

Selecting and hosting artists in a globalizing art world

Experience of Cultural Programmers in the case of Artistic Residencies in The Netherlands

Nia Konstantinova

Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Student number: 452436

Supervisor: A. Brandellero

Second reader: N. Komarova

Master Thesis June 2018

Acknowledgements

Thank you, Amanda Brandellero for the advice and knowledge you provided me with during these months. Michael Verweij, thank you for the unconditional love and support. Moreover, thank you for the beautiful cover design which compliments my thesis. Thank you, Bilyana Konstantinova, Nina Mladenova and Borislav Konstantinov for believing in me and putting my development and education before yourself. Thank you, Lara Tanke and Jo Alexander for sharing this exciting journey with me. Thank you, Janwillem Schrofer and Angela Serino for all the shared sources and insights. Finally, I am grateful to all my interviewees whom I cannot name. Thank you, for your time and willingness to participate in this research.

Contents

Selecting and hosting artists in a globalizing art world	1
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theoretical framework.....	5
2.1 Globalization, Cultural Globalization, Globalization of the high arts	5
2.2 Artistic Residencies	9
2.3 Cultural Programmers	12
2.4 Working practices in the context of high arts globalization	14
2.5 Organisational identity	15
3. Research design	17
3.1 Units of analysis and sampling techniques	17
3.2 Scope	19
3.3 Data gathering method	19
3.4. Operationalisation	20
3.5 Ethical considerations	21
3.6 Additional data.....	22
3.7 Data analysis method.....	22
4. Results.....	24
4.1. Cultural programmers and their environment.....	26
4.2 Practices	30
4.2.1 Matching	30
4.2.2 Facilitating.....	43
5. Conclusion	52
5.1. Strengths, limitations, recommendations	56
List of references.....	59
Appendices.....	66
Appendix A Interview guide.....	66
Appendix B Operationalisation.....	69
Appendix C Consent Form	71

1. Introduction

The focus of this research is set on the practices of cultural programmers in artistic residencies in the context of globalization. Previous research on artistic mobility suggests that as institutions, artistic residencies are supposed to facilitate intense global mobility of contemporary artists by giving them space and time to develop new projects (Pousette, 2011; Matias, 2016; Bydler, 2004; Gielen, 2010). Even though there is little research on AiR programmes, artistic residencies or as also named “artists-in-residence programmes” have been recognised as an essential cultural organisation in the art world (Matias, 2016). Thus, this master thesis aims to set the beginning of building academic knowledge around AiRs by uncovering organisational practices in these organisations. The study is based on interviews with programmers in different residencies situated in The Netherlands. The central question of the current research is:

How do programmers in artistic residencies select and host artists in the context of high arts globalization?

In general, cultural globalization has been a concept long contested (Held and McGrew, 2003; Crane 2002, 2006; Velthuis & Curioni, 2015; Scheurman, 2006; Buchholz & Wuggening, 2005). Nevertheless, a significant transformation in the contemporary art sector has been detected in the last 30 years (Velthuis & Curioni, 2015; Velthuis, 2013). The emergence of alternative art centres such as China, Brazil, India and Russia have been observed (Velthuis & Curioni, 2015). Even though the literature on the globalization process of high arts is scarce and there is no unified understanding of what the phenomenon of cultural globalization is, scholars have been trying to establish at least a coherent account of the different understandings of cultural globalization (Velthuis & Curioni, 2015). In previous literature (Velthuis & Curioni, 2015) globalization of the high arts has been understood in the following three ways: First, this phenomenon has been considered as the cross-border sales of contemporary art. Second, the unification of local markets into a “global ecumene” (Hannerz, 1989) referring to the notion that cultural workers operate in one global field and market instead of in separate ones. Third, the formation of art markets in new geographical places and the establishment of institutions which facilitate this new market (Velthuis & Curioni, 2015, p.3).

Even though there is a lack of literature on the subject of globalization of the high arts the existing sources are already contradicting each other. For example, according to Waters (2001) and Kramer (2001), the globalization of high arts is a process that has begun already in the 19th century. Thus, it is not a 21st-century phenomenon. Contrary to those are the statements of Buchholz and Wuggening (2005), Schultheis (et al. 2016) who claim that globalization is a myth and that internationally the most represented artists are still those based in the West, thus what is spreading is not a “cross-cultural flow” but a westernisation.

Globalization of the high arts can be encouraged or prevented by the actors in the cultural field (Crane, 2002; Janssen & Verboord, 2015). Previous research states that gatekeepers have this power (Janssen & Verboord, 2015; Bydler, 2004). At the centre of the current research are the cultural programmers who exercise the role of gatekeepers in various cultural organisations (Kawashima, 1999). Even though cultural programmers work in various art organisations such as theatres, cultural centres, festivals and artistic residencies, little is known about their role as a cultural operator. In academic sources, it is stated that they are often compared to curators (Kawashima, 1999) because they select the artists, theatre shows, dance companies on behalf of cultural organisations (Kawashima, 1999). Multiple factors can influence the decision making of cultural programmers. For example, previous research (Velthuis, 2013; Kawashima, 1999; Janssen and Verboord, 2015) have shown that in contrast to the expectation of local art markets opening up towards global flows, institutions at the local level might continue to opt for locally oriented practices and prefer selecting local artists. Thus, the way cultural programmers operate can shape the identity of the organisations in which they work. The current study will look deeper into this process by answering the following question:

In what ways do the selection and hosting practices of cultural programmers shape the identity of their organisations?

Managerial studies focusing on organisational identity (Jones, 2016; Oelsner, 2013, Albert and Whetten, 1985; Whetten, 2006, Gioia, 1998; 1991) have shown that the sum of values and practices exercised by the organisational members form the perceived identities of their organisations. As the current study is focused on practices and values which the programmers exercise and those are studied from multiple respondents working in the same organisations, the study can also tell us something about what is at the core of the organisational identities of artistic residencies and how do programmers influence their formation. This is very important for organisations and especially in times of globalization because without strong

identity organisations cannot be recognised by others and it will cease to exist (Jones, 2016; Oelsner, 2013).

The current research contributes to academic knowledge in several ways, first even though AiR programmes are cultural organisations which have been previously recognised as an essential component in artists' CVs (Matias, 2016), they have never been studied from an organisational perspective. Thus, this study fills a knowledge gap regarding how artistic residencies operate through the perspective of cultural operators working in them. Further, by exposing the practices of cultural programmers who are perceived as the gatekeepers in artistic residencies, this study will build on and contribute to the current knowledge (Janssen and Verboord, 2015; Negus, 2002, Bourdieu, 1984; Becker, 1982) we have on gatekeepers in the art world.

Practically this research will reveal how gatekeeping functions within cultural organisations work at a time of globalization and what are the key concerns in decision making and hosting practices in not for profit cultural organisations.

The thesis is structured as follows: Theoretical framework was developed and presented in chapter 2. The chapter begins with a broader view on globalization, followed by a specification of the globalization of the high arts. Next, the concept of artistic residencies will be presented. This is a challenging task since most of the documents regarding residencies are policy documents and not scientific research. Then, the concept of cultural gatekeepers and intermediaries based on the research of Janssen and Verboord (2015) and Negus (2002) will be presented. Then the text will zoom into the notion of the cultural programmer as defined by Kawashima (1999). Further, the chapter will explore the practices of other cultural workers in times of globalization through the lens of Velthuis (2013). Lastly, the concepts of perceived identity will be introduced, based on the studies of Albert and Whetten (1985) and Gioia (1998; 1991). The perceived identity of the organisation is formed by the practices, values and believes of its members. Thus, by investigating those in the current research we can also see how programmers impact the organisational identities of the artistic organisation.

Empirically the study is based on nine semi-structured interviews conducted with programmers working in artistic residencies in the Netherlands, those were transcribed via Otranscribe and resulted in 12.45 h of data. The analysis was done via Atlas.ti and through the perspective of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Additional data was gathered from the profiles of the participating AiRs from the online platforms TransArtists and ResArtis. The platforms were considered a vital component of how the organisations reach

out to potential participating artists and how they profile themselves. Further, methodology such as sampling technics and operationalisation are discussed in chapter 3.

The results of the current research are presented in detail in chapter 4. The key findings show that the two main practices that cultural programmers engage in when selecting and hosting artists involve processes of matching and facilitating. Those practices encounter specific opportunities and constraints and are balancing act between pragmatic requirements and constraints and ideal visions. First, the chapter outlines the environment in which cultural programmers operate namely the organisational organ of the programming committee. Then the various dimensions of matching will be outlined following a subchapter on facilitating.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Globalization, Cultural Globalization, Globalization of the high arts

Globalization has become one of the most popular and debated concepts today (Held and McGrew, 2003; Crane 2002, 2006; Velthuis & Curioni, 2015; Scheurman, 2006; Buchholz & Wuggening, 2005). Soon after its establishment, the notion of globalization began to be associated with the field of culture and in particular with the field of high arts. Thus, in the last thirty years, a tendency has been detected in which contemporary art perceives itself as operating in a united global field where global cultural operators from all over the world select, exhibit and sell artists internationally (Bydler, 2004; Wu, 2007). Besides the celebratory approach towards cultural globalization and globalization in general, these concepts have been opposed, criticised and challenged by many scholars (Velthuis, 2013; Velthuis & Curioni, 2015; Buchholz & Wuggening, 2005; Giddens, 2013). Thus, due the complexity and disagreement in the field of cultural globalization and globalization of the high arts, this section aims to expose and create a dialogue between the different views on the topics. In general, we will look at models and studies which propose that cultures indeed have changed and immersed in a global entity successfully and positively, and the studies and models which propose that globalization, in fact, has not taken place. Further, this section will look at studies which show that globalization leads to adverse effects on cultures, such as homogenization.

As there is no consensus on the definition of globalization in the field of sociology, we can find variations of what we should understand as globalization. One of the very criticised views on globalization is the one of McLuhan (1989), who considers globalization to result in the shrinking of the world to a global village. Since then, more complex understandings on globalization are introduced. For example, Held and McGrew (2003), propose that signs of globalization are the actions which shorten physical and time distances. Further, they suggest that culture is more integrated into a global entity, that there is “an exhilarating interdependence” (p.3). Another sign of globalization proposed by them is the expanding awareness of interrelated global “condition” (p.3). Other scholars conceptualise globalization in relation to subjective awareness. For instance, Robertson (1992) refers to the phenomenon as the continued shrinking of the world as well as the worlds’ growing unified

“consciousness” (p.8). Lechner (2005) suggests another definition of globalization which connects more to the current research, the definition presented by this scholar is connected to the creation of immerse global awareness, but it also specifies that this phenomenon is expressed in “the world diffusion of practices, expansion of relations across continents, organisation of social life on a global scale” (p.330). This definition deals with how globalization effects practices, thus it relates to the main research question of the current research. Moreover, we will study if those have indeed expanded beyond national borders and continents or they are predominately locally embedded.

Zooming into cultural globalization, it becomes evident that the different opinions and views are no less diverse than the ones concerning globalization in general. One of the most used definitions of cultural globalization is the one established by Crane (2002). Cultural globalization as proposed by Diana Crane (et al. 2002, p.1) is “as oppose to economic, political or technological globalization – refers to the transmission or diffusion across national borders of various forms of media and the arts.” Within this definition, different models and understanding of cultural globalization can be discussed. For example, imperialism theory (Tomlinson, 2001, p.37) is the widest spread model when it comes to cultural globalization (Crane, 2002; 2016). Building on world system theory this model is guided by the belief that the world is economically dominated by Western countries, which are perceived to be the centre of the global, while non-western countries are left in the periphery of global relationships and lack of influence. Therefore, another name for this model is “core-periphery”. Some researchers (Salwen, 1991; White, 1983) go as far as stating that in global relationships we observe imposition of values, norms, lifestyles from the Western countries on to third world countries. This type of imposition is considered to come from strong capitalist societies such as America, and it is thus also named Americanization. Those studies propose that globalization has a negative influence on other cultures and results in a hegemonic, homogeneous, unified culture, which accelerates at the cost of local cultural expressions and values.

