JYX JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Pyykkönen, Miikka; Stavrum, Heidi

Title: Enterprising Culture : Discourses on Entrepreneurship in Nordic Cultural Policy

Year: 2018

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2018 Taylor & Francis

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en

Please cite the original version:

Pyykkönen, M., & Stavrum, H. (2018). Enterprising Culture : Discourses on Entrepreneurship in Nordic Cultural Policy. The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 48(2), 108-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2017.1391726

Enterprising Culture: Discourses on Entrepreneurship in Nordic Cultural Policy

Professor Dr. *Miikka Pyykkönen*, Cultural Policy/Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

Researcher Dr. *Heidi Stavrum*, Telemark Research Institute, Bø, Norway.

Abstract

The sphere of arts and culture has been going through a process of economic re-evaluation during the last decades. Parallel to the rise of a creative economy discourse, which both in its political and scientific forms has highlighted the economic significance of culture and arts, entrepreneurship has become a feature in the cultural policy of many countries. In this paper, we compare how entrepreneurship is established and used as a concept in cultural policy discourses in two Nordic countries, Norway and Finland. Through analyzing policy plans and documents, we discuss what is seen as positive cultural or artistic activity in the framework of entrepreneurship, and we identify the eligible cultural subjects of this discourse.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, creative economy, cultural policy, artists, Finland, Norway.

Word count: 7035

Introduction

> *The year 2010 was pivotal in the sense that for the first time I got orders for the whole year. Despite of that, I could not make my enterprise profitable, for I could not resign from other jobs because of the weak economic situation of my family. I tried to manage between three different jobs. […] However, in 2011 I made the decision to be a full-time entrepreneur. At the moment I concentrate fully on my own enterprise and despite of the pennilessness I am rather satisfied. (Rensujeff 2014, 60; transl. by the authors).*

The above quotation from the open answers of a survey for Finnish artists made in 2011 describes the ambiguities of entrepreneurship from an artist's point of view. On the one hand, the structural changes of labor markets and marketization of culture push artists towards entrepreneurship, but without much security of income. On the other hand, the satisfaction of artists varies according to their field of work and assignments as well as to personal factors. For some, entrepreneurship is an obvious or a practical choice. Others gain economic success through starting an enterprise. Again, others appreciate the freedom and control over work life it brings. Then there are many artists and cultural workers who are not satisfied with entrepreneurship but practice it because they have to. Rensujeff's (2014) study also shows that the percentage of entrepreneurs and freelancers among artists in Finland has not really grown between 2000–2010, and that incomes are lowest in the fields where there are most sole entrepreneurs, freelancers, or so-called "free artists", i.e. artists without steady contracts.

Artists' attitudes towards entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial work have been recently studied through surveys also in Norway (Heian et al. 2015; Gran 2014). They show that very few Norwegian artists identify or categorize themselves as entrepreneurs (11.5%, in

Heian et al. 2015; 2%, in Gran 2014). At the same time, they confirm that Norwegian artists have smaller incomes than most other occupations, and that being an artist or creative worker is still a risky and insecure profession regarding economic and social security.

However, the *policy response* to the challenges of entrepreneurship among artists has insisted in the need for more entrepreneurship. Both in Finland and Norway the increased focus towards entrepreneurship in cultural policy is related to an "economic re-evaluation" of the sphere of arts and culture that has been going on for the past two decades. Politicians and policymakers from different ministries, especially those from ministries of culture, have emphasized the significance of culture for the national economies and competitiveness (Kultur- & kirkedepartementet 2005; Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013; OKM 2012; 2014).

In this article, we discuss how *entrepreneurship* relates to the process of economization of culture in Finland and Norway. We compare how entrepreneurship is established and used in cultural policy discourses. We analyze *administrative and educational discursive practices* construct entrepreneurship as a needed subjectivity for cultural workers and artists. We use guiding questions such as: How is entrepreneurship presented and defined in Norwegian and Finnish cultural policy documents? Which cultural or artistic activities are considered as suitable in the discourse? Who are the eligible entrepreneurial subjects of arts and culture? We also search for similarities and differences between Norway and Finland.

The research questions will be answered through critical discourse analysis of policy documents concerning creative economy and labor markets in the cultural sector in Finland and Norway in the period 2005–2016. Our methodological and analytical framework is inspired by theoretizations of (i) the relations between economy and culture (Throsby 2001; 2010; Abbing 2002; Bourdieu 1993), (ii) entrepreneurial subjects in general (Bröckling 2016; Rose 1992) and especially in arts and culture (Ellmeier 2003; Frederking 2010; Røyseng 2016; McRobbie 2016; Sørensen 2012), and (iii) how discourses (re)produce the contexts of actions (Foucault 1972; Howarth & Stavrakakis 2000, 2–3) and correspond with ideologies and hegemony (Fairclough 1992; Laclau 1996; Van Dijk 2006).

