues that art has its price as one produces art, and as one is consuming it to suffice its need, as one is supporting it by making voluntary donations. It means that prices are paid by putting artistic and social values on the benefits, which are not attached in market transactions. This context provides the theoretical framework for the article that helps to understand the introduction of the new artistic and financial considerations of British subsidized theatre venues to Dutch subsidized theatre venues to know how to cope with the cut in their public funding. First of all, the article introduces the emerged financial problem in both theatre fields. Furthermore, it shows the way the two theatre fields react to the same problem in their operation. The different approach leads to realize that the British theatre field is more entrepreneurial in respect of running the artistic operation with the lack of subsidy than the Dutch theatre field. Therefore, the article finally presents the applicable activities for Dutch subsidized theatre venues that allow them to learn from the coping strategies of theatre organizations in England in order to improve artistic and financial entrepreneurship.

Problem Statement

Placing the relationship of art and economy in the context of the financial crisis in the cultural and creative industries, a meaningful case occurs. Today's world attaches great importance to the global financial crisis for the whole of society, both in Europe and in most developed countries. The financial crisis has had an impact not only on the current financial models of governance (production and consumption of goods), but also on the cultural sector in Europe. In the cultural sector, the majority of European countries have reacted to the crisis with structural changes of their cultural policies. Arts councils have reduced the level of subsidy; hence the severe cuts affect the budgets of cultural organizations and cause a reduction of cultural productions and activities. Moreover, it automatically provokes a decrease of cultural consumption. However, the new market conditions bring new opportunities for a structural change and great impact on management models in the cultural sector (Bonet & Donato, 2011). The opportunities in the new market can be equally financial and artistic.

By approaching the financial crisis in the field of theatre, a political decision has been made. The government had to amend the content of the regulations in cultural policy. As one of the impacts of the changed cultural policy, the financial crisis has led to a reduction in the financial subsidy system, which also affects theatres. For this reason, theatre companies and theatre venues have to operate with less public funding, which forces them to behave more entrepreneurially (artistically) and compels them to be independent (financially) from the subsidies.

To be more specific, in the Netherlands, Schwartz (2011) stresses that meanwhile the Council for Culture (Raad voor Cultuur), a government advisory body, recommended that the government softened the proposed €200m cuts, by reducing them to €125m and implementing them gradually between 2013 and 2015. The ministry of education, culture and science usually adopts the proposed recommendations of the Arts Council, but last month Zijlstra submitted his final position, under the heading “More than quality: a new vision for cultural policy.” This confirmed the €200m cuts, as of January 2013 (Schwartz, 2011, n.p.).

As far as the British situation is concerned, the British Arts Council announced the budget cut for 206 arts organizations. Bowie Sell (2011) argues that larger arts organizations were able to financially tolerate the budget cut, but some smaller companies had remarkable financial difficulties. Nancy Meckler and Polly Teale, Co-Artistic Directors of Shared Experience said of the decision: “We are shocked and disappointed to hear that we will receive no National Portfolio Funding from 2012 – 2015. We feel strongly our work delivers the Arts Council’s goals and we are devastated by their decision” (Bowie-Sell, 2011, n.p.).

The two extracts prove that the two theatre fields have to face the same problem. Therefore, hereinafter it is interesting to examine the different way they approach the financial obstacle in their artistic function. In other words, it is important to know to what extent the artistic strategy is limited by the changed financial support system in both theatre fields.

Impacts of the Financial Crisis in the Artistic Strategy

The Netherlands

The artistic strategy is limited by the changed Dutch subsidy cycle in the Dutch theatre field, as one of the impacts of the financial crisis. To answer the question: to what extent is the artistic strategy of Dutch theatre venues limited?, the author determines that it is not limited, but affected.