In contrast, the models developed by Appadurai (1990, 1996, 2003) present a view on cultural globalization which does not consider The West as a pivotal point. Instead, it views cultural globalization in terms of cultural flows which flow in various directions. Further, the model of Appadurai (1996, 2003) does not see the globalization of culture as one whole which does the model outlined above. Alternatively, the scholar identifies various flows within cultural globalization. Namely the flows of images, ethnicities, technologies, ideologies and artscapes. This model has been criticised by Buchholz & Wuggening (2005)

who consider the diversification of flows not enough for one to study cultural globalization of the contemporary art. For example, both the flows of artscapes and images do not differentiate enough between popular arts and high arts.

Therefore, this study will dive into other references dealing more precisely with the globalization of the high arts. For example, Alexander (2003) stresses that in comparison to popular culture globalization of high arts is not so prominent because it is not centralised and generally it is operating in a smaller market than the market for popular culture. Contrary to Alexander (2003), Waters (2001) and Kramer (2001) state that globalization of high arts is a fact and it is not a new phenomenon. They consider globalization of the high arts as a phenomenon dating back to the 19th century, while according to them, popular culture has been only shared amongst locals. Other authors also disagree on the issue when globalization first began. Some (Belting et al. 2013; Appadurai, 1996) perceive globalization as a phenomenon which began after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Regime and the Eastern Block. Other authors disagree, for example, Vethuis and Curioni (2015) have dedicated a whole subchapter on studies which prove that globalization of the high arts has been well established before 1989. For instance, Brandellero (2015) discovered that international ties in the contemporary art sector in Brazil have already been established in 1950. Guerzoni (2011) also argues that cultural workers have had nomadic lives at least since the Renaissance.

Another concern in the field of globalization in contemporary art is the degree to which the field is globalized and how it is globalized. For example, some scholars perceive the current state of high arts as very inclusive and global (Kravagna, as cited in Buchholz & Wuggening, 2005; Griffin et al. 2003). For instance, according to Kravagna (as cited in Buchholz & Wuggening, 2005), the art world has been extensively changing by facilitating large inclusion for non-Western cultural actors. Similarly, Griffin (et al. 2003), considers the contemporary art as highly globalized and inclusive, according to this scholar the appointment of non-western cultural workers on high positions such as curator of Documenta, and the dissemination of biennials and art fairs around the globe shows inclusivity and diversification in the field of contemporary art. Contrary to this optimistic view other researchers have provided data which shows that galleries and museums are much more likely to persist in exhibiting and favouring local art. For example, Quemin's research (2006) exposes that even the most renowned and well-supported museums favour the showcasing of local over foreign artists. Further, one of the art fairs celebrated by Griffin (et al. 2003) as inclusive, namely Art Basel, has proven to be the opposite (Velthuis & Curioni,

2015): one-third of the participating galleries are local.

In 2004, Bydler published a study pointing towards multiple signs that globalization in the sphere of contemporary arts has increased. Similarly, to the current study, the scholar gathered data from gatekeepers in the art world, namely critics and curators. According to her interviewees, there is a rise in the international job possibilities for artists and curators. The scholar points artistic residencies as one of the cultural institutions which have made possible the international workflow. However, Bydler's (2004) findings also show that only a few artists and curators can gain permission for international travel because such practices are a subject of immigration regulations, which allow only a small number of actors to travel. Thus, this study also reminds us that other factors are playing a role when it comes to the globalization and movement of people, which significantly differ from the established global norms for mobility of cultural goods. Thus, institutional models and regulations are often not affected and not changed to fit globalization trends. For example, the study of Komarova, Krachenkova and Velthuis (2015) shows that in Russia and China Official Art Organisations formed during the Soviet / Communist regimes are still existing and persist being influential in the art world. Further, the study of Velthuis (2013) which will be considered in detail later shows that Berlin and Amsterdam galleries are still based on the French gallery model from the 19th century which makes the inclusion of foreign and especially non-Western artists difficult.

The research presented above shows a broad and vibrant perspective on the globalization of the high arts. However, these studies mainly deal with the theme of art markets in the context of high arts globalization. Thus, there is a visible knowledge gap regarding small non-profit and development-oriented organisations and how do their practices relate to contemporary art globalization. By studying artistic residencies, the current study aims to contribute to the discourse of high arts globalization by filling the gap existing in the current literature regarding the practices of non-product and non-profit oriented organisations. Further, the study proposes an exciting case because artistic residencies are perceived as a significant catalyst for international mobility (Matias, 2016).

2.2 Artistic Residencies

Artistic residencies also named “AiRs”, “AiR programmes” and “artist residencies” are a type of organisation operating in the realm of the cultural sector. However, there is no reached consensus on what they particularly are. These institutions are considered to be situated in between a gallery and a museum because they fill a different void in the art industry (Matias, 2016). In contrast to galleries residencies do not aim to sell art or exhibit art, and in contrast to museums residencies do not collect art or preserve art for future generations (Matias, 2016). Instead, AiRs focus on providing the possibilities to artists for creation and research around new contemporary art projects (Matias, 2016), by being at a “certain place for a certain amount of time often connected to this place” (Poisson–Cogez 2012, p. 2). Therefore, artistic residencies are characterised with the short-term facilitation of talent development in the field of contemporary art. As expressed by Digne and Pacquement (1995, p.31), AiRs stimulate “creative activity through contacts either with other artists or with a specific environment.” Unique to the specific environment artistic residencies provide is that besides the working studios, they grant the artists with sleeping spaces (Pousette, 2011). By doing so, they create home-like setting for the travelling artists which grounds them in the local cultural context (Pousette, 2011). Further, the home environment leads to non-institutional knowledge, which is based on learning through experiencing and is a fruitful setting for self-exploration (Serino, 2015). Artistic residencies are development driven (Gielen, 2010, Pousette 2011, Matias, 2016), insofar as they provide the artist with the time for experimentation and innovation.

Artistic residencies could be a source of income for artists (Matias, 2016; Louargant & Szary, 2010; Stephens, 2011); however, as we see from platforms such as TransArtists¹ and ResArtis², this is not necessarily true for all of them. From the profiles of the residencies available on those platforms we can see that many require a payment for the stay instead of providing a stipend or a working budget. In this research, only residencies which give a stipend, or a working budget will be taken into consideration. This decision comes with the understanding that the organisations which provide a working budget are established on a higher level and deliver a better facilitating framework for the residing artist (Chen et. al, 2005).

¹ Transartists is an online platform hosting a database of profiles of artistic residencies:

<https://www.transartists.org/>

² Resartis is an online platform hosting a database for profiles of artistic residencies: <http://www.resartis.org/en/>

Artistic residencies have also been considered programmes for exchange, for example, the Australian – Asian (Asialink) programme which has been studied by Rösler (2015). Asialink is a residency program which sends Australian artists to Asia where they live and work for a certain amount of time. Rösler (2015) studied how Australian diplomacy used the artistic exchange to warm cultural ties to Asia. In a similar fashion to Asialink. In the Netherlands the Mondriaan Fonds³ is running a program of exchange named “Gaastateliers”⁴ (Guest Studios) in collaboration with different artistic residencies around the globe. Exchange programmes such as Guest Studios and Asialink aim to increase the cultural exchange between countries and to “promote” the image of a given national culture outside the borders of the given country. Even though such exchanges are also using the name artist residencies, artistic residencies or AiR programmes, they differ from artistic residencies studied in this research. The programmes mentioned above are the networks which make exchange possible, but they are not the organisations which are tight to a physical location and which select and host the guest artists. Thus, artistic residencies which are just networks of exchange will not be at the focus of the current research. In his research from 2001, Stephens investigates Artist residencies in the context of England. He is also focused on studying artistic residencies as “schemes where different types of artists work outside their “normal” circumstances and in contact with people that are considered to be an “arts audience” in any conventional sense” (Stephens, 2001, p. 44). In his contextualization of artistic residencies, Stephens (2011) suggests that artists are “placed” by third parties in companies to interact and create art outside the comfort zone of the studio. Thus, the residencies serve as a social tool to bridge the gap between society and the artist. Today private companies can establish artistic residencies. For example, in The Netherlands one of the major banks in the country namely “Rabobank” has created such a platform⁵ which focuses on giving artists the possibility to create an art piece concerning the values of the organisation and its members. However, the type of artistic residencies which operate as exchange programs and are considered third parties will not be included in the scope of this research. Artistic residencies set up by companies and corporations will also not be considered in this research.

Even though a precise definition of what artistic residencies are is yet to be

³ Mondriaan fonds is an arm’s-length body organisation in the Netherlands distributing funding and other possibilities to cultural organisations

⁴ <https://www.mondriaanfonds.nl/aanvraag/bijdrage-gastateliers/>

⁵ <https://www.theaterkrant.nl/nieuws/lucas-man-artist-residence-rabobank/>

established, their contribution is already recognised globally. For example, third-party organisations such as ResArtis and TransArtists have created a database consisting of profiles of artistic residencies. Those can be used as a searching tool for creatives to find a matching residency for their creative needs. In this research, the “patchwork” of Matias (2016) on describing artistic residencies will be used. Thus, artistic residencies, AiR programmes and artist residencies will be considered the host organisations of artists. Thus, cultural workers in the AiR programmers themselves select and host the artist (Matias, 2016). Artistic residencies are not a liaison between the artist and the host organisation. They are the hosts themselves (Matias, 2016). Further, artistic residencies as perceived in this research connect to a physical space where the artists reside, and the members of the organisation have a role in looking after the artist for the duration of their stay (Serino, 2015). The AiRs which are researched in the current study function as contemporary art spaces all year long, thus they differ from the two models of residencies presented in the previous sections. In this study the terms AiRs and artistic residencies will be used interchangeably.

Currently, there is a lack of academic research focused on artistic residencies. These organisations have been mainly studied in the perspective of artistic mobility (Matias, 2016; Menger 1999; Magkou, 2012; Staines, 2012; Grabski 2011; D’Andrea, 2006; Bernava & Bertacchini, 2016; Styhre & Eriksson, 2008; Laaksonen, 2016) where the focus was put on the experiences which the nomad artist gains from his/her stay in the artistic residency. Predominately the above-listed research and policy documents have been suggesting that artistic residencies are institutions which facilitate the global mobility. Very little has been said about how artistic residencies operate and how do they select and host the artists in the context of globalization. Thus, this research examines the artistic residencies from the perspective of the gatekeepers working in them: namely, the cultural programmers thus sheds light on the organisational side and choices of this organisations.

2.3 Cultural Programmers

Cultural programmers are the main cultural actors studied in this research. Even though there is a lack of literature regarding cultural programmers and no literature on cultural programmers working in artistic residencies, the current study will first draw on references connected to gatekeepers and cultural intermediaries to contextualise cultural programmers. In the study of Janssen and Verboord (2015) we can find a collective encounter of the role of gatekeepers and intermediaries in the cultural field. Some of the characteristics, obligations and influence of gatekeepers they have outlined might prove to be essential to the cultural programmer in artistic residencies.