The economization and entrepreneurialization of culture

We study the policy discourses of two Nordic countries, which have followed a specific Nordic model of cultural policy. This model is characterized by generous public subsidizing of arts and culture, direct social welfare goals, and a weak tradition of private funding (Mangset et al. 2008; Duelund 2003). During the last decades, however, the traditional welfare model of Nordic cultural policy has been challenged by an economic re-evaluation of the field of arts and culture (Bille 2011; Mangset et al. 2008; Pyykkönen 2014, 70–82). Growing administrative attention to creative industries and their potentiality for the national economies and national economic competitiveness has been a push factor for this development (e.g. Kultur- & kirkedepartementet 2005; Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013; OKM 2012; 2014). At the same time, the discourse of creative economy among the cultural policymaking institutions has become more general. This discourse highlights the economic side of culture even more. (Bille 2011;

Pine & Gilmore 1999; Røyseng 2016; Throsby 2001; 2010.) It is not irrelevant for current policy discourses who the primary value-adding actor of the creative economy is. Most often, it is an independent actor, such as a private entrepreneur or company, which is as self-managing and economically self-sufficient as possible. (Bilton & Cummings 2014; McRobbie 2016; Oakley 2014.)

The economic re-evaluation of culture also relates to a general decrease in public spending on arts and culture due to the crises of many European economies. Finland is an example of this: a new economic rationality of culture has taken over after the decrease of traditional industries and their need for workforce following the two recent economic recessions (Heiskanen 2014) and the increase of unemployment among artists and cultural workers due to the imbalance between the number of graduates and free jobs (Rautiainen & Roiha 2015). Recently the rationalities of neoclassical economic theory and austerity policy applied by the present right-wing government have speeded up these changes even more (Pyykkönen 2014, 29–43).

Europe's financial crisis has not affected Norway in the same way: on the contrary, during the Labor Government period of 2005–2013, public spending on arts and culture was almost doubled. This happened partly due to the strong oil-financed national economy, but also due to a strong political initiative for increasing the status and economy of culture (*Kulturløftet*, cf. Henningsen et al. 2015*).* In addition to a continuous big spending of public money on the cultural sector, both official cultural policy documents and policy debates in Norway have been quite critical towards the economization of arts (Kulturdepartementet 2013). The election of the right-wing

government in 2013 has however turned the political discussion closer towards the economic rhetoric also in Norway (Kulturdepartementet 2016; Stavrum 2014). Even if the general economic situation differs between Norway and Finland, the artist population in both countries faces the same insecure occupational situation, with low income (compared to other occupations) and a high degree of self-employment, risk, and competition. Current studies show that this precarious situation is increasing (Mangset et al. 2016; Houni & Ansio 2013; Rensujeff 2014).

In this article we study how entrepreneurship becomes part of the creative economy discourse. Since the 1980s the term entrepreneur has come to be used in a wider sense than the original 'Schumpeterian' definition (Schumpeter [1934] 1983): now entrepreneurship is not only about owning for-profit businesses, it is also seen as a way of self-understanding and being. While the traditional understanding of entrepreneurship as business practice is called 'external entrepreneurship', this wider meaning is labeled 'internal entrepreneurship' or 'intrapreneurship'. Intrapreneurship refers to the entrepreneurial spirit as a personal life ethos. It becomes a moral imperative for behavior. (Carayannis et al. 2015, 141; Harni 2015; Mangset 2008; Mangset & Røyseng 2009; Pyykkönen 2014.) Consequently, being an entrepreneur requires other kinds of qualities from a person than only business-oriented ones, but to be more precise, these other kinds of positive qualities can be attached to the business orientation (Rose 1992).

The wide definition of entrepreneurship relates closely to traditional features of artistic and creative work. Hence, as we will show, the creative workers and artists becomes the core targets of the entrepreneurship discourses of Nordic cultural policy. According to

Leadbeater & Oakley (1999), the cultural entrepreneurs are young and independent individuals who run their small companies in the creative industries, such as design, music, fashion, computer games, and film. They are creative, imaginative, and innovative people, who develop their businesses in close relation to their personal but informal networks in the creative fields (ibid). Ellmeier (2003) also defines cultural entrepreneurs as multi-skilled and independent, able to grasp whatever job opportunity available. Cultural entrepreneurs are most often sole entrepreneurs and freelancers, whose work consists of projects on temporary contracts (cf. McRobbie 2016). As in the case of traditional artists, these entrepreneurs face a great deal of risk and insecurity. This in contrast to the more traditional working subject, placed in a permanent job position with regulated working hours and a high degree of trade unionism.

Power, ideology, and discourse

The spreading ideas of creative economy and cultural entrepreneurship mirror a current general trend in Finnish politics (Patomäki 2007, 55–97; Siltala 2004, 119–131) – and one of global politics as well (Harvey 2005, 5–38) – in which the initiatives for significant political reforms come from top-level right-wing politicians, ministries of finance and economy, representatives of employer organizations and industry associations, and the finance and banking sector. This "rule of economic liberalization" and the entrepreneurialization of Finnish society have both been machinated by the same actors, to a great extent (Pyykkönen 2014; Turunen 2011, 110–117). The general economic and labor market situation in Norway has not been affected by these trends as much. However, as we shall see later in our analysis, the present right-wing government is pushing changes forward to liberalize the economy.