The argument is that, as the researcher experienced, every intention and pursuit of theatre venues are focused on the means of earning back the lacking amount of money that has been cut by the Dutch municipality. It implies that theatre venues try to increase their income through the box office by

selling tickets. To be more precise, by programming shows more than once helps them to enhance their income and save money. For instance, one of the possible outcomes of decreasing the number of productions is to show a performance more than once. Harm Lambers stated that “the programme that we can show, which has a promise that it might attract big audience, then we show it 3 or 4 or 5 times, so it has a long run with one performance” (Lambers, 24th March 2014, personal communication). On the other hand, Joost de Kleine declared that they decreased the different types of performances, which allowed them to show one performance several times and continued by saying “... it is easier for us to organize sight services around the performance or creating interesting programs, so we are able to attract more visitors a little bit easily” (Kleine, 26th March 2014, personal communication). What is more, Vivienne Ypma made sure that the programme was good and the performances she showed for the audience would be sell out (Ypma, 16th April 2014, personal communication). Andreas Fleischmann approached the same statement from another perspective. He stated that by selling tickets, which increased the income of the theatre venue, he was able to pay for artists or theatre groups (Fleischmann, 11th April 2014, personal communication).

It leads to the point that the quality of the programmed shows are not affected either. For this reason, venues tend to programme artistically high quality of performances. Dutch theatre venues make sure that the tickets for the performances will be sold out and the audience meets its need. That is the reason why all of the interviewed theatre venues concentrate on programming. However, this is not about growing financially, since they are a non-profit organization, but about attracting more people and convincing them to come back for future performances. Convincing the audience can lead to a long and loyal relationship for theatre venues, which ensures them a financially balanced artistic operation.

The other conclusion is being more active in the theatre market in a way that theatre venues cooperate with each other and have common projects, such as lending an actor to another theatre company. The reason is that there is less money to make theatre, therefore; theatre venues, as the researcher experienced, started using their network and realized that they can benefit from it, as far as their fight against their artistic limitation is concerned. For example, Frank Noorland said that his artistic strategy was limited: however, he found some ways to solve his artistic limitations. For instance, he made some cuts in the décor and he tried to find volunteer actors, “which is usually then a traineeship for third-year actors from the theatre schools” (Noorland, 18th April 2014, personal communication). He also made a coproduction with another company in order to lend out one actor for two companies. This situation points to the fact that theatres need to use their network and be more active, if they intend to cooperate. Cooperation can save money and theatres can reinvest this money into making or buying into productions.

England

The general conclusion in connection with the British theatre field is that theatre venues are not limited artistically by the effects and consequences of the economic crisis.

According to David Jubb, the artistic director of Battersea Arts Centre (BAC), the significant cut has been made along with all the other cuts in the public services (Jubb, 9th April 2014, personal communication). Steve Marmion, the artistic director of Soho Theatre, confirmed as well that “there was a 20% cut in the funding, but it is a 250% increase in our turnover and our box office” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). In fact, they also experienced a cut in their financial budget, but they continued to grow artistically and financially. The reason is that they invested public money on production, so they have more money to spend on art, to programme more and better quality productions. Steve Marmion, whose theatre established itself as the major venue for new writing, comedy, and cabaret, said that if you do not have enough financial resources to produce, than you are in trouble. His method was that he took the money that ACE gave to his theatre venue to make more money, namely, he produced. He stated that regardless of the financial crisis and the cut in their financial budget, “people go to the theatre more, people want to be entertained. Comedy does better during the recession” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). What is more, he highlighted that comedy is a one person performance and the tickets were sold out every night, so that made money. The money he earned through comedy shows was spent on the playwrights and plays with six actors, which costs six times as much the wages alone. It means that he used “that profit to make that thing happen. So they balance each other right through” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). The argument, why this theatre venue is growing in respect of the finances, is that venues started commissioning the plays and put all the artistic ideas together. In doing so, the theatre has money to spend on art and on people who work for the theatre venue. Thus, the venue is able to produce and represent an artistically high quality of shows.

Furthermore, both of the theatre venues are opened for their audience, involving them in the initial phase of the artistic development of performances. It guarantees a long-term, loyal relationship with the visitors that ensures a secure financial background. David Jubb stated that they try to be an open organization; “we are talking openly about what we do, people come to our programme meetings, so they can see what is going on” (Jubb, 9th April 2014, personal communication). It means that they try to be transparent for the audience in a way that the venue intends to involve them in the artistic progresses from the beginning.