First, due to overproduction of art and the minimal financial support available in the cultural sector, only a small percentage of the existing artists get institutional and private support. Thus, the existing opportunities for an artist to build a career are limited, and gatekeepers and intermediaries have the authority to be the first to select who will be supported (Janssen & Verboord, 2015; Peterson & Anand, 2004). In the case of artistic residencies which have been previously contextualised as institutions facilitating a global flow of artists (Matias, 2016; Menger 1999; Magkou, 2012; Staines, 2012; Grabski 2011; D'Andrea, 2006; Bernava & Bertacchini, 2016; Styhre & Eriksson, 2008; Laaksonen, 2016), the programmers working in them might be the one who makes the first selection of foreign artists and introducing them to a local art scene.

Second, the selecting role of gatekeepers is related to their ability to assign symbolic value and legitimise artistic products (Bourdieu, 1984; Janssen & Verboord, 2015). In a turbulent cultural sector and the art market, the gatekeepers and intermediaries create symbolic value around a cultural product when they approve it by selection or positive critique. This action contributes to the reputation of the artist and legitimises his/her work as valuable (Janssen & Verboord, 2015). Cultural programmers in residencies might give legitimation to the accepted artists. As Matias (2016) has written residencies are an essential component of artists' CVs.

Third, gatekeepers and intermediaries could be considered co-creators of cultural products (Becker, 1982; Janssen & Verboord, 2015). Gatekeepers often provide feedback to the artists during their artistic process. In AiRs, the programmers are present during the artists' residency period, and they guide the project. It would be interesting to see how the programmers perceive their connection to the artistic process of the residing artists.

Fourth, in their study from 2015, Janssen and Verboord suggest that gatekeepers and

mediators “are almost by definition a connector” (p.441). According to them, this statement is true about the way gatekeepers searching process occurs. In order to minimise risk due to demand uncertainty in the cultural sector, gatekeepers rely on their personal network to find potential artists (Janssen & Verboord, 2015). However, they point out that gatekeepers and intermediaries are also “a professional connector” (p.441). For example, they aim to connect artists with the right audience, or buyer.

The last role of gatekeepers and cultural mediators studied by Janssen and Verboord, (2015) is the role of supporter and protector which seems to be intriguing to programmers working artistic residencies. This role seems to be relevant to programmers working in residencies because AiRs facilitate and try to stimulate a creative process (Matias 2016). Therefore, the programmers could be seen as supporters of the artistic development of artists. However, as presented by Janssen and Verboord (2015) in the context of cultural globalization gatekeepers might also create protection for local production. Such as the music and local television quotas for the national channels. Thus, as residencies are publicly funded bodies, similar rules might apply.

Intermediaries are also studied by Negus (2002), wherein the focus is the exchange of values which the intermediaries create. Intermediaries are cultural workers who “come in between creative artists and consumers” (p.3). Thus, they are perceived as “connectors between production and consumption”. Further according to Negus (2002) cultural intermediaries “shape both use values and exchange values and seek to manage how these are connected with people’s lives” (p.4). Negus (2002) states intermediaries seek to translate artworks in values with which the public can identify. In artistic residencies, the programmers might seek identification between the values of their institutions and the applying artists.

The single reference I found on cultural programmers in art centres was from Kawashima (1999). She studied cultural programming both in theatre and the visual arts in the context of British cultural institutions. Thus, her framework will be used as a pillar for the conceptualisation of the programming practice. According to Kawashima (1999), the choice making of programmers begins with artists submitting their proposals to the given institution. One of the most important considerations that programmers have to take into account is how the submission is relating the artistic vision and values of the given institution (Kawashima, 1999). Other considerations are: whether the act would interest a big enough audience and if the fee asked by the artists is reasonable. Kawashima (1999) stresses that unlike theatre programmers, the professionals working in art centres need to program a much wider variety of art genres: performance, painting, conceptual art, even dance and music. Thus, a

programmer working in such institution needs to be knowledgeable in many different areas and to be aware of the new developments in the fine art sector. Further, due to funding cuts, the programmers handle multiple tasks within the cultural organisation such as fundraising, administration, educational activities. In the prior research (Kawashima, 1999; Velthuis, 2013) is shown that the budget constraints and time limitations (due to multiple tasks management) in the visual arts organisations force cultural programmers and curators to draw references from their local cultural environment, rather than engaging with international artists.

Research on gatekeepers is not new. However, it is evident that there are types of gatekeepers which have not been previously researched in academia. The current research aims to contribute to existing literature by revealing the selecting and hosting practices of cultural programmers working in artistic residencies.

2.4 Working practices in the context of high arts globalization

The current research will draw on Velthuis' (2013) findings regarding how cultural actors operate in the context of globalization of high arts in The Netherlands. Similarly, to this research Velthuis (2013) studies the practices of organisations through the perspective of the gatekeepers working in them: namely galleries and dealers. The core question of his research is: To what extent are the art markets in Amsterdam and Berlin international? He studied it by examining what are the nationalities of the represented artists in local galleries. Despite the media perception of a global market, his findings show that most galleries represent local artists. Velthuis (2013) referred to this phenomenon as "home bias" (p. 297): meaning that the interviewed gallerists had a preference for local artists. The qualitative data gathered during his interviews shows that the existing organisational models are responsible for the home bias. He connects the lack of non-Western artists with the phenomenon of institutional-isomorphism introduced by DiMaggio and Powell (1983). To clarify isomorphism as explained by Hawley in DiMaggio and Powell, (1983, p.66) is "a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions." Moreover, institutional isomorphism as contextualised by the scholars as "the forces pressing communities towards accommodation with the outside world" (p.66). Velthuis (2013) has translated the institutional-isomorphism into six practices and constraints which create difficulties for non-Western artists to be represented in Berlin and Amsterdam

art galleries. First, he points out that the selection process happens on a local level, and that art-fairs are more of a gallery-buyer endeavour, and not a gallery-artist meeting ground. Secondly, the artists are part of the support personnel of the gallery. Locals can more easily join a “communal effort” (p. 299). Thirdly, dealers want to be closely involved in the creative process of their artists by visiting the art studios. Fourthly, dealers need to be convinced hundred percent of the quality of the work: a lengthy process that requires them to interact in-person with the artist. Fifthly, dealers create support systems such as media and critics that are local. Sixth, the relationships between dealer and artist are often orally binding and based on trust. Those are much more easily established with face-to-face interaction. Hence according to Velthuis (2013), despite anticipation of a global art market, we find that the majority of the represented artists in galleries in Amsterdam and Berlin are local, because of organisational practices and constraints that pertain to the everyday running of a gallery and working practices of gallerists and artists.

In his research Velthuis (2013) deals with the contemporary art market, which is sale driven. Artistic Residencies which are at the centre of this research are process driven (Gielen, 2010; Pousette, 2011), thus it would be interesting to understand if the autonomous artistic pole (Bourdieu, 1993) in which production is entirely intrinsically and artistically motivated is also affected by a home bias. Velthuis’ research (2013) is particularly exciting for this research because the current study is situated in the same geographical region as one part of his study: The Netherlands.

2.5 Organisational identity

There is no clear differentiation between the concepts institutional identities and organisational identities. For example, in their researches concerning institutional identity, both Jones (2016) and Oelsner (2013) built on the works of Whetten (2006) whose speciality is organisational identity and not institutional identity. From the two concepts, organisational identity has been thoughtfully studied (Albert and Whetten, 1985; Hatch & Schultz, 2002; Whetten, 2006; Ravasi & Schultz, 2006), therefore in the current research, the term of organisational identity will be used.

Organisational identities have multiple dimensions (Jones, 2016; Oelsner, 2013, Albert and Whetten, 1985; Whetten, 2006). They are composed of physical and intangible attributes. The physical attributes of organisational identity are the physical space of the

organisation: office, building and its members and symbols, such as logos. While the intangible dimension refers to the communication between members and external actors, statements of the actors, values held by the organisational members, goals which they strive to achieve.

Similarly, Gielen (2010 p.280) conceptualises institutions as two-fold. “On one hand the institution refers to concrete organisations consisting of people, buildings and objects. On the other hand, the concept extends to the totality of value, norms and customs that are considered important to society.”

The current research studies organisational identity from a hermeneutic perspective. As proposed by Gioia (1998; 1991) and Albert and Whetten (1985) this method entails that the study will focus on how the members of the organization, in this case, the cultural programmers construct or influence the organisational identity. In other words, this study will focus on the intangible manifestations of organisational identities of artistic residencies.

Thus, the intangible manifestations as conceptualised by Gielen (2010) and Oelsner (2013) and Jones (2016) relate to the values, actions, goals and statements the organisational members exercises, hence relate to the organisational practices and values. This conceptualisation of institutional identity is very close to what Albert and Whetten (1985, p.225) have defined as “perceived identity of organisations”.

Perceived identity refers to the collection of attributes that are perceived as typical for the “continuity, centrality and uniqueness” of an organisation in the perception of its members" (Albert & Whetten, 1985, p.225). The uniqueness of this definition has been rejected as significant and important measuring tool due to the increasing isomorphic tendencies in organisations (Gioia,1998; 1991). Thus, in the current research, we focus on the continuity and centrality. Continuity refers to the values and practices of organisational members who persist over time (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Whetten, 2006). While centrality refers to the core values and practices of an organisation (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Whetten 2006) as perceived by their members. In the case of the current research, the term “attributes” refers to the policy of the programmers for example mission statements, goals, and values and their selection and hosting practices.

Dutton and Dukerich (1991) found that the perceived identity is an essential stimulus for action. In their 1991 study, they showed how the idea of what the organisation stands for amongst its members was an essential part of their members’ decision-making process in a critical for the organisation situation. Most importantly it showed how the different actors have the capacity to influence the “perceived identity”.

3. Research design

At the centre of the current research are the organisational practices in artistic residencies in the context of cultural globalization. Those are studied through the experiences and perception of cultural programmers. As suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1990), Bryman (2012), Babbie (2014), qualitative methodology is the most fruitful way of studying experiences and perspectives of individuals.

3.1 Units of analysis and sampling techniques

The units of analysis are cultural programmers based in The Netherlands. These actors of the cultural field exercise the role of gatekeepers in artistic residencies.

The sample size is nine respondents from whom 12.45h of recorded data was gathered. In the process of finding respondents purposive sampling was used. As described by Babbie (2014) and Bryman (2012, p.245), purposive sampling is the process of selecting respondents who are most representative of a given target population. The type of purposeful sampling is criterion sampling. For a detailed description of the sample see Table 1 below.

The first criterion is that the respondents need to hold a position as a cultural programmer in artistic residency. Artistic residencies are organisations which facilitate the creative process of artists in a certain place for a certain time. They are process driven. Thus, many of these organisations are not focused on a finished cultural product. As suggested in the theoretical framework there is a lack of precise definition what artistic residencies are. To clarify, in the scope of the current research will be studied only organisations which select and host the artists themselves. Moreover, in the sample are included only artistic residencies which support the artist with a working budget or a stipend.

Second, the respondents need to be working in The Netherlands. The Netherlands because despite its small size in the country are situated at least 56 residencies, which is a significant number if we compare to Belgium with 26 and UK with 56 registered artistic residencies. Dutch Culture⁶: an organisation which is an advocate for artistic mobility and artistic residencies is situated in Amsterdam. Further, Trans Artists⁷ and ResArtis⁸: platforms

⁶ Dutch Culture website: <https://dutchculture.nl/nl>

⁷ <https://www.transartists.org/>

⁸ <http://www.resartis.org/en/>

providing access to a database showcasing organisational profiles of almost all AiRs, are also situated in Amsterdam. Thus, despite its moderate size, the art world in The Netherlands is influential in the field of artistic residencies.