The distribution of ideas serving the interests of dominant groups requires the ideologization of certain meanings and frames of signification, i.e. discourses. For example, the above-mentioned actors use discursive, rhetorical, and practical means and strategies through which they represent their opinions and views as truths and related actions as compulsory and inevitable. This requires mastery of the necessary means of communication, ability to mobilize the right kinds of knowledge producers such as legitimate experts, appropriately problematic social conditions for backing up the arguments, and the right kind of problematization of existing rationalities, discourses, and practices (van Dijk 2006, 36; Laclau 1996, 35–39).

The concept of ideology used here is a mix of Althusserian, Barthesian, Gramscian, and Faircloughian conceptualizations. Ideology is a collection of ideas, doctrines, and beliefs shared by members of a certain group. It influences their beliefs, expectations, and motivations. Ideology is not neutral or external to power and government, but rather immanent to them. Ideology is imposed on all members of society by the elite or dominant societal class. The basic purpose of ideology is to maintain and strengthen the position of the dominant class or elite in society and maintain a compatible social order – Marxist researchers talk about 'ideological reproduction' (Althusser 2014; Gramsci 1971).

Ideology relates to hegemony, which is not chiefly produced and maintained through coercion, but through peaceful reproduction of its social order and system of governance by means of soft conduct and persuasion. Reforms and changes take place, but smoothly, evolutionally, and under control. On the individual level, the goal is that a person

conducts oneself according to the key rationalities and ideals of the hegemonic block and order, such as practicing the entrepreneurial ethos of the capitalist market economy and liberal political regime. Crucial for the success is that the individual understands this to be for her own best. This indeed requires ideological practices, as the purpose of ideology is to make certain identities, meanings, and behavior appear *natural* (Althusser 2014; Barthes 1974, 206; Gramsci 1971; cf. Rose 1992).

According to many critical discourse analysts, the production, reproduction, and naturalization of ideologies take place through discourses, which propose ideologies as common sense, rational, and often compulsory to follow. Ideological discourses are particularly common in times of drastic changes, like economic crises. “Ideological discursive formations” work through raising certain problems and solutions in sufficient popular representation channels (e.g. mass and social media) and by using a rhetoric that pleads on emotions, reason, and/or facts. The relation between discourse and ideology is reciprocal. Ideologies influence the formation of discourses, and discourses construct and reproduce ideologies (Fairclough 2013, 25–69; van Dijk 2006).

Many researchers around the world have recently shown how the hegemonization of the ‘creative economy ideology’ - i.e. understanding the value of arts and culture chiefly through economic value, has happened. This results from an active discursive machination through policy documents, programs, funding scheme definitions, and education (e.g. Asia: Lee 2016; Australia: Cunningham 2009; Finland: Heiskanen 2015; Pyykkönen 2014, 70–92; UK: Bilton & Cummings 2014; Harvie 2013, 67–74; McGuigan 2016). Critical researchers claim that the ground for those ideological

discourses – and hence their fundamental justifications – can be found from the rationalities of neoliberalism and the global capitalist market economy, such as national competitiveness, market effectiveness, and a diminished public sector (McGuigan 2016; Pyykkönen 2014).

Our discourse analysis followed the above-mentioned principles. In practice it was conducted through a three-step investigation of relevant policy documents in Norway and Finland. These documents were published between 2000 and today. *Firstly*, we analyzed the sociocultural and institutional practices represented in the texts. On the one hand, this meant analyzing the political, social, and institutional positions of the actors who published the documents. On the other hand, we asked what kinds of societal problems the documents describe and which key subjects they name to tackle these problems in desired ways. *Secondly*, we paid attention to the discursive practices: what is the type of the document and what is its significance in the field that it tries to influence, and how does it contrast to other economic and political "metatexts" of today, such as ideological discourses on market liberty and austerity? *Thirdly*, we analyzed the textual practices such as the key topics, themes, statements and words, subjects (who are important for the goals and who are not or are the opponents), and the ways of convincing through argumentation.

The policymakers and the construction of the entrepreneurship discourse

In Finland, cultural entrepreneurship is a crucial element in the strategic goals of the present Ministry of Education and Culture and Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment, and it already played an important role in the still influential policy

program of Matti Vanhanen's second cabinet (2007–2010). Through their strategic documents, these policymakers and politicians have represented themselves as the core actors of the discourse. Entrepreneurship has been advanced loudly also by the Creative Industries Finland project, and regionally and locally by the Centres for Economy, Transportation and Environment and regional councils. In addition, the Arts Promotion Centre Finland has recently made the promotion of entrepreneurship one of its key goals. Another important actor entity enhancing entrepreneurship in arts and culture are educational institutions: today all arts and culture curricula on upper secondary and higher level in Finland entail entrepreneurship studies.