Nevertheless, they are considered as cultural entrepreneurs, because they are constantly looking for artistic opportunities to grow (financially). Using their

creativity or by building a new venue within the venue allows them to realize their goals. An appropriate example is when Steve Marmion explained that they reimagined their business problem and how their theatre looked. In doing so, “We built a new venue within the theatre; we fundraised, so within my theatre there are 3 venues now. When I arrived, there was one venue, so we built new venues there and put 2 shows a night in each venue” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). As an outcome of their expansion, the number of their audience grew from 80.000 to 180.000 a year. The company focused on what was still artistically possible to realize it financially, therefore; they invested money to go further. For this reason, it can be determined that the artistic director and the company itself are cultural entrepreneurs, because they are mixing artistic values with business sense. He confirmed this determination with his opinion: “I am more entrepreneurial, than most artistic directors. I don’t need to put myself in a box. I mean, I think, I am an artist first probably, and then I am a business man. I don’t mean anything wrong with making money, especially on spending the money on good things, like culture” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication).

Comparison

In order to discuss the possibilities of Dutch subsidized theatre venues and the extent they can acquire the strategy of British subsidized theatre venues, it is important to understand the way how the two theatrical worlds react to the same problem artistically and financially.

First of all, it can be concluded that the focus point of Dutch theatre venues is money in the sense that they intend to earn back the lacking part of their public funding. The strategy is that some of the interviewed theatre venues decrease the number of performances, therefore; they show the same performances more often, than before. Joost de Kleine declared that “by decreasing the amount of different performances, so not by decreasing the amount of performances, but different performances. So by showing one performance several times, it is easier for us to organize sight services around the performance or create interesting programs, so we are able to attract more visitors a little bit easily” (Kleine, 26th March, personal communication).

In contrast, British venues have much more confidence in programming as they invest money into their new artistic projects. What is more, they have a conscious attitude in maintaining their venues in the sense that they try to balance the artistic intention with their financial possibilities. David Jubb stressed that “we just have to manage it and make sure that the financial imperative or the financial restriction does not completely flatten the artistic freedom” (Jubb, 9th April 2014, personal communication). Their confidence and their conscious attitude allow them to realize their artistic purposes that can, in turn, provide them financial stability.

Furthermore, Dutch theatre venues seem to primarily use collaborations to make more money, and not because of their artistic intention. It means that: “we are co-producing with local producers. People have their own network around here... and, it attracts a lot people”, said Fleischmann (Fleischmann, 11th April 2014, personal communication). However; they consider it as a contribution to increase their income. For instance, it attracts a lot people as two companies participate in the marketing campaign for the performance (Fleischmann, 11th April 2014, personal communication).

The British theatre venues, however, point out the importance of collaborating with other venues. They argue that theatre venues still compete with each other, but in a collaborative way. Public funding and a proper investment model help them to be successful and confident in producing together. They argue that public funding from the Arts Council England, regardless of the amount of subsidy, and a proper investment model, breeds confidence and collaboration. David Jubb said that: “We still compete, but we do that in a collaborative way” (Jubb, 9th April 2014, personal communication). On the other hand, this is their strategy and how they approach and solve the financial problem in their artistic operation. For this reason, they are much more confident in businesses, much more confident with audiences, and much more confident in a relationship with artists (Jubb, 9th April 2014, personal communication).

In addition to this, the interviewed Dutch theatre venues do not dare to take risks in programming, because they assume it may lead to a deeper financial deficit. Furthermore, they are not aware of the advantage of being financially supported by the local administration. They regard the authority as one of the financial sources from where the money comes, and do not consider it as a partner that favours that their artistic mission is realized. Harm Lambers, whose theatre is one of the companies that did not experience a cut in their subsidy, but received even more, stated that: “What you see in theatres in Holland goes back many years already, that most of the theatres are withdrawing to a safer domain. Safe in a way that people, that audiences, can get to them, so they programme, well, safer programming, not so risky anymore” (Lambers, 24th March 2014, personal communication). It means that there is a trend in the Dutch theatre field, where theatre venues create programmes in a safer way. Namely, theatre venues have recently avoided taking risks in programming, because it may endanger the success of their artistic activities. Harm Lambers thought that taking risks would lead venues to failing financially (Lambers, 24th March 2014, personal communication).