Table 1. description of sample

Respondents	Gender	Occupations	Country of origin	Organisation	Interview Duration
programmer 1	F	Curator, facilitator	Hungary	A	79 min
programmer 2	F	Curator, writer, programmer	Italy	D	135 min
programmer 3	M	Artist, programmer	Sweden	E	65 min
programmer 4	M	Artist, programmer	Italy	E	-
programmer 5	F	Artist, programmer	Spain	E	60 min
programmer 6	M	Director, critic, programmer	The Netherlands	B	78 min
programmer 7	F	Curator, programmer	The Netherlands	C, D	190 min
programmer 8	F	Director, programmer	Belgium	C	120 min
programmer 9	M	Director, programmer	The Netherlands	A	120 min
Total:					747 min 12h 45 min

The research aimed to have a diverse sample. Therefore, the residencies from which respondents were drawn, were selected on the basis of multiple variables. First, there are both respondents from long-term and short-term residencies. Second, respondents from large residencies were included. Those institutions host around 20-50 participants simultaneously. Further, in the sample are also included respondents from small residencies those can host one or two artists at the time. The third variable is location. In the research were included two residencies which are situated in relatively isolated regions and three residencies which are located in the Randstad⁹. TransArtists was used for a search engine for finding suitable artistic residencies. Before making a final selection, the criteria mentioned above were examined to make sure that the sample is diverse. Further, the sample tries to include

⁹ Randstad is the megalopolis in the Netherlands formed by the cities: Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam, Utrecht.

multiple respondents from the same institution, so more in-depth information is gathered regarding the practices in the institutions as a whole. Nevertheless, one of the institutions is represented only by one respondent.

During the search process of valuable participants, it became evident that residencies might have slightly different structures and are a subject of language fog¹⁰. Some programmers were named advisors, some facilitators. To remove the language fog the sample aimed to include only people who select and host the artists in residencies and work in a committee. However, in the final sample, there is one respondent (interviewee 1) which only hosts the artists, and it is not actively involved in the selection procedure. (See table 1 above)

3.2 Scope

This research is performed in the form of Master Thesis at Erasmus University Rotterdam; the given time frame is 5th February till 12th June. Due to time restrictions, the sample size is a relatively small: minimum of 10h of recorded data. The geographical setting of the current research is The Netherlands.

3.3 Data gathering method

An in-depth semi-structured interview was used as a data gathering tool. This method is considered as the most helpful in case the study is focused on the perspective and experiences of the respondents (Bryman, 2012 p. 514). Further, the semi-structured interviews provide structure to the interviewer, however, they leave space for new themes to unfold. Since both residencies and cultural programmers are understudied concepts, the semi-structured interviews can provide new insights. The interviewees were recorded and later transcribed via the online platform Otranscribe¹¹.

During the current research potential, respondents were approached for participation by email. In total 19 residencies were contacted for participation in the research. Of which seven replied with an affirmative answer and were willing to be interviewed (two of the residencies were not included, due to conflicting schedules), two rejected the invitation for

¹⁰ Language fog means that not all programmers across residencies used the same title for the same job

¹¹ www.otranscribe.com

participation, ten never responded on the invitation.

The interviews took between 1h and 2h 15min. Time wise the interviews were conducted in the period between 9th March 2018 and 3rd April 2018. Eight of the respondents were interviewed individually, one of the interviews was conducted with two participants (programmer 3 and 4). Six of the interviews were conducted in person one of which in the home of the interviewee 9, the others in the working place of the programmers. Three of the interviews (with programmer 2, programmer 7, programmer 8) were conducted via Skype. This program is considered to be an advantage, not a disadvantage during qualitative data gathering. As stated by other researchers (Seitz, 2016; Hanna, 2012; Deakin & Wakefield, 2014) the program gave me the possibility to conduct the interviews, and it was beneficial to reach participants without necessarily demanding too much of their working time. Skype does not diminish the quality of the qualitative data and can be very useful especially in projects such as master thesis where time is a cooker pressure (Sullivan; 2012). Interview guide is available in Appendix A.

3.4. Operationalisation

The concepts of the current study are cultural globalization, artistic residency, organisational identity and cultural programming.

Cultural globalization will be operationalised as operationalised by Velthuis (2013). One of the central questions is: how are international artists embedded in the curriculum of artistic residencies? Other signs of cultural globalization will also be considered, for example, if the programmers implement strategies that they have borrowed from other international organisations into their practice. Further, the collaboration with international organisations will be considered a sign of cultural globalization. This concept is not separated on its own, but it can be found throughout the questions, being incorporated in the other dimensions and topics.

The second concept is artistic residency's organisational identity. As stated by Albert and Whetten (1985), Whetten (2006) Gilen (2010), Oelsner (2013) and Jones (2016) institutions are separated in physical manifestations and intangible manifestations. In this research only, the intangible manifestations will be considered. Those refer to the actors', in this case, the programmers': actions, goals and statements and their values (Albert and Whetten, 2006). Further, as suggested by Albert and Whetten (1985) and Gioia (1998, 1991)

the intangible manifestation of organisational identity is the sum of the centrality and continuity. Continuity refers to the values and practices of organisational members which persist over time (Albert & Whetten, 1985, Whetten 2006). While centrality refers to the how wide spread are the core values and practices of an organisation (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Whetten 2006) as perceived by their members. Therefore, the concept of artistic residency's institutional identity has only one dimension in this study: immaterial manifestation. This dimension, however, is separated into three sub-dimensions: continuity and centrality, local goals and values and international goals and values.

The third concept is cultural programming as a practice which is separated into four dimensions. According to Kawashima (1999), the artistic vision of the programmer is essential for the shaping identity of the art institution. The second dimension is awareness of cutting-edge developments in contemporary art, this, as stated by Kawashima (1999), is of utmost importance allowing programmers to make informed choices about the program of their institutions. Third, as stated by Velthuis (2013) and Kawashima (1999) the selection process is the primary influence whether the gatekeepers will select international or local artists. Fourthly, the nature of the relationship between gatekeepers and the artist, as stated by Velthuis (2013) and Kawashima (1999) has a considerable influence whether local or international artists will be selected. For detailed operationalisation and topics see Appendix B.

3.5 Ethical considerations

During this research, the participants do not take any substantial ethical risks. However, to ensure the confidentiality of the interviewees a consent form was prepared. This form was provided to all interviewees. The consent form gives the respondents the right to choose if their name will be present in the document or if they want to remain anonymous. Further, the form states that all information gathered from the interviews will be used for academic purposes only. Consent form is available in Appendix C. Two interviewees gave consent by mail, the rest of the respondents signed the forms. To secure the confidentiality of the respondents, this study will not use the names of the participants in further chapters of this research. The respondents will be referred to by the number assigned to them or by their occupation and number. The number with which the respondents will be represented have

been assigned based on an inverted chronological order in which the interviews were conducted (see Table 1 above).

3.6 Additional data

During the research additional data was gathered. The data consists of the online profiles of the residencies created on global platforms such as Trans Artists and ResArtis. These as briefly mentioned before are online platforms on which residencies can create a platform, thus being visible for applying artists and other cultural workers. Currently, the databases of the two platforms feature 2000 residencies in total. Further, open calls and yearly reports were gathered from each of the selected residencies. Open calls are public invitations which organisations release. With them, they encourage artists to apply with a project or portfolio to create something in the organisation. Yearly reports are annual documents which organisations issue in those they state what has happened in the organisation during the past year. The annual reports also feature budgets and evaluation techniques. As this research is focused on how the programmers select and host the artists in the context of globalization of the high arts, these documents, and in particular the online profiles can provide us with an insight how these institutions profile themselves to the artists. In the profiles, the mission statement and core values are featured. Further, the profiles showcase a brief description of the selection process as well as the conditions which the hosts provide for the artists during his/her stay in the residency. The yearly reports give insightful information about the way the residencies evaluate their programs in relation to funding bodies. Thus, they can give some insight into how the intangible creative process has been monitored and evaluated. For details of the profiles view the additional documents of this master thesis.

3.7 Data analysis method

For this exploratory research, the grounded theory is used as the data analysis method. As stated by Glaser and Strauss (1967) grounded theory is a method that is very suitable for exploratory research, where there is little previous research is available for the development of a deductive strategy. Further, the method assists with “the discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.2). Further, the

interviews were analysed in a hermeneutic fashion where an inductive approach was taken. The coding took place in the program Atlas.ti. As stated by Friese (2014, p.153), the software can be a valuable tool, which gathers all the thoughts and process of the researcher. Atlas.ti allowed me to keep memos, quotes, codes and code trees together, allowing me to build my coding tree coherently and efficiently.

In the tradition of the grounded theory according to Glaser & Strauss (1967), the analysis proceeded in multiple stages. Firstly, I familiarised myself with the interviews by reading each of them several times. Secondly, I marked my first thoughts with open coding, this process continued until meaningful categories emerged. During this cycle of the analysis, small codes were marked such as individual views, everyday practices, examples given by the interviewees. Thirdly, I began to merged codes which evolved into axial codes, those consisted of overarching themes which described the studied phenomenon. Fourthly, evident patterns were established, within them the developments of the perspectives of the individual programmers, then the individual perspectives were followed within the theme. In those patterns, a constant comparison was made between the interviewees' perceptions and views. The comparisons were helpful to crystallise the similarities and differences between the respondents. Then the hermeneutic process began from the beginning. This process helped me verify and study the established phenomenon again. In the end, new theoretical insights emerged. Those, however, do not come as a blank canvas but are connected to previous researchers. These will be discussed in depth in the results chapter and the discussion and conclusion section. Coding tree is available in an external appendix.

4.Results

During the analysis of the data gathered from programmers working in artistic residencies in the Netherlands recurring patterns emerged. This chapter aims to reveal the findings made during the empirical part of this study.

As expected it was quite a challenge to understand how organisations work on practical level and then analyse what intrinsic subtleties play a role in the selection and hosting practices of programmers who work in artistic residencies. During the analysis, many variations were found regarding the profiles of the studied residencies. Therefore, first, the organisational profiles of the residencies are introduced, the information presented below is retrieved from the interviews and the artistic residencies' online profiles. However, to respect the confidentiality of the interviewees no details such as location, websites and names are shared.

AiR A:

Artistic residency A is a large AiR situated in the Randstad. The residency hosts 50 artists simultaneously. Each participating artist receives a personal studio to develop his/her work. The artists are selected through an annual open call. The residency also has various workshops which the residents can use to learn a new technique and “broaden their working palette” (Interviewee 9). The programmers who are named advisors during the facilitating process advise the artists if they sign up for a personal talk. The residency also has a small research centre and a library which support the theoretical development of the artistic process. AiR A is a long-term residency which continues one year with an opportunity for the residents to extend the stay to two years. Once per year the residency is open to the public for three days during which the artists have prepared mini-exhibitions in their studios. Residency A is one of the most renowned art institutions in The Netherlands, with established reputation abroad.

AiR B:

Residency B is a large residency situated in the Randstad. The residency can host 20 participants and provide each a studio. Interviewee 6 framed AiR B as an organisation providing “a studio program”. Participating artists meet the programmers once per week to get feedback and exchange ideas. Residency B also has workshops which the residing artist can use to create new work. AiR B is also a long-term residency which continues from one to

two years. Each year the work period culminates in an exhibition during which the participants are welcoming visitors in their studios. Residency B is established internationally.