It is education, training, or development through which most of the core actors justify their hegemonic position in the discourse. Policymakers and policy institutions formulate the rationale and goals of education and training of skills, and educational institutions and promotional organizations facilitate learning accordingly. The role of educators, consultants, etc. is to mediate the message to individual learners and "shepherd" their learning processes:

> *The economy of cultural industries must focus on developing the prerequisites for cultural entrepreneurship and cultural exportation, productization of culture, creation of concepts, business competence and marketing. Self-employed people and small business entrepreneurs need joint structures for the promotion of marketing and business competence, such as managerial activities (OKM 2011, 21; transl. by the Ministry of Education and Culture).*

In Norway entrepreneurship became an explicit theme in cultural policy documents around the mid-2000s. A white paper on art and business published in 2005 introduces the topic for the first time, and identifies it as a main feature of innovation and economic growth:

> *Entrepreneurship, the establishment and development of new businesses, is an important driving force behind innovation, growth and wealth creation in the economy. It is proven a clear correlation between a high start-up and liquidation rate and productivity growth. This in turn will ensure prosperity and growth in the Norwegian economy (Kultur- og kyrkjedepartementet 2005, 35; transl. by the authors).*

The document is rather vague in its concrete actions towards developing entrepreneurship. However, the text is clearly a part of the creative economy discourse in the sense that several statements in it take a rather optimistic view on how the creative industries can contribute to development and change. The optimistic rhetoric is furthermore enhanced in two plans of action for developing Norwegian creative industries published during the Labor Government of 2005–2013 (Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet et al. 2005; Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013):

> *The creative industries have many of the qualities needed in order to make Norwegian business succeed in being innovative and adaptable. The creative industries can contribute to increased innovation and competitiveness in other industries. The creative industries also contribute to a broader development of society by promoting attractiveness of places, for those who live there, for visitors and for companies (Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013, 9; transl. by the authors).*

The expression of the hope for increasing Norway's economic competitiveness through entrepreneurship in the creative industries is very similar to how the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment describes it in Finland:

> *Through the development of entrepreneurship in the creative sector, Finland can strengthen the competitiveness of other sectors and the whole country. The trademarks and brands of products and services will have an increasingly strong position, and the related competences will be at the heart of the creative sector in the future (KTM 2007, 3; transl. by the authors).*

These documents frame cultural entrepreneurship as crucial for three interrelated reasons: (i) it is beneficial for innovations from and the reform of the fields of cultural production; (ii) it increases economic practices in culture and creates new markets; and, hence, (iii) it increases general wellbeing through the birth of new jobs. These examples from the policy documents make it clear that the situation in Norway and Finland resembles that of most European countries (cf. e.g. Bilton & Cummings 2014; McRobbie 2010; Oakley 2014). Sometimes entrepreneur-driven production is also justified with the diversity and accessibility of cultural services and activities. These are the sociocultural practices to which entrepreneurship can contribute positively, by improving their functionality and outcomes.

An important part of the construction of the discourse in the policy documents is the way the general character of the current cultural actors and their main "problems" are articulated, and how these should be tackled to reach the ideal goal. For example, the main goal of the Norwegian development plan is identified as "contributing to more wealth creation in and export of creative industries" through "mak[ing] it possible for a

higher number of people to make a living from these industries" (Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013). In the discussion on how to reach the policy goals, a concern is articulated regarding a lack of skills among the creative workforce:

> *It is a challenge developing creative ideas into products or services for sale in a commercial market. These challenges are especially related to [lack of] business skills, access to funding and share capital, network and cooperation, possibilities for export and internationalization (Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013; transl. by the authors).*

The plan furthermore describes how to deal with these problems, and presents the idea of including entrepreneurship in arts education programs. The issue of artists' missing business skills is also used as an argument in the latest cultural policy documents and initiatives regarding entrepreneurship in Norway (Kulturdepartementet 2015; 2016).

Statements concerning policy actions in Finland also create some ideals for the actors who are supposed to behave in a particular way in order to serve the given policy goals. As in Norway, this is outlined with references to the lack of skills and competence among those who work in the sector, such as their lack of skills in business management, marketing, and communication, or the problem of too much dependence in the sector on state support leading to anti-entrepreneurial attitudes:

> *The training affiliated with entrepreneurship must be directed especially at self-employed, entrepreneurs and individual artists. The businesses in the creative sector are run by self-employed and individual entrepreneurs, many of which need more entrepreneurial skills (KTM 2007, 31, 35, 37, transl. by the authors).*

> *The threat is that the actors of the creative sector feel that entrepreneurship is too demanding and risky. Anti-commercial attitude can also limit the willingness of becoming an entrepreneur. […] On the other hand, there are not necessarily enough existing jobs in the creative sector, which might make the threshold of starting private businesses lower. (KTM 2007, 51, transl. by the authors.)*

It is typical for the above-mentioned administrative and educational public-sector actors who use the discourse that when they define entrepreneurship, they take a patronizing position towards artists and cultural workers. They identify themselves as the ones who know the appropriate goals of change and the acceptable ways in which culture and art workers should behave in order to achieve these goals and for their own best. In this regime, the governing bodies and public-sector actors are needed for coordinating and financing the change, conducting the organization of education, developing projects and clusters, and assessing the quality of the impacts of entrepreneurial actions. The policymakers and educators position themselves as indispensable leaders of the process through this rhetorical and discursive strategy. When this paternalistic touch mixes with the austerity politics of diminishing the public sector, it creates something close to what Jim McGuigan (2010, 329) calls the "paradox of independence". Although the objective is to enhance the capacities of the free and self-responsible entrepreneurial subjects, organization and orchestration by administrative actors are necessary to lead the way to the right direction. Central to these paternalistic ideas is that entrepreneurial freedom does not formulate itself; it is not *laissez-faire* freedom but regulated and conducted freedom.