On the contrary, the British theatre venues are strongly dependent on public funding, because they stress that national investment is the key to taking artistic risks. Steve Marmion stated that they are strongly dependent on national investment, because it “is a key to the whole model, because that enables us to take risks” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication).

That means that they are not completely driven by commercialism, because they are not dependent on everything that is popular. For instance, they can bring acts from around the world. He claimed that receiving public funding contributes to a “real theatrical quality that we need to get all the other work happening. That is the spark, the fire is easy” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). Since they take artistic risks, it allows them to grow financially as well. What is more, they consider themselves as social entrepreneurs, because their main motivation is not profit, but social capital. Social good can be represented in the relationships that are built through a community. Steve Marmion exposed that, as well in connection with the terms of social enterprise, “this is a newish term, but social enterprise is a company that works to do social good and to reinvest profit it makes back into doing social good. So it’s like a charity, but slightly more business minded” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). In doing so, they regularly communicate not only with their audience, but the local administration via a group called What next?. David Jubb mentioned that this is a movement that aims to bring together arts organizations and the public, and also involve the government in conversations about arts. He said that “What next?” is trying to join the dots, all of the different parts of this ecology and make the case both for the people and the government” (Jubb, 9th April, personal communication). That indicates a strong relationship with the local municipality.

Finally, the interviewed Dutch theatre venues rely on their audience, because they see them as one of their financial sources. For instance, Vivienne Ypma said that her theatre venue made a membership programme for her audience and the programme is beneficial for both parties, because: “They can buy the ticket in advance, so that we are sure that they have a ticket for that, but that’s what we give them. And what they do is support us by buying those chairs” (Ypma, 16th April 2014, personal communication). From the Dutch audience perspective, it seems that the audience is much more critical in terms of choosing a performance or supporting theatres financially. The reason is that when the cut was made in the Dutch arts sector budget, the arts turned to the public, but they did not show any willingness to support them financially, said David Jubb (Jubb, 9th April 2014, personal communication). Furthermore, for instance, Oscar Wibaut said that “the audience is much more critical; they are waiting until they hear that it is good or wait until they have read the reviews” (Wibaut, 31st March 2014, personal communication).

In contrast, according to the British theatre venues, the audience is the centre of the operation of the venue. An example to the statement is when Steve Marmion stated: “Keep it front of your mind: the audience. Many people focus on other artists, this is not about them, it is about the audience. So that’s what we do” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication). Furthermore, the British audiences are willing to support venues as they need

art and entertainment for their personal pleasure. Steve Marmion claimed that in spite of having an economic crisis and people struggling from its impact, the audience did say: “we need art” (Marmion, 9th April 2014, personal communication).

Artistic and Financial Strategy of the Two Theatre Fields

In this chapter, the researcher asserts her personal opinion that is discussed from four perspectives. The discussion helps to see the various artistic and financial strategies that both theatre fields pursue to cope with the financial difficulties in their artistic operation.

Programming

Since there is a shortage in the amount of subsidy, theatre venues rather put the focus on the method that supports them to earn back the lack of money. For this reason, the intentions of Dutch theatre venues are to save money such as by playing significantly less performances more often. As they are growing financially thanks to the sold tickets and the other kind of financial sources, for instance running their own café, they will be able to show better quality (high art) performances. The approach of the financial viability is important for them, and they support the idea of solving the problem with financial considerations.

British theatre venues approach the financial problem in their artistic operation from the artistic perspective. That means that they are willing to take artistic risks in their programming by investing the public funding they receive from Arts Council England. Since they invest money and show better quality performances, they can financially grow. That is the reason why British theatre venues are able to cope with the cut in their subsidy.