AiR C:

Residency C is situated in the North of The Netherlands. It has begun as a group of friends who have inherited a house from a dear friend who was an artist and a gallerist. The organisation is focused on selecting young talent. The residency is situated in a house in a small village in the north. The residency can host a maximum of four people. The organisation usually hosts collaborations between two artists or an artist and a theoretician. The resident is not obligated to finalise his/her research as a finished cultural product for example artwork or an exhibition. Thus, the residency is mainly used as a place for research development. Assigned programmer from the committee guides each of the selected artists. The duration of AiR C is six weeks, during his/her stay the artist needs to “open” (interviewee 2 and interviewee 7) the doors for the local public during the weekends. Occasionally the residency participates in international art fairs such as Art Rotterdam and Supermarket Art Fair in Stockholm.

AiR D:

Residency D is situated in the north of the Netherlands. The organisation runs two residencies. The first residency program ran by the organisation is a moving residency which is situated in a van. Thus, the participants get to travel in a slow van in the province of Friesland and create a project around their journey. During their travel, they are in contact with a member of the programming committee which follows their development. The travel takes a month. However, the preparation for the project takes five months prior to the travelling. The residency finishes with an exhibition which is open to visitors. The van can facilitate one artist per residency. In the results chapter the travelling residency is referred to as “the moving AiR” or “van AiR”. The second residency program which the organisation runs is very new and not in use yet, thus there is not much data on it. The whole organisation is regarded to as AiR D.

AiR E:

Residency E is situated in the Randstad. The residency can host one artist at the time. The residency is with duration two months. During their residency period, the artists are not required to produce a tangible cultural product. The residency is used mainly for artistic research purposes. During their stay the artists get assigned one programmer, however, in general, they are in touch with all programmers. The artists are required to have one public moment while being in the residency. This event can take any form example: “ice skating evening” (programmer 5) or a “record playing night” (programmer 3), the evening aims to create a possibility for the public to meet the artists and become familiar with their research and persona.

The results chapter is separated into two sections. First, I present the organisational context in which cultural programmers operate. While sometimes operating as freelancers they liaise with others in the programming committee, formed of multiple programmers. Thus, the programming committee appears to be the organisational organ in which the programmers operate.

The second section of the results chapter presents the practices of cultural programmers. These can be summarised as falling broadly into two categories the selection procedure referred to as matching and the hosting practice referred to as facilitating: the combination of which leads to specific institutional identities.

4.1. Cultural programmers and their environment

Cultural programmers are embedded in programming committees. This, on the one hand, influences their own chance to be selected as cultural programmers, because they need to fit into a specific profile requirement. The findings also show that as part of programming committees cultural programmers work in a team.

According to all respondents programming committees are the organs of the organisation which select and host the artists during their stay in the artistic residency. Programming committees are consisting of several programmers. According to my interviewees, the programming committees are “running” (interviewee 7) the residencies. They have significant responsibilities regarding the content and the profile of the institutions.

The committees are however regulated and established by the director of the artistic residency who chooses their composition. The composition takes into account the combined qualities and characteristics that the individual members of the committee need to possess. Various aspects are taken into consideration in the different AiRs. The aspects named by my respondents are the diversity of occupation (position in the art world), social capital, gender diversity and experience.

First, all participants expressed that for the committee is essential that its members have different occupations within the art world, such as artist, curators, critics, art historians. This finding relates to the findings of Kawashima (1999) who found that cultural programmers often have other occupations besides programming. My respondents shared that the diversity represents the different perspectives within the art world. Respondents 7 reflects on this choice in the following excerpt.

“I7: Amm...well I think with the division you have kind of representation of the art world. Of course, because you have on one hand the artist and on the other the facilitators and the curators, or the writer. And I think we want to represent the art world by making this choice. And artists and art historians have different skills you know...amm..artists are more kind of...they know more practical stuff about knowing art. And art historians are more skilled in reflecting more theoretical and placing the works in the context of art history. And I think this is a very valuable mix, also when we are discussing the proposals. Everyone has kind of different view on these proposals. Gives an interesting mix of perspective and opinions.” (Interviewee 7; 06:19)

Further, from the excerpt, it becomes evident that according to the programmers the artists and theoreticians participating in the committees have different strengths. Five of the cultural programmers (interviewee 9, interviewee 6, interviewee 8, interviewee1, interviewee 7) expressed that artists cope better with “uncertainty” and “potential quality” while theoreticians are better at “understanding” and “contextualising” the works of art. “Potential quality” refers to the potential that programmers see in an artist’s work, but the talent still needs to be developed (interviewee 6). Regarding the artists who participate in the committees, it is crucial that each has a different artistic expertise for example painting, installation art, performance, photography.

Second, sources of knowledge and contacts are essential at multiple scale levels. All respondents stressed that social capital is important individually for each member as well as the social capital accumulated by the programming committee as a whole.

“I8: They (the programmers) need to be from all over Holland. To have somebody also from Rotterdam and Amsterdam. Because those two cities are very divided they are two completely different networks. Amm...the girl from Amsterdam she also worked quite a long time at (name of organisation) so, yeah of course because I like the institution. I want to make a connection there. And we also have (programmer’s name) he is our first (moving AiR D) residency person (participant). So, he knows how it works and he has a big network. And he is an artist and he works not only with photography but also with installations. Yeah, he also works with an institution (name of organisation). So, it is in the area that is interesting for us...” (Interviewee 8)

From this excerpt, we can understand that the smaller residencies which seek to establish themselves on the national level compose the programming committee in a way that each member lives and has a network in a different major city/region in the Netherlands. Usually separated into North, South, Rotterdam and Amsterdam. This way the respondents explained that the artistic circles in the regions are informed about activities that take place in the AiRs. Thus, the committee members establish the reputation of the organisation on a national level by disseminating information about the organisational projects. Further, my respondents (interviewee 7, interviewee 8, interviewee 2) explained that the programmers could draw new artists and practices from the organisations in the city in which they live and suggest them for the development of the AiR programs during committee gatherings.

On the other hand, as perceived by my respondents (programmer 1, programmer 9, programmer 6), the committees in these types of residencies have a more international composition. Thus, they gather together members from major international artistic hubs such as NY, LA, Moscow, London, Hong Kong, Tokyo. Since the artists who apply to these residencies are international, the directors seek committee members who have had direct contact with the different types of artistic traditions spread around the world.

The findings regarding the importance of social networks in programming committees are relating to the scholarly work of Janssen and Verboord (2015), Kawashima (1999) and Velthuis (2013) that gatekeepers heavily rely on their social network for advice and recommendations. Moreover, according to the year applications, additional experts might be asked to join the committees with the intention that they can shed more light on what is relevant at this point in the contemporary art sector in a given art market.

“I6: Two years ago, I asked a friend who was an expert in contemporary art from the Middle East to help us. Because he knew what is going on there. So, dealing with global art is not so easy.” (Interviewee 6)

These findings are in line with Velthuis' study (2013) they suggest that there is no one united type of artistic expression within the globalized art world and that new challenges are arising before programming experts. One of them is that programmers are faced with judging and selecting artists working in artistic traditions different from the local cultural affinities. Further, they point to the need of local knowledge and networks to tap into networks elsewhere in order to have sound judgments of foreign art.

Third, in one of the AiRs researched in this study (AiR D), the gender diversity appeared to be a variable considered during the process of composing a programming committee. According to the respondent, it is crucial that at least half of the committee be female because this way there is a more significant chance for female artists to be selected for participation. This is well illustrated by interviewee 8:

“I8: Well in the commission there are few ground rules. It has to be ...amm. 50% male and 50% female. Because I am critical towards myself for that. We don't program enough women, and that is a problem everywhere. So, somehow women are invisible in the art world. Female artists are quite invisible, I need to have women in my commission, so they will hopefully bring more female art names. That is one part. So, in the art world, before you know it everything is with men. The organisation are female, and the artists are men. (laugh) So, the bosses are men, and the artist is a man and everything in between are women. So, to balance in my commission has to be 50/50.” (24:58; Interviewee 8)

The above quote suggests that due to male domination in the art world, the committee is structured in a way to prevent the exclusion of female artists. Thus, as perceived by interviewee 8, female programmers will advocate the right of female artists to be selected, therefore achieve gender equality amongst the overall selection of artists in the residency.

Fourth, the experience is a quality that is taken into consideration for the composing of the committees. In some smaller artistic residencies, the value of talent development spills over from the selected artists to the programming committee. Thus, inexperienced artists and theoreticians are selected as committee members with the aim of giving the possibility to young cultural actors to develop themselves in a new sphere. In the larger residencies (AiR A, AiR B), the opposite is essential. The committee members need to have a solid place in the art market. The committee members must “feed” (interviewee 6) themselves by selling their artworks, and the theoreticians need to be full-time critics or curators. Their position in the committee must be perceived not as a job, but as a pleasure and privilege that is not related to financial incentives.

In sum, cultural programmers are themselves the result of selection based on criteria

of internationality, skills, gender equality, social network. By virtue of having been selected to be part of a programming committee, they themselves contribute to the identity of the organisations.

4.2 Practices

The programmers' practices can be separated into two main branches: matching and facilitating. Matching refers to the selection process occurring in the artistic residencies while facilitating is a term explaining the supporting role of the programmers during the artists' participation in the residency programs. The two roles differ considerably because during the matching process the programmers need to judge the submissions sent by the artists. However, once the artists have been accepted and welcomed in the residencies, the programmers need to shift their role into supporting the artists by adopting a nonjudgmental attitude.

4.2.1 Matching

All interviewees referred to the selection process in the artistic residencies as “matching”. The interviewees explain matching as “finding the artists and proposals which correspond to the values and program of the residency” (Interviewee 2). The process of matching the applying artists to the residencies is a long and detailed one. During the matching process, the artists interested in participating in a residency submit their portfolios and projects. The submissions are accepted in two different methods: open calls and only by invitation. During open call matching procedure, artistic residencies place an open invitation once per year asking artists to submit portfolio or project proposal. Usually, open calls are open to all artists. Four of the residencies researched in this study are using this method. Those are residency A, B, C, E. Only by invitation strategy is a matching strategy during which only invited artists can submit proposals for participation. Thus, programmers seek potential artists and ask them to submit a proposal which is then judged by the programming committee. This matching practice is used by one of the residencies researched in the current study, namely AiR D.

In the following section more will be revealed about these two practices and the consequences they bring for programmers.

4.2.1.1. Matching as a collective act

The data shows that even though programmers might seek artists themselves, in all of the participating residencies the final decisions about who would be selected is made during committee meetings. Thus, the matching process can be seen not so much as a result of personal artistic preference, but as a “collective action”. The quote below well demonstrates this:

“I6: (During the matching) ... you really rethink your own programme, your own criteria, your own ideas about art. And that is really refreshing and also to do this (the matching) in a constant dialogue with your colleagues (other programmers), this is really nice. This (matching) is an interesting procedure, and it brings other questions which are beyond the individual capacity, and potential.”
(Interviewee 6)

The findings of Kawashima (1999) regarding programming in British cultural centres also describe the selection practice of programmers as a collective action. As explained by Kawashima (1999) we can see the process of matching through the lens of Becker (1982). He proposes the idea that art is never made by one individual, it is instead the result of collaboration between an artist and his/her “support personnel”, for example, the artists’ dealers, mentors. In the case of artistic residencies, the process of selection is not the product of an individual’s opinion or artistic preference. It is the result of group negotiations amongst cultural programmers based on common “conventions” (Becker 1982). The matching process always occurs in a conversation between the members of the programming committee, where the committee members’ interaction with one another is a key. From the following excerpt we receive an impression of the interactions between programmers during the matching process in AiR C:

“I2: ..we were people that are very different from each other. IN TERMS OF taste. SO, what was important in the conversation is that we would never leave a table without all of us being agreeing on something. So, yeah..some cases the proposals we all liked it in other cases not. So, there was a moment of..you had to convince the other person..but It was a moment of negotiation in which you had to put on all the reasons why..you think that application was successful and the other person would do the same..but then say why it was not. One thing that saved us always was the idea that we were not doing it ourselves only as the person but for (AiR C) so somehow these ongoing conversations have shaped the identity of (AiR C). So, the questions we asked were: "Is this a (AiR C) project?" "Can this be a (AiR C) project?" (Interviewee 2; 2:03:35)

From this quote, we understand that programmers often have disagreements about the quality of the applicants and they use multiple strategies to overcome taste differences and arrive on a coherent decision about the final selection of artists. First, programmers agree to not close a meeting without reaching consensus. This rule forces them to make a choice. Second, they negotiate with each other their reasons why an applicant should be accepted until the other colleagues are convinced of a decision. Third, to overcome taste differences, programmers think of the applications through the identity of the organisation: “Is this AiR C project?” (Interviewee 2). Thus, the programmers take on the identity of the organisation to neutralise the differences in taste and simultaneously shape what the organisations stand for.