The entrepreneurial work ethos and the entrepreneurial subject

The basic characteristics of this discursive representation of the new entrepreneurial subject of the Nordic arts fields who is supposed to develop him-/herself according to economic rationalities are very close to those which Nikolas Rose (1992) defined for the "entrepreneurial self". Descriptions of this entrepreneurial figure consist of ideas, goals, images, desires, and self-practices, which together create the ideal subjectivity of an 'artrepreneur' (Harvie 2013, 62). It is a metonym for an entrepreneurial *ethos*, which, as a reason and a moral, tends to conduct subjects' actions and choices (Pyykkönen 2014, 13). The ethos represents everything that is good and right in the entrepreneurial discourse. Bengt Sørensen (2012, 340) has observed, on the basis of Danish examples, that the subjective ethos is constructed in the discourse through images and words that become a source of identification for a worker or employee to fit in an organization, a model of a suitable or appropriate working individual. In today's arts field the organization is enterprise and the model entrepreneur.

How is this ideal ethos and subjectivity constructed and represented in the policy discourses 'translated' into the everyday work and lives of artists and cultural workers? According to our data, this establishment of artrepreneurs is chiefly done through education. Both in Finland and Norway all students and pupils now have entrepreneurship as part of their curriculum from the 1st grade all the way to university (e.g. Kunnskapsdepartementet et al. 2004; 2009). In Finland even children in daycare have special 'entrepreneurial days' where they learn how to do business through playing. In Finland there are also 'entrepreneurship kindergartens', which commit to entrepreneurship on a daily basis. In them, even the basic skills that children learn – such

as tying shoelaces – are considered a sign of entrepreneuriality. Their intention is to teach children resilience so that they will "manage in the precarious labor markets of the future". (Kuperkeikka 2012; YES-verkosto 2012.)

A similar focus on entrepreneurship occurs all the way to the top level of education in Finland. All the main culture and arts education institutions have adopted this goal, too:

> *The primary profit goal of the project is to advance the business skills of the actors of the cultural field […] so that they can become better employed either as independent practitioners or, for instance, in cooperatives. […] The aim is to find models that facilitate things that cultural actors often find difficult, such as financial management. (Haaga-Helia 2013; transl. by the authors.*)

The image on the front page of the first Norwegian plan for entrepreneurship and education (Kunnskapsdepartementet et al. 2004) presents a collection of words associated with entrepreneurship; "self-confidence, creativity, innovation, initiative, courage, creation, ideas, business" are the words creating associations of entrepreneurship. The document also determines that there is a broad political consensus around the fact that "the integration of entrepreneurial thinking and activities in education will have significance for the future of the nation" (ibid.). A more recent plan (Kunnskapsdepartementet et al. 2009) states that in addition to gaining knowledge and skills of "business development and innovation processes", the teaching of future entrepreneurs is supposed to develop their "personal attitudes and attributes, ability and willingness to take new initiatives, innovation and creativity, willingness to take risks, self-confidence, cooperative spirit and social skills". Both the external and internal sides

of the entrepreneurial subject are articulated here when combining issues of business management with the development of social character and personality.

Descriptions of the entrepreneurial self in cultural policy documents in Norway resemble the ideals articulated in education policy. The white paper on art and business (Kultur- og kyrkjedepartementet 2005, 35) for instance states that:

> *Entrepreneurship is a dynamic and social process where individuals, alone or in collaboration identify economic opportunities and develop these into new activity. This process requires qualities such as self-feeling, ability to take risks and ability to show personal interest and commitment (transl. by the authors).*

Again the documents highlight the need for making artists and creative workers become more confident about the business sides of their work. The political initiatives outlined are about creating an infrastructure around entrepreneurs by establishing different kinds of network groups and mentoring arrangements, and establishing co-working spaces and offices. (Kulturdepartementet et al. 2013; Kulturdepartementet 2015.) All this in order to improve the business expertise of entrepreneurs. In a recent policy document (Kulturdepartementet 2015), the need for more entrepreneurship in arts education is the main topic of the discussion. Here it is concluded that in order to make artists themselves "more aware of including entrepreneurial thinking as part of their artistic development", arts education institutions are urged to "take the responsibility and include entrepreneurship as part of the education of artists to a greater extent than today" (2015, 139; transl. by the authors).

In Finnish cultural policy documents, entrepreneurship also refers primarily to the organization of artistic work according to business models. The constructed business ethos is hence a mix of external and internal qualities:

> *The biggest threshold in entrepreneurship is to take the next step from an idea to implementation. It […] requires independency, courage, tolerance for uncertainty – and a lot of work. If one lacks the real passion, one should not become an entrepreneur. In the end what differentiates an entrepreneur from the others, is attitude. (Blomberg 2014, transl. by the authors.)*

The goal is a new entrepreneurial and economically enlightened artist, who continuously calculates her/his market value and brands her-/himself. Being an artist does not only mean creating or processing thoughts and meanings through art, but it also means working on the self economically towards a profitable future, which requires active sparring. Usually the message is liberating in nature: when people take as much responsibility as possible for their own work and livelihood, they are free to fully realize their personal creativity and potential. Creative workers need to be entrepreneurs in order to be actors in the discourse. The project of developing the artistic self is carried out under the fatherly guidance of expert visionaries, as articulated in the policy.