Collaboration

Dutch theatre venues know that coproducing and collaborating are prosperous for them (some of the venues have already started to apply), however; they consider as a contribution of saving money. Dutch theatre venues seem to primarily use collaboration to have more money, and not because of their artistic intention.

Inversely, the British theatre venues believe in the power of collaboration and producing a performance together. They argue that the public funding from the Arts Council England, regardless of the amount of subsidy, and a proper investment model breed confident and collaboration. They still compete, but they do that in a collaborative way. On the other hand, this is also their strategy on how they approach and solve the financial problem in their artistic operation. For this reason, they are much more confident in businesses, much more confident in audience, and much more confident in a relationship with the artists.

Relationship with the Local Administration

Dutch theatre venues, first of all, do not dare to take risks in programming, because they assume it may lead to a deeper financial deficit. Second of all, the theatre venues in general are not aware of the advantage of being financially supported by the municipality. They regard the local administration as one of their financial sources where the money comes from, and do not consider it as a partner that favours their artistic mission to be realized. They actually need the money from the municipality, but they rather blame them that they decided to make a cut in their subsidy, instead of cooperating together.

Dutch theatre venues rely significantly on their audience, because they receive money from them through sold tickets. Giving social good and artistic value is just a secondary purpose. However, from the audience's perspective, the Dutch audience does not support them as much as the Dutch theatre field would expect. The reason is when the cut was made in the Dutch arts sector budget, the arts turned to the public, but they did not show any willingness to support them. The Dutch audience is not involved enough in the arts sector, although there is a rudimentary process that has already been started in connection with public involvement (education, maintaining bar within the venue). Dutch theatre venues believe that arts for the audience should be supported by the audience as well. This can be an explanation why Dutch theatre fields are not able to take risks in their artistic freedom and primarily try to stay financially stable.

British theatre venues, besides being cultural entrepreneurs, are more entrepreneurial in terms of the way they think about the use of their building and about the relationship they have in their local community and how they earn money. In addition to involving the audience in artistic progresses, venues are characterized as a social enterprise as they give social capital to them. It leads to build up a community within the venue. Furthermore, in England theatre venues have a strong relationship with the Arts Council England, especially when they are coping with financial and artistic obstacles. Finally, British theatre venues have a conscious attitude in the sense of achieving their artistic goals. The reason is the awareness of the financial support, namely, the public funding of the Arts Council England, therefore; they maximally do take risks in their programming.

Audience

Dutch theatre audiences are not that attached to the theatres or to the performances. The relationship between the venue and the audience is not remarkable. The cause can be explained with the behaviour of the audience, because they still do not realize that arts are for them, theatres make performances for their entertainment. For this reason, their intention to support theatre venues has not yet been built. That is the reason why theatre venues are struggling to earn back the lack of the money, because they are

aware that they cannot rely on the help of the audience. However, theatre venues have started to strengthen the relationship with the audience, such as by offering membership, but it needs time to be fruitful for the venues. In the British theatre field, theatre venues can remarkably count on the audience as they enjoy memberships and give a large amount of donations. It indicates that the audience has a supportive attitude towards theatres, because they realize that art is for their personal pleasure. Therefore, they need to contribute to the development of the arts.

Reasons to Learn from the British Model

Dutch subsidized venues have the possibility and are able to learn from the coping strategies of British theatre organizations. The investigator has three reasons to support her choice.

Connection with the Local Administration

It is perceptible that Dutch theatre venues do not dare to take financial risks in order to reach their artistic goals. They would rather save money and try to earn back the decreased amount of public funding to operate on the same level as they did before the cut. Therefore, they should be aware and learn from the British example in terms of taking financial risks in their programming, because they significantly rely on the stable subsidy from the Arts Council England. Dutch theatre venues should realize that because they get subsidy from the municipality, they should be brave and take greater artistic freedom to programme. This leads to the point that they should build up a stronger connection with the local administration and should not judge it as it caused a financial shortage in their subsidy. Collaboration with the municipality can contribute to a confident artistic and financial operation in the Dutch field of theatre.