The disagreement could also be a tool for understanding the core of applicants’ qualities and revealing new possibilities for organisational developments and adaptation. This is well illustrated by the quote below:

“I6: I think it is good that they (programmers) disagree with each other, basically the disagreement is the most important thing in order to develop something in art. If everybody agrees then we might as well also go home... Because I do like to have a fight between them (the programmers) and the applicant. But otherwise, it is just sleepy (LAUGH) (LAUGH) booooring let's go home. So, disagreement is important and also..well disagreement is also only interesting if people have interesting ideas...you constantly think of ..look at are we missing out, more and more people are working with digital techniques should we adapt now?” (Interviewee 6)

From this excerpt, it becomes evident that programmer 6 finds disagreement to be “the most important” ingredient for progress in art. Interviewee 6 utilises the disagreements amongst the programmers in several ways. First, to test the applicant’s ability to stand behind his/her work. Second, to understand what value lays in new opportunities and developments such as “digital techniques” which could be implemented in the organisational practices.

4.2.1.2. Matching to values

In their work cultural programmers also match their practices to what they perceive as being core values of their residency. Those values need to be uphold and reproduced in the selection process of the artists.

Through the interviews and the additional data gathered from TansArtists and ResArtis, the core values of the residencies were researched. The findings show that even

though there are differences in the sizes of the organisations, there were many similarities in what are the core intentions of the organisations concerning the artists.

First, all interviewees stressed that “experimentation” is one of the main values they strive to support. Experimentation was defined with the idea that the artists are willing to use the time in the residencies to take new courses in their working and contextualising artistic practices. From the interviews, it became clear that practically this value was implemented by selecting artists who have clearly stated this in their proposals and applications. For example, programmer 7 states how she considers a match to experimentation:

“The artist needs to have a good idea about what she/he wants to do, but there still needs to be a room for development once you are there.” (Interviewee 7)

“Freedom” was another value which the programmers stressed as important to their practices. “Freedom” refers to the financial support which artists receive during their participation. Moreover, for 6 of the programmers (Interviewee 7, interviewee 2, interviewee 5, interviewee 4, interviewee 3, interviewee 8) this value is strongly connected to the value of experimentation because it also refers to lifting the obligations from artists to produce final artwork or shows. In the statement from residency (AiR E), (AiR C) and (AiR D) we can read that: “residents are not obliged to produce a fixed artwork” (AiR D) and “opportunity to research not focused on a final product or exhibition” (AiR E).

Thirdly, “talent development” was stated as a core value by all my interviewees. In general, this value was referred to as the artistic progression in one’s development. Thus, in general, talent development was perceived as giving artists the tools to develop further their practices. During the analysis of the interviews, different nuances in the perception of talent development were detected. Practically this value is exercised by 6 of my interviewees (interviewee 2, interviewee 7, interviewee 6, interviewee 9, interviewee 8, interviewee 1) as the selection of younger artists (25 – 35) who are not yet established and have room for development. The quote below illustrates how interviewee 6 thought about talent development.

“We are there to learn young artist how to mature. And how to realize the fullness of their potentials as an artist.” (Interviewee 6)

On the other hand, interviewees (5, 4, 3) referred to talent development as the diversification of the art sector in The Netherlands. They practically implement this value by focusing their efforts to select unknown artists and international artists, thus diversify the artistic field in the country. As suggested by the following quote, talent development was clearly stated in all

documents retrieved from TransArtists and ResArtis. For example, this is visible in the profile of AiR A:

“Residency A in Randstad focuses on developing talent in the fine arts. We select and facilitate top talent and offer selected artists a platform for further development of their work.” (Online profile, AiR A).

Further, the data showed that talent development has a second dimension which refers to the artists being ready to be developed. This dimension of talent development was named “urgency” or “timing” (interviewee 1) and seemed to be very important for all the programmers. This value refers to the momentum in which the artists apply. Urgency is “Is this the right time for these artists to be here?” (interviewee 1, interviewee 6, interviewee 9, interviewee 7, interviewee 8). According to my interviewees if the artists are too immature they would not be accepted, if he/she is too developed or prosperous, they do not need a residency. Urgency is not listed on the websites of Trans Artists or ResArtis.

Lastly, “Internationality” was expressed as a value by nine of my interviewees, besides one (interviewee 2). Internationality means having international artists present in the organisation as residents. This value is the most crucial for the current research as it studies how residencies deal with artists in the context of globalization of the high arts. Contrary to the interviews and to previous research done on residencies (Matias, 2016; Menger 1999; Magkou 2012; Staines, 2012; Grabski 2011; D’Andrea 2006; Bernava & Bertacchini, 2016; Styhre & Eriksson, 2008; Laaksonen, 2016) in the retrieved documents from Trans Artists and ResArtis only 2 (AiR A, AiR B) of the residencies stress internationality as significant value. Other two residencies (AiR C, AiR D) state that there are accepting foreign artists. Never the less, the website of residency D is in Dutch, which might be a problem for foreign artists (defined as non-Dutch artists living outside The Netherlands) to understand. Moreover, in AiR C unlike local, the foreign artists need to pay a fee of 1500 euros for participation, this can be an obstacle for the foreign applicants.

In sum, we can say that through the lens of Albert and Whetten (1985) and Whetten (2006) almost all values presented above are central and continues. This was confirmed because new and old members of the organisations had a matching perspective and understanding of the values listed above. Excluding internationality, there is a consistency between how the interviewees perceived the core values of their organisations and how those were presented in the additional textual data. However, we can conclude that there is a discrepancy between how the interviewees talked about welcoming international artists at first and what has been stated in the documents. Thus, the interviewees do value

internationality, but they do not uphold it in their selection due to pragmatic and cultural affinity reasons.

These findings also relate to the study of Negus (2002). The scholar proposes that intermediaries are shaping values of organisations and make them match the values of possible audiences. From the data, it is evident that indeed cultural programmers are shaping the values residencies stand for. However, they are not a connector to an audience instead they are a connector between the organisations and the applying creatives.

4.2.1.3. Matching to local rules and regulations

When selecting artists to join the program cultural programmers need to consider the local rules and regulations. According to all my interviewees, the AiR programs are predominantly supported by Dutch governmental subsidies. This makes the Dutch government an essential stakeholder of residency programs in The Netherlands.

“19: ...Half of the population of the artists should know the Netherlands...Either by being Dutch or by having lived there for several years. And the reason for that is several reasons again. One very political: the state was paying nearly everything. So, they should have at least 50 percent stake.” (Interviewee 9; 30:40)

Thus, as explained by my interviewees due to the finances received from local authorities the residencies need to reserve from 50% to up to 80% (in smaller residencies) of their program to local artists. Until now residencies have been primarily seen as artistic programs meant for nomadic artists (Matias, 2016; Menger, 1999; Magkou, 2012; Staines, 2012; Grabski 2011; D’Andrea 2006; Bernava & Bertacchini, 2016; Styhre & Eriksson, 2008; Laaksonen, 2016). However, this practical rule which programmers need to follow reveals that in these organisations there is a “home bias” (Velthuis, 2013). Therefore, Dutch artistic residencies need to be considered as talent development institutions, rather than as institutions meant for facilitating nomadic artists. The presence of this home bias relates to the findings of Velthuis (2013). The explanation of Velthuis (2013) has been based on the work of Powell and DiMaggio (1983, p. 67). The selection of predominately local artists can be explained with “coercive isomorphism”. “Coercive isomorphism results from both formal and informal pressure exerted on organisations by other organisations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organisations function” (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p.67). Thus, in the case of artistic residencies in the Netherlands the

expectations which the government puts directly (the funding conditions) and indirectly on artistic residencies pressures the organisations to reserve a certain number of participation places for local artists. These findings also match the results of Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) according to whom such dependencies are common among arts organisations with the aim to receive sufficient amount of funding to survive. This practical rule which programmers need to incorporate in their matching process has an undeniable impact on the international ambitions of the programmers and the institutions they work in.

4.2.1.4. Matching and variations in internationality

During the analysis, it became evident that the respondents perceived internationality in the context of the Netherlands in several ways. In other words, there is an apparent variation in what counts as international in the residencies. While some (programmer 8, programmer 7, programmer 2) consider foreign artists based long-term in The Netherlands as international others (programmer 1, programmer 3, programmer 4, programmer 5, programmer 9) consider them local – pointing to the subjectivity in the perception of internationality as a feature of the Netherlands.

The view programmers have on the internationality of artists spills over to their perception of the artistic climate in the Netherlands as a whole. The ones who view the foreign artists residing in the Netherlands as international, perceive the overall artistic climate in the country as international, while others view the artistic climate in the Netherlands as “closed circulation of names.” This contrast is well illustrated in the two quotes below:

“I2: IN THE NETHERLANDS...TOO there is a dutch and non-dutch art circle a! So, Dutch and international circle..because don't forget still that the benefit all of...The Netherlands is that it attracts a lot of foreign artists. And that is a benefit because..it brings a lot more ongoing confrontation of different people and culture...and that is the beauty of this..and that is what we did..that in terms of strengthening on an international level.” (Interviewee 2)

“I4: We started very early...and we started inviting from the very beginning artists that you would not come across first the Hague and then in The Netherlands. Not because we have a special preference to a foreign artist, but because one of our preferences was to bring artists that indeed don't have exposure in The Netherlands...that we see as somewhat circular. For example in The Netherlands you keep on seeing you know every year..there is annual wave..there is a circulation of artists.” (Interviewee 4)

From these excerpts, we can read that the understandings that programmers hold towards the climate in the Netherlands shape the goals of the residency. For example, programmer 2 strives to invite the international artists living in The Netherlands, while programmer 4 wants to diversify the Dutch artistic climate by introducing unknown artists. Further, their perception points them towards the kind of artists the programmers are likely to match with the artistic residency. Moreover, the programmers utilise their views to achieve other goals. For example, programmer 2 frames the artistic field in The Netherlands as international, which gives her organisation the status and reputation of an international institution, even though the participating artists are predominately based in The Netherlands.

This finding relates to the research of Gioia (et al. 2000) and Albert and Whetten (1985) and Whetten (2006). According to their research on organisational identity, the perceptions and beliefs of the members of an organisation have a crucial influence on the planned actions of the organisation and subsequently on the identity of the organisation. In the case of the current research, the perception of the studied programmers on the cultural climate in The Netherlands and their interpretation of internationality influence the matching process.

4.2.1.5. Matching the population of artists

From the data, it became evident that cultural programmers working in larger residencies also need to match with one another the participating artists. The sum of residing artists was named “a population” (Interviewee 9).