The background idea in the current administrative and educational discourses in Finland and Norway, but also globally, is that an entrepreneurial ethos can be particularly desirable and successful in the creative economy, because there the labor markets have always been precarious (Mangset et al. 2016). Artists have acted like entrepreneurs in many ways due to their lack of steady income and because the field is based on creativity, which, according to many entrepreneurial discourses, is the fundamental part

of all entrepreneurship. The repertoire of affects motivating artists and entrepreneurs have been considered to include similarities: flexibility and freedom in time use, autonomy and self-actualization, and success through one's own innovations and creativity (Bilton & Cummings 2014, 91–97; Elstad 2015, 103–104; Harvie 2013, 62–108; McRobbie 2016; Pyykkönen 2014; Sørensen 2012).

Conclusions: A change in the Nordic model of cultural policy?

The aim of this article has been to analyze representations of entrepreneurship in cultural policy discourses in two Nordic countries, Finland and Norway. We have showed how entrepreneurship has been introduced as a concept in cultural policy parallel to the economic re-evaluation of the field of arts and culture that has taken place during the last two decades. We have examined both the general representation of economy and entrepreneurship in policy documents and the representations of the entrepreneurial subject and its ethos in more detail.

Our analysis shows that the entrepreneurial discourses used in the two countries have several similarities. In both countries, the discourse on entrepreneurship is directly linked to general discourses of the creative sector and cultural industry. On a general administrative level, the entrepreneurship discourse is about making the creative industries grow and create economic value to the nation, ideally through more entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial behavior among artists and cultural workers. The ideal subject of the discourse of the creative sector is an entrepreneurial artist,

‘artpreneur’ or ‘artrepreneur’ (Harvie 2013, 62), who can combine artistic creativity and innovation with good business and marketing skills, and employ herself through increased sale of artistic products or performances. The discourse on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial qualities in cultural policy also shares many similarities with the discourse on entrepreneurship presented in the education system, and this is the case both in Norway and in Finland.

It is evident that an administrative discursive change towards entrepreneurship has taken place in both the two countries analyzed here, but the change is more noticeable and prominent in Finland than in Norway. When it comes to the “tone” and rhetoric of the discourse, there are similarities, but our findings indicate that the use of an assuring and appealing rhetoric seems stronger and even more economically and market-oriented in Finland than in Norway. The rhetoric of necessity of entrepreneurship is also more visible in Finland, and there is a clearer interdiscursivity between the economic/labor-inspired policies and cultural policies present there.

The differences can most likely be explained by the general economic circumstances: after 2008, Finland has faced a deep financial and economic crisis affecting all sectors, also cultural policy. Norway still has a rather strong national economy, and public spending on arts and culture has been increasing every year since 2005. This means that the discourse about entrepreneurship and the economic potential of the creative industries in Norway is still more of a rhetorical feature of cultural policy than a reflection of any real change in the policy schemes. Nevertheless, the present Conservative Government

has initiated some new policy actions that might indicate an even stronger change towards entrepreneurship in the years to come.

The entrepreneurialization of the field of arts and culture in Finland and Norway discussed here does not necessarily come as a surprise for readers outside the Nordic countries. Our findings are very much in line with international trends regarding the development of creative economy and creative industries as it is described in international research (cf. e.g. Bilton & Cummings 2014; Ellmeier 2003; Harvie 2013; Leadbeater & Oakley 1999; Lee 2016; McRobbie 2016; McGuigan 2010; Røyseng 2016; Throsby 2010). The entrepreneurship discourse in Finnish and Norwegian cultural policy is clearly related to the ongoing international process of economization of culture and "liberalization" of the working conditions of artists and other workers in the creative sector. It highlights values related to business models, and economic growth and innovation, rather than the intrinsic values of art for art's sake.

Consequently, as researchers located in Nordic countries, it is necessary for us to ask whether changes in the policy discourse towards entrepreneurship and creative economy indicate a broader shift within the Nordic model of cultural policy as such. Is it so that the well-established traditions of Nordic cultural policy, such as high public spending on arts and culture, a relatively low number of artists receiving their main income from business activities, and high appreciation of the intrinsic rather than the economic value of the arts, now face a turning point? When observing the statistics of artists' labor market conditions and income, and the results of artists' income surveys, it seems that the change has not yet been very radical outside the administrative cultural policy rhetoric. It

is however likely that through continuous discursive reassurance, reforms of educational curricula, national, local, and regional consultation projects, and establishment of new funding schemes, the market economic and entrepreneurial spirit might gradually become hegemonic among artists and cultural workers, too. According to our analysis, this will take longer in Norway than in Finland. In both cases, the change could be interpreted as a weakening of the Nordic model of cultural policy as we know it today.

Bibliography

Abbing, H. 2002. *Why are artists poor? The exceptional economy of the arts.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Althusser, L.2014. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses.* Trans. and ed. G.M. Goshgarian. London: Verso.

Barthes, R. [1973] 1974. *S/Z.* London: Cape.