Financial-Artistic Management

Dutch theatre venues do grasp the problem of the financial cut from the economic perspective. That is why they save money and do not purpose to take risks in their artistic activities. However, they should approach the problem from the artistic perspective as the British theatre venues do. Since they know that they get public funding from the Arts Council England, they take risks in their programming and they are remarkably willing to invest money into it. Investing money, as a coping strategy, helps to change the structure of the venue, namely, to grow: financially and artistically. While the Dutch theatre venues economise their financial sources as a reaction to the reduction in their subsidy, the British theatre venues invest into it.

Audience

Dutch theatre venues can learn from British theatre venues in respect of their behaviour towards the audience. They should be more committed and active towards them, because having a loyal audience can contribute to fi-

nancial and artistic growth. However, Dutch theatres have already started to build up a strong relationship with their audience, through educational programmes with schools and memberships.

In addition to the various possibilities that Dutch venues offer to their audience, there is one thing to apply from the British model and this is social enterprise. The aim of representing themselves as a social enterprise is not for pure profit, but giving social capital, social value through art to the audience. It would be beneficial for the Dutch theatre venues to represent themselves as a social enterprise, because the current relationship between them and their audience can be improved in a more positive way. It means that if Dutch theatre venues focus on giving them significantly more social capital, then they can be sure that they are going to have a stable and constant audience. It leads to the point that they would have a stable relationship with them and may contribute to their stable artistic and financial operation. From the audience's perspective, the realization that theatre venues tend to have a connection with them can slowly turn into their willingness to enjoy their offers. As an outcome, they would support theatre venues: financially.

The above mentioned topics, such as the attitude of the two theatre fields, or their relationship with the government or the audience, refer to essential differences in respect of their artistic and financial considerations. It seems that the Dutch theatre field has notable amount of relevant input to learn from the British theatre field.

Recommendations

The previous section indicates that Dutch subsidized theatre venues have possibilities to apply the artistic and financial considerations that British subsidized theatre venues follow. For this reason, the researcher made an advisory report that includes recommendations for those Dutch subsidized theatre venues that experienced a financial cut in their public funding. It stands for a model and allows them (to learn from coping strategies of British theatre venues in order) to improve their artistic and financial entrepreneurship. The model includes the following artistic suggestions that contribute their financial viability:

1. Taking Risks

It is suggested to Dutch subsidized theatre venues to take risks in their programming by using the public funding they receive from their local administration. The subsidy enables them to buy in financially expensive, but artistically high performances. In doing so, theatre venues can make sure that financial growth can be experienced as an outcome of the artistic process.

2. Collaboration

Dutch theatre venues should take into account that the amount of subsidy allows them to use the great power of collaboration all over the Netherlands.

It means that theatre venues can share audiences if they buy into a performance together. First of all, it reduces the purchasing costs. Second of all, it strengthens the relationship between the two venues and may facilitate further common projects. However, theatre venues would still compete, but in a collaborative way.

3. Education

Students are the future visitors for theatre venues. Therefore, theatre venues should build up a strong relationship with schools. However, it is not only about taking care of the young generation, but supporting colleagues to develop themselves and the venue for which they work. Theatre venues can help schools by:

- Choosing a performance that is appropriate for their children.
- Having conversations with students in connection with their theatrical studies.
- Giving up work-space within the theatre.
- Giving courses to artists and colleagues for further development that allow venues to enhance their income.

4. Programming

There is a financial advantage in decreasing the number of the shows in a given season. Playing the decreased number of performances for a longer period helps to increase the income of theatre venues as it is available for a broader audience. That leads to financial growth as they save money in programming.

5. Public Relations

Creating memberships for the audience allows theatre venues to build up a long and loyal relationship with them. A loyal relationship with the audience means that theatre venues can rely on their (financial) support. On the other hand, as one joins a one-year long membership, he, or she, commits himself to the performances of the theatre venue. It means that theatre venues should programme artistically high performances in order to keep and increase the number of their loyal fans.