It was previously established that during the matching process the government sets local rules which obligate the residencies to reserve a high percentage of their annual selection to local artists. Besides this being the wish of the government, the programmers (respondent 1, respondent 6, respondent 9) looked on the bright side of their restrictions and expressed that this is also a strategy they use to settle in the international artists and to keep the residency of becoming entirely “an isolated community” (Interviewee 9).

“I9: If you have forty people and only three from the Netherlands, everyone comes from outside to this moon ship which is hovering above the city, it is disconnected. So, only by having already half of the population who have their own friends, their history in the city, who have their family, etc. And it gets a bit normal. They go at the end of the day they go out of the cloister. They (the international artists) stay in the cloister...But anyhow there is a quite a big part of the population who has a normal life and not cloister life. So, it doesn't get to be an isolated community.” (Interviewee 9)

To clarify the quote above the programmer shares that the Dutch artists have practical reasons to leave the residency such as family and friends, which makes their lives much more normal than the life of their international colleagues living the residency. The local artists are integrating the newcomers into their own life. Thus, the locals are helping the international artists to adapt. Further, even though in residencies there is a certain amount of work facilities and sometimes materials, often the artists need to find things outside of the residency, locals can guide the international artists. This is a very practical reason, why the presence of locals ground the international artists. The second reason is that the mix between local and international artists gives new meaning to values, symbols and beliefs. For example, Interviewee 9 shared that an Iranian artist was painting tulips, Dutch artists were curious “why is she so obsessed with “Dutch” tulips. The Iranian artists shared that tulips are a national flower in Iran and are part of their folklore.” Thus, the programmer observed that the mix between Dutch and international artists creates new meanings of symbols, values and beliefs.

From the data, it became evident that according to the interviewed programmers the Dutch artists from the population also benefit from the presence of their foreign colleagues. The following quote from interviewee 6 illustrates this well:

“I6: To be honest, there will be no Dutch artists in (AiR name) if we only go for the Best. They (locals) are outnumbered by very good applications from the USA, England, Germany, France, Spain. As we are funded partly by the state. We see it as our own responsibility to do something structural for the Dutch art community.. We are not the Hilton of art education where people fly in and out. So, we want to do something because the Dutch artists benefit from working in a building with the foreign artists. Sometimes more often they are better (the foreign artists) and more motivated, initiative and entrepreneurial. And you see the Dutch artist kind of clinging on to this. And then the Dutch artists cling on to that and they are lifted upwards, and that works very well.” (Interviewee 6)

From the excerpt above it becomes clear that Dutch artists gain from the presence their foreign colleagues in several ways: learn to be more initiative, more entrepreneurial and more motivated, meet and work with artists who possess higher artistic qualities than theirs. Which as perceived by programmer 6 elevates the local artists in artistic and business sense.

During the matching process the programmers think of the qualities each artist has and how are those going to impact, contribute the “population” as a whole. International artists gain from local artists because they help them to integrate into the unfamiliar environment, while foreign artists, especially from Western countries, elevate the artistic quality and business spirit of their Dutch counterparts.

4.2.1.6. Matching non-western artists

The primary way international artists are drawn in artistic residencies is through the matching method of the open call. According to my interviewees (programmer 1, programmer 2, programmer 3, programmer 4, programmer 5, programmer 6, programmer 7, programmer 9), the open calls help them to stay updated with global trends especially when they are open to international artists. The programmers receive a snapshot of the international art world. According to the interviews, programmers working in bigger residencies view around 20 000 artworks during the matching process, while programmers working in smaller residencies view around 500 – 700 artworks. This process provides them with an overview of the production made by artists for the last 3 years, and at the same time, programmers do not spend time on externally seeking for this selection. The open calls are considered by four (interviewee 6, interviewee 9, interviewee 7, interviewee 4) of my interviewees as a strategy to be up to date with the tendencies in the contemporary art. Some of the bigger residencies have the budget and network to create an international support system and engage in work relationships with foreign embassies and governments which are crucial for the financing of the travel and stay for artists from third world countries. Internationalisation is a very important aspect for larger renowned residencies (interviewee 6, interviewee 9). As explained by interviewee 9 the process of “internationalisation” (interviewee 9) refers to the inclusion of international and specifically non-Western artists as participants in the residencies.

Having said that, the respondents outlined evident aspects which guide the matching process of non-Western foreign artists. The following quote illustrates how interviewee 9 matches non-Western artists:

“I9: If you have longer history tradition. If the materials you work with are much more defined by your local culture. If you can survive a little bit as an artist on a small scale don't come to us. Because you are so strongly embedded in your situation and If you want to cooperate then we should come to you instead of you coming to us. Because this is your basic point of departure and you wouldn't function if you go to another place... IF you are connected to place, to your own social, political, religious culture but you want to try to formulate your personal standpoint then come to us. Because perhaps it is not so visible in your own case but we all do this. There is no difference between East and West, North and South. We all try to define our own position relating to society, art world. There we are all equal.” (Interviewee 9)

In the excerpt above we read that interviewee 9 does not encourage non-Western artists to apply to the residency if they are too dependent on their local environment. Nevertheless, he

believes in a universal language of art in the sense that all artist “try to define” their position towards society. Thus, this is for him a meeting point between all artists and a goal which in its core is universal for all contemporary artists. However, the idea of trying to define your position in society in a highly individualistic process in a studio environment is a Western concept, and it might not fit artists who are accustomed to a different way of the artistic process (Belthing, 2009). Thus, as expressed above, for artists who create art in a collective approach the experience of being in a residency which provides a studio program might not be beneficial. Contrary, interviewee 6 is convinced that there is no universal art language, he believes that the art world is separated into core-periphery or as explained by him “dominant art world and suppressed art culture.”

“I6: What we should be cautious of is to say art is universal everybody can tap in. I don't believe in that..to plug into..there is nothing to plug into what art is, is what we define ourselves to be you know of any value. And that can be somebody from New Delhi and somebody from Kinshasa or Utrecht. But it is not universal. I have big doubts about the idea of universal language in art. There is a dominant art world and suppressed art culture. Am...and that is a tension field...and that is...yeah” (Interviewee 6)

Further, the interviewee expressed that there are cultural differences which are “hard” to tackle when it comes to participants from non-Western regions.

“I6: And amm you create networks that continue long after the two years at (AiR A). The other question is how to deal with globalization? It is hard to...you have to deal with cultural differences. For example, we have experienced that artists from India which you have in the program were not so accustomed to the fact that they were self-responsible for their own good, practice. And they will sit and wait till you tell them to do something. So, they were much less used to the self-motivated practice of Europeans. Also, they are much more used to doing things together than doing a thing on their own, and their own studio.” (Interviewee 6)

From these excerpts, we can see that even though artistic residencies are spaces for freedom and development they have been created in a specific tradition. They are referring to the vision of an artist formed during the periods of Enlightenment and the Romanticism, where the figure of an artist is perceived as the thinker and genius who have to work on their self-development in isolation and as an individual (Belting, 2009). According to programmer 9 non-Western artists who are too dependent on their environment should not apply for a residency because it will not be beneficial for them. Interviewee 6 stress that the artists coming from non-Western tradition are not “accustomed” to work individually and in a studio. Even though based on personal experience this is a judgmental and biased mindset of perceiving non-Western artists, which is based on the perceived cultural differences between

programmers and the applying non-Western artists. The interviewed participants who work in bigger residencies view the non-Western participants through the lens of the cultural affinities model (Hannerz, 1992). In a nutshell, this model claims that contemporary art created in non-Western countries will not be selected, sold and exhibited very well in the West due to the cultural differences between locations. In the case of artistic residencies in The Netherlands, we see that the cultural differences which lay in the perception of the programmers create a boundary for non-Western artists to be selected. The programmers mentioned the countries from which artists have been most selected for residencies and are pleased with the quality of the works such as USA, France, England, Germany, Spain, Italy. In these countries, the concept of a residency has been present for centuries, and thus, artists coming from these countries are very familiar with the concept of what is a residency (Matias, 2016). For programmers, it is essential that the artists understand the notion of artistic residence, because the artists need to use their time in the institution in the best way possible for their development. This often entails that artist should be able to spend a considerable part of their time on their own, working independently on projects.

4.2.1.7. Matching within a programmer's network

One of the five artistic residencies (AiR D) studied in the current research selects artists via “only by invitation method”. Explainable from its name during this process, not the artists approach the programmers, but the programmers seek the suitable artists for the residencies and ask them to write a proposal. Interviewee 8 who is a programmer and the director explained the motives behind this decision with her disappointment in the low quality of applications during an open call process.

“I8: But yeah, it is quite bad what you get, mostly 80% of the applications is just completely shit (laugh). I mean you see things you cannot imagine...I mean it is beyond. So, it takes a lot of time and energy and it is never a very good result. And I think that with the (the residency situated in a van) because a lot of people want to do it we will get a lot of applications. And yeah, of course, they are angry that they are not chosen, and I have to email more so no...” (Interviewee 8.)

Thus, by selecting the artists themselves, the committee saves a lot of time, energy and funding which they can use in other aspects of the organisations. The small percentage of high-quality applications was supported by interviewee 4 and interviewee 3 according to

them “only 10 to 15 percent of the applications were worth considering.” This statement is valid for both international and Dutch artists.

Central questions for the programmers working at residencies which use the only by invitation matching method are "What artists do you know?", "Who do you wanna work with?" (Interviewee 7). From these statements, we can understand that with the by invitation only method the artistic desires of the programmers are at the centre of the program. Thus, the “by invitation matching process” gives the possibility to programmers to develop their craft in an environment sculpted by them. Moreover, programmers have more control in the shaping of the organisational identity.

This search process, however, brings consequences for the programmers. The programmers need to be resourceful with supplying proposals and relevant artists names themselves, instead of being automatically sent proposals and names during the open call matching process. Thus, the programmers working in such residencies need to be aware of the current developments in the contemporary art. This might seem like a standard requirement for the position of a programmer, however six of my interviewees (interviewee 7, interviewee 2, interviewee 8, interviewee 4, interviewee 3, interviewee 5) found it challenging to keep up with all the new developments and exhibition openings in the contemporary art in The Netherlands and abroad. The reasons given by the interviewees were lack of funding for travels (interviewee 2, interviewee 7, interviewee 5), lack of time due to part-time job (interviewee 5, interviewee 7, interviewee 8) and the amount of administrative responsibilities relating to running an organisation (interviewee 8, interviewee 4, interviewee 3).

To resolve this issue programmers who have developed a strategy to rely on their social network for recommendations. In the following quote programmer 8 reflects on how she finds relevant recommendations:

“I8: Well, of course, I work with a lot of people...Amm so during work I talk to them. Some people became my friends and I also drink beer with them.” (Interviewee 8; 16:20)

Searching recommendations and new artists as explained by cultural programmer 8 happens in mostly unofficial ways through friends and other programmers, and it is based on a word to mouth communication. Especially for programmers working in more isolated residencies, this means that they rely on local friends and cultural workers for advice. The recommendations thus point towards local museums, studios and recent graduates from art academies. This finding relates to the research of Velthuis (2013) on the “home bias” found in galleries in

Amsterdam and Berlin. In his study, he describes that the search process of young dealers from these regions is similar to the search process described above. He describes the phenomena of local cultural workers and artists recommending artists from their network as who is “most likely to be local” as “path dependent effect” (Velthuis, 2013, p.298). According to which “even if non-Western artists are speaking the global language of art they may remain out of the rather” of gallerists. Therefore, this searching process presents a barrier for artists living and working outside of The Netherlands, and especially outside of Europe to be selected for a residency when programmers adopt the “only by invitation” method.

Kawashima (1999) has also found that due to the burden of multiple tasks and lack of time programmers in Britain rely on their social network for finding artists for their programme, which results in the selection of well-known local artists instead of foreign artists.