Bille, T. 2011. "The Scandinavian approach to the Experience Economy – does it make sense?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18 (1): 93-110.

Bilton, C., and S. Cummings. 2014. "Introduction to part II: Creative Entrepreneurship". In *Handbook of Management and Creativity*, edited by C. Bilton and S. Cummings, 15-18. Cheltenham and Northhampton: Edward Elgar.

Blomberg, J. 2014. "Selviytymisopas luovan alan yrittäjälle." Accessed April 28, 2016. http://vyyhti.metropolia.fi/selviytymisopas-luovan-alan-yrittajalle/.

Bornstein, D., and S. Davis. 2010. *Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bröckling, U. 2016. *The Entrepreneurial Self. Fabricating a New Type of Subject*. London: Sage.

Carayannis, E., Samara, E., and Y. Bakouros. 2015. *Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Theory, Policy and Practice.* New York: Springer.

Cunningham, S. 2009. "Trojan horse or Rorschach blot? Creative industries discourse around the world." *International journal of cultural policy* 15 (4): 375–386.

Duelund, P. (ed.). 2003. *The Nordic Cultural Model.* København: Nordisk Kulturinstitut.

Ellmeier, A. 2003. "Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9 (1): 3-16.

Elstad, B. 2015. "Freelancing: Cool jobs or bad jobs?" *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift* 18(1): 103–104.

Fairclough, N. 2013. *The Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language.* Oxford and New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M, 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Frederking, Lauretta C. 2010. "Government entrepreneurship and the arts: the politics of the National Endowement for the Arts." In *The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship*, edited by D. Hjorth and C. Steyaert, 55-73. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* Edited by Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: Lawrence and Whishart.

Gran, A.B. 2014. *Kunstnere og bedriftsmarkedet. Basert på kunstnerundersøkelser utført i perioden 2008-2011.* Notat nr.1. Oslo: Center for Creative Industries, BI.
Gran, A.B., Ø. Torp, and M.G. Theie. 2015. *Kreativ næring i Norge 2008 - 2014*. Rapport nr. 1. Oslo: BI Centre for Creative Industries.
Haaga-Helia 2013. ”Kulttuuriyrittäjyys. Luova työ kannattavaksi.” Accessed August 4, 2014. http://www.haaga-helia.fi/fi/node/1884/aluekehityshankkeetmuut/kulttuuriyrittajyys.
Harvey, D. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Harvie, J. 2013. *Fair Play. Art, Performance and Neoliberalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Harni, E. 2015. ”Mielivaltaista kasvatusta, yrittäjyyskasvatusta.” In *Koko elämä töihin – koulutus tietokykykapitalismissa. Aikuiskasvatuksen vuosikirja 52*, edited by K. Brunila, J. Onnismaa and H. Pasanen, 102-123. Tampere: Vastapaino.
Heian, M. T., B. Kleppe, and K. Løyland. 2015. *Kunstnerundersøkelsen 2013. Kunstnernes inntekter*. TF-rapport nr. 350. Bø: Telemarksforsking.
Heiskanen, I. 2013. ”Taiteen ja kulttuurin uusi asemointi talouteen: kulttuuriteollisuus, luovat alat ja luova talous.” In *Taiteen ja kulttuurin kentät*, edited by I. Heiskanen, A. Kangas, and R. Mitchell, 109-189. Helsinki: Tietosanoma.
Henningsen, E., L. Håkonsen, and K. Løyland. 2015. ”From institutions to events – structural change in Norwegian local cultural policy.” *International Journal of Cultural Policy.* Published online 01. July 2015, p.1-20.
Holvas, J., and J. Vähämäki. 2004. *Odotustila. Pamfletti uudesta työstä.* Helsinki: Teos.
Houni, P., and H. Ansio (eds.) 2013. *Taiteilijan työ*. Helsinki: Työterveyslaitos.
Howarth, D., and Y. Stavrakakis. 2000. “Introducing discourse theory and political analysis.” In *Discourse theory and political analysis. Identities, hegemonies and social* change, edited by D. Howarth, A.J. Norval and Y. Stavrakakis, 1-23. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Kantola, A. 2010. ”Kilpailukykyvaltio politiikan valtastrategiana.” In *Hallintavalta. Sosiaalisen, politiikan ja talouden kysymyksiä*, edited by J. Kaisto and M. Pyykkönen, 97-118. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
Keat, R., and Abercrombie, N., eds. 1991. *Enterprise Culture.* London: Routledge.
Komulainen, K., S. Keskitalo-Foley, M. Korhonen & S. Lappalainen, eds. 2010. *Yrittäjyyskasvatus hallintana*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
KTM. 2007. *Luovien alojen yrittäjyyden kehittämisstrategia 2015*. Helsinki: Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriö.
Kulturdepartementet. 2016. *Prop. 1 S (2016-2017). Proposisjon til Stortinget. For budsjettåret 2017*. Forslag til statsbudsjett for 2017. Oslo: Kulturdepartementet.
Kulturdepartementet. 2015. *Kunstens autonomi og kunstens økonomi*. Utredning om kunstnerøkonomi gjort av et faglig utvalg. Oslo: Kulturdepartementet.
Kulturdepartementet. 2013. *NOU 2013:4 Kulturutredningen 2014*. Oslo: Kulturdepartementet.
Kultur- og kyrkjedepartementet. 2005. *St.meld. nr. 22 (2004-2005) Kultur og næring*. Oslo: Kultur- og kyrkjedepartementet.
Kulturdepartementet, Nærings- og handelsdepartementet, Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet (2013. *Handlingsplan: Fra gründer til kulturbedrift*. Oslo: Kulturdepartementet mfl.
Kunnskapsdepartementet, Nærings- og handelsdepartementet, Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet. 2004. *Se mulighetene og gjør noe med dem! Strategi for entreprenørskap i utdanningen 2004-2009.* Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
Kunnskapsdepartementet, Nærings- og handelsdepartementet, Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet. 2009. *Handlingsplan. Entreprenørskap i utdanningen - fra grunnskole til høyere utdanning 2009-2014.* Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.