6. Catering

It is proposed to theatre venues to consider the possibility of developing catering facilities, for instance, by giving dinner to the audience before the show, or by allowing them to have drinks after the show. The reason is that people want to belong to a community and theatre venues are a great platform with which to fulfil that want. Having a dinner or drink in the great atmosphere that venues have can enhance the appropriate mood to enjoy the

evening. This kind of activity also appears as a contribution of giving social good to the audience.

7. Extra Programme Series

Taking into account the programming of non-traditional events, besides regular performances, can help to attract more diverse people and make a strong relationship with them. Furthermore, it also enables theatre venues to grow artistically and financially.

For instance:

- Touring music festivals and theatres around the country with best works.
- Programming mini festivals that aim to show young work created by young theatre-makers to the audience.
- Choosing performances from the last year and presenting them as a personal choice of the theatre venue once a year.

Taking into account the above mentioned model ensures an ongoing financial development for Dutch subsidized theatre venues in order to pursue their artistic entrepreneurship.

In conclusion, the article introduces the effect of the global financial crisis in the creative and cultural sector and presents possible solutions to it for Dutch subsidized theatre venues. As a consequence of the financial crisis in the theatrical field, British and Dutch subsidized theatre venues experience a significant shortage in their public funding. The cut in their subsidy forces them to cope with the financial deficit to maintain their artistic activities. The different way the two theatre fields react to the problem shows that the British theatre field is much more entrepreneurial than the Dutch. Therefore, the Dutch theatre field can learn from coping strategies that British theatre venues apply against the financial difficulties. For this reason, a management product that has been created by the researcher helps Dutch subsidized theatre venues to cope with the financial challenges and develop their artistic activities. However, Dutch theatre venues have realized their situation in the changed theatrical field and recognized new opportunities. In doing so, Dutch theatre venues have started to apply some of the artistic and financial considerations that the British model already follows.

Furthermore, exploring the artistic and financial considerations of Dutch and British theatre venues in the era of the new economic market circumstances and analysing the coping strategies of British theatre venues that can be utilized in the operation of Dutch theatre venues confirm the existing relationship between art and economy. This linkage stresses the relevancy of arts management and cultural entrepreneurship, because it deals with one of the effects of an economic problem in the theatre field.

Nevertheless, the researcher strongly believes that the article is a contribution to a further artistic growth of Dutch theatre field in a new period of the altered financial situation.

References

Bonet, L. & Donato, F. (2011). The financial crisis and its impact on the current models of governance and management of the cultural sector in Europe. *Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 1(1), 4-11.

Schwartz, G. (2011, July 12). Dutch government refuses to back down over huge budget cuts. *The art newspaper*. Retrieved from <http://www.theart-newspaper.com/articles/Dutch+government+refuses+to+back+down+over+huge+budget+cuts/24210>

Throsby, D. (2003). Determining the value of cultural goods: How much (or how little) does contingent valuation tell us? *Journal of cultural economics*, 27(3-4), 275-285.

About the Author

Judit Bolla is a Hungarian young professional who has a Bachelor's degree in International Business. Meanwhile she studied economics at the Budapest University of Technology and Economics; she realized that an economist has a significant influence and role in managing cultural organizations financially. Since theatre and also its finance belong to her personal interest, she finds it interesting to combine the two fields. According to her, the emphasis is on the need of a remarkable subservience in the cultural-economic scope. Therefore, her mission is to subserve and support international theatre organizations with remarkable financial management. She transposes her personal enquiry to the theatre sector because she is fascinated by theatre performances and by the financial operation of theatre companies.

Correspondence concerning this thesis can be sent to the email address of: juci.bolla@gmail.com

Utrecht, July 2014.



Imprint

ARTS MANAGEMENT NETWORK

c/o KM Kulturmanagement Network GmbH

PF 1198 · D-99409 Weimar

Bauhausstr. 7c · D-99423 Weimar

Phone +49 (0) 3643.7402.612

Fax +49 (0) 3643.7402.614

office@artsmanagement.net

www.artsmanagement.net

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/amnweimar](https://twitter.com/amnweimar)

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/ArtsManagement.Network>

Editor: Leonie Krutzinna