4.2.2 Facilitating

The interviewed programmers described their hosting practices in the residencies as facilitating and their role for the duration of the hosting practices as a facilitator. As briefly mentioned before, the process of facilitation refers to the supporting role programmers take on during the time artists reside in artistic residencies. Facilitating is a term first established by Janwillem Schrofer who has taken the role of transformational leader for Rijksakademie in Amsterdam in the 80’s. In the manuscript of his recent work “Transformation and Innovation” expected in 2018 we find the full definition of facilitating:

“In case of facilitating of personal development (as in artist-in-residence programmes) the focus is on the artists. They receive resources directly and are responsible for “what, why and when” of their residency. This requires flexible employees who can deal with uncertainty, are empathic and can improvise autonomously within a flexible, amoeba-like organisation that has no overarching institutional profile, leadership that welcomes multiple inputs and frictions and has no need to be in the spotlight” (p.2)

Facilitating can have multiple components. On the one hand, the programmers help the artists with their artistic practices by observing the process and help them with whatever is necessary regarding their artistic work. On the other hand, programmers take care for practical difficulties that the artists have, such as not being able to find the shop, registering

in the city hall if necessary. Further, the facilitators need to understand the emotional wellbeing of their artists especially in longer residencies, because as stated by interviewee 1 shared: “this can have crucial influences on their work.” She described her role as a temporary “psychologist”. For the programmers, it was difficult to describe what precisely were their tasks during the facilitation process because according to all of them it happened “organically” (interviewee 5, interviewee 7). Nevertheless, in the following section, the study will outline the central patterns found regarding the facilitating practices in artistic residencies.

4.2.2.1 Facilitating as an alternative to curating

During the interviews the respondents explained their role as facilitators. Many did so, by giving facilitating as an alternative to curatorship. Seven of the interviewees (interviewee 3, interviewee 4, interviewee 5; four of which had a curatorial background: interviewee 7, interviewee 2, interviewee 6, interviewee 1) perceived the curator as a cultural worker who like them works in close proximity with the artists during their creative process.

Nevertheless, the process of facilitating was differentiated from curating in several ways. First, the programmers expressed that they work together on “equal” (interviewee 5) level with the artists, which they thought it was not always the case when a curator works with an artist. The facilitation process was seen as “collaboration” (interviewee 2) between an artist and the programmer, while the curating was seen as “appropriating” (interviewee 2) the artistic work.

“I2: If I were to have a different attitude as a person you would not be able to work with an artist the way I work. If you have an ego..I am a strong person I am..But my ego is an ego that is already open for involving an listening...to the others..artists and ...my ego is inclusive..that is the s starting point..without that you are the curator but in a different way..like amm..Artists feel you as a competitor if you are such curator, as someone who wants to appropriate...what they do..and put their name on it..So, I am a person..who is like my name is there or not it is ok..I am in the credits and that is more than enough..I am just happy that I helped you..” (Interviewee 2)

The quote above illustrates well that for the cultural programmers is crucial that they do not seek to be in the spotlight. This way the relationship developed between an artist and the programmer can be free of tension regarding who is the author of the work. The lack of tension was seen as beneficial for the development of the artist and as productive atmosphere during the residency. This finding relates to the definition of facilitating presented by

Janwillem Schrofer (2018), because from the data it is evident as a facilitator you need to be willing to nourish the success of others without seeking direct public confirmation about your role in the process. We can theoretically connect these findings to the study of Janssen and Verboord (2015) according to whom the gatekeepers such as the cultural programmers do not seek recognition for their feedback, because they want the "charismatic ideology" (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980, p.262) to remain. This idea refers to the art, and creativity being the outcome of a genius individual. By employing this strategy, they are strengthening the symbolic power of the artists (Janssen & Verboord, 2015; Bourdieu & Nice, 1980).

Further, the programmers expressed that they do not create overarching narratives in which to fit the artists, something they saw as oppositional to the practice of curators.

"I1: Of course..Well, you don't want to be this big show,..you know like when they come and there is this BIG text, big theme. But yes, we do have a short intro by the director that is always there, a forward. But that is very general..and since there is no curatorial idea behind it...it is you just show what we got. You introduce the artist the best way possible." (Interviewee 1; 1:08:22)

"I3:...I think that is our profile and very much thinking from our artistic practice, so, there is not so much curatorial exhibitions here at most decisions are made from the intent of the artistic practice that we invite...I4: I think there is enough material to if you try to give the space to the artist to develop with the necessary concentration on his practice without trying to smear to redescribe what he does under another light. Because you know otherwise you get this..you know you might get the possibility to produce something..but ..you are not really going to the core of what this artist does and what it is how..really an exhibition or an art piece works." (interviewee 3 & interviewee 4)

The excerpt above illustrates that overarching themes were perceived by four of the interviewees (interviewee 6, interviewee 5, interviewee 4, interviewee 3, interviewee 8) as a distraction for the artists to focus on their process. Further, they were perceived as obstacles for the artist to find the "core" of his practice. The themes were seen as global "hypes" (interviewee 6) used as a method by organisations and curators to "explain" (interviewee 4) better what their practice is to audiences and funds.

Concerning globalization of the high arts, this means that the facilitators, unlike curators give the chance and the space to artists to develop their practices outside the emergence of global themes such as Anthropocene, Diaspora, Feminism, Decolonization. Programmers intentionally ignore these global themes and frame the activities happening in the residencies through the artists' own practice. The identity of the organisation is thus, developed outside the global themes that are emerging in the art world. We can interpret this

strategy of the programmers as a mechanism to go their own way instead of following current trends.

4.2.2.2 Facilitating and relationships to the art market

In the following section will be presented the findings which relate to how the programmers deal with the relationship between the artist and the art market.

During the facilitating process, all programmers (interviewee 1, interviewee 6, interviewee 9) working in large established residencies stressed that they aim to shelter the artists from the art market. First, the residencies provide the financial security for artists. Therefore, artists do not need to involve the opinion of buyers or audience as a variable when creating their work. Second, they focus on the artistic aspects of developing work, not on the monetary value of the works created by the artists. This is well illustrated in the following quote from Interviewee 6:

“I6: We just want to sit here in the studios as artist talking about art. This way you try to learn and help our participants, how do you grow and play and how do you learn to play. What kind of artist do you want to be? What kind of art would you like to make?” (Interviewee 6)

The third component is that the programmers do not allow external actors such as collectors, gallerists and journalists to visit the artists’ studios during the facilitation process. Here the programmers exercise a gatekeeping role which is crucial for the identity of the residencies in relation to globalization. Cultural programmer 6 shared that he wants to keep the “MEDIA and The MARKET and HYPE out of here”, This statement relates to the perception of interviewee 9. He compared the AiR A to “the eye of a hurricane” meaning that the residency is in the middle of the art market, but it is “silent” and calm. In the following interviewee 9 is providing us with an example how he is protecting the artists:

“I9: The DOOR which is ONLY opened by the artists themselves during the year. And you cannot come in. Sometimes I got a telephone from someone he said: " I fly from NY to Moscow, and I would like to stop in Amsterdam and visit a studio." And that would be quite a well-known person. And I would ask: "Do you know someone here?" They answer: "NO." I say: "Well, so you can't enter." Only if you knew someone. I continue: "If YOU want to be here, you can be here at the open studios for this three, four, five days.” (Interviewee 9)

In this excerpt, the programmer refuses to host the interested actor. Gatekeepers’ role of protector is also outlined in the study of Janssen and Verboord (2015). These findings add to

the various dimensions in which gatekeepers, in this case, cultural programmers can shelter and support the artists. Further, from the quote above, we read that interviewee 9 guides the interest of the actor towards the “public moment” of the residency. We can interpret the denial of access to people participating in the global art market as a strategy of the programmers to create even bigger interest amongst important actors during the days when the institute is open, at the same time the artists are protected from unwanted outside influence during their participation in the residency. The effort which programmers put into sheltering the artists and yet remaining in warm contacts with art market was compared to “choreography” (Interviewee 9). We can interpret this strategy as a way for the programmers to remain in control of the process which happens in the residency, especially in big residencies where there are 50 participants, it might be hard to keep track of the process of all the participants. At the same time, the programmers try to keep the core of the residencies which is about artistic talent development and self-reflection, thus very much related to the idea of the artists working in somewhat isolated space from the art market. The idea of arts for art sake is oppositional to monetary values assigned to art. Thus, if too many influences from the art market are allowed into the residency, the programmers risk losing the status of an organisation focused on the artistic development.

Regarding the organisational identity, we can see that the programmers do not want to compromise the core of the identity which is artistic development and experimentation. Never the less they try to remain connected to the international art market in order to declare their position as a player on an international level. We can see this for instance in the 2010 publication “Global contemporary artists for artists” which the Rijksakademie co-published with Sotheby’s: an influential international auction house. The Rijksakademie and Sotheby created an auction with alumni from the residency. With the gathered funds the Rijksakademie established a fund which supports the work budgets of the current artists.

The search for balance between those two values is also evident in the annual reports which were used as additional sources. There we see that the evaluation of the success of the residencies is measured by the participation of their alumni in the art market: for example, the participation of alumni in Biennial, MoMA, Documenta. Thus, we can see that in the identity of artistic residencies there is a tension between remaining focused on the development process of artworks which are very intangible and hard to describe and the evaluation of the impact and the success of this processes, which is ultimately proved by the participation of alumni in international high-profile contemporary art events.

On the other hand, smaller residencies try to make a bridge between the artistic

development of the artist and the international art market. In line with the previous section, programmers grant space to the artists. Thus, this process occurs only if initiated by the artist himself or herself. Both AiR C and AiR D have participated in the experimental section of Art Rotterdam, which is an international art fair situated in Rotterdam. They have also taken part in other fairs focusing on small artistic spaces like Supermarket fair based in Stockholm. The participation of the residencies in these platforms was initiated by the artists themselves or strictly coordinated with their personal development and their personal wish to exhibit on such occasion. This is well illustrated by the quote below:

“I8: Well...we were invited to go to Art Rotterdam and the artist mainly wanted it. So, for us, if the artist really wants to do it than we will do it...Otherwise, what is the point?” (Interviewee 8; 59:34)

Even though the residencies did not initiate their participation in the art fairs, cultural programmer 8 shared that taking part in Art Rotterdam, had a positive impact on their organisation.

“I8: Well that we got an invitation and that we were selected. So, for us it was really quite...it did a lot for the organisation. Because we could finally see to...speak to the people and to the funds who never go to Friesland. So, yeah we met a lot of people. But just being there and taking a place on a national level, that we can. So, for me, it was like we are now on a second level.” (interviewee 8; 1:00:44)

From this excerpt we can read that in the perception of the programmer the recognition from other organisations who operate on an international level can create a sense of accomplishment amongst the team, thus strengthen the identity of the organisation. Even though the residency had previously established exciting projects which were well funded, the programmer was not entirely sure if the artistic quality of the organisation could compete on a national level. By participating in an event such as art fair, the organisation could create new contacts and be more secure in itself and its artistic quality. We can understand that if the programmers are too isolated from the art market as it is in the case of AiR D., then they cannot clearly decide for themselves if the artistic quality of the projects created in the residency are on the same or better level as the projects created by similar organisations across The Netherlands.

In sum, we can say that different AiRs relate to the art market in different ways. However, in general, programmers need to facilitate a meeting between the art market and the residency without compromising the wishes of the participating artist. This meeting is a strategy for the programmers to verify the level on which the residency can operate and thus have a positive influence over the identity of the organisation.

4.2.2.3 Facilitating and the formation of bonds