Kuperkeikka. 2012. *Yrittäjyyskasvatus*. http://www.kuperkeikkaesikoulut.fi/page.php?id=4 [Opened 01.02.2017]
Laclau, E. 1996. *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.
Leadbeater, C., and Oakley, K. 1999. *The Independent. Britain's new cultural entrepreneur.* London: Demos.
Lee, H-K. 2016. "Politics of the 'creative industries' discourse and its variants." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 22 (3): 438-455.
Mangset, P. 2008. *Cultural entrepreneuralism, from an analytical, discursive and rhetoric perspective.* Paper to research seminar, University of Jyväskylä, Finland, Nov 8th, 2008.
Mangset, P., Kangas, A., Skot-Hansen, D., and G. Vestheim. 2008. "Nordic cultural policy". *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 14 (1): 1-5.
Mangset, P., and S. Røyseng (eds.). 2009. *Kulturelt entreprenørskap*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
Mangset, P, Heian, M. T., Kleppe, B., and K. Løyland. 2016. "Why are artists getting poorer? About the reproduction of low income among artists." *International Journal of Cultural Policy.* Published online 14. August 2016, p.1-20.
McRobbie, A. 2016. *Be Creative*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
McGuigan, J. 2016. *Neoliberal Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
Mc Guigan, J. 2010. "Creative labor, cultural work and individualization." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 16 (3): 323-335.
Mononen-Batista Costa, S., and K. Brunila. 2016. "Becoming entrepreneurial: Transitions and education of unemployed youth." *Power and Education* 8 (1): 19-34.
OKM. 2011. *Valtioneuvoston selonteko kulttuurin tulevaisuudesta. Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriön julkaisuja 2011:8*. Helsinki: Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö.
OKM. 2012. *Kulttuuriteollisuus ja -yrittäjyys tietoyhteiskunnassa.* Helsinki: Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö. Kindle edition.
OKM. 2014. "Yrittäjyyden toimenpideohjelma." Accessed September 12, 2014. http:// www.minedu.fi/OPM/Koulutus/artikkelit/yrittaejyyden_toimenpideohjelma/index.html
Patomäki, H. 2007. *Uusliberalismi Suomessa*. Helsinki: WSOY.
Pine, J.B., and J. H. Gilmore. 1999. *The experience economy. Work is theatre & every business a stage.* Boston, Massachusets: Harvard Business School Press.
Pyykkönen, M. 2014. *Ylistetty yrittäjyys*. Jyväskylä: SoPhi. Kindle edition.
Rautiainen, P., and T. Roiha. 2015. *Taidealojen korkeakoulutus Suomessa*. Helsinki: CUPORE. Kindle edition.
Rensujeff, K. 2014. *Taiteilijan asema 2010. Taiteilijakunnan rakenne, työ ja tulonmuodostus*. Helsinki: Taiteen edistämiskeskus. Kindle edition.
Rose, N. 1992. "Governing the enterprising self." In *The Values of the Enterprise Culture. The Moral Debate*, edited by P. Heelas, and P. Morris, 141–164. London: Routledge.
Røyseng, S. 2016. "The social contract of artists in the era of cultural industries". *International Journal of Cultural Policy.* Published online 15. Sep 2016.
Schumpeter, J.A. [1934] 1983. *The theory of economic development. An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle.* New Brunswick (USA) and London (UK): Transaction Publishers.
Siltala, J. 2004. *Työelämän huonontumisen lyhyt historia*. Helsinki: Otava.
Stavrum, H. 2014. "Blåblå frihet? Kulturpolitikk i lys av regjeringsskiftet." In *Kulturrikets tilstand 2014*, edited by M. Johansson and A. Winkelmann. Konferanserapport, Bø: Telemarksforsking.
Sørensen, B. M. 2012. "Management as farce: entrepreneurial subjectivity in the creative industries." In *Handbook of Organizational Entrepreneurship*, edited by D. Hjorth, 338-361. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
Throsby, D. 2001. *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Throsby, D. 2010. *Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tilastokeskus. 2014. *Kulttuuritilasto 2013*. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus.
Turunen, T. 2011. *Yrittäjyys – mitä se merkitsee?* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
Van Dijk, T.A. 2006. *Ideology and Discourse. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.
YES-verkosto. 2012. Koko Ehjä polku -video. Accessed June 15, 2012. http://vimeo.com/32080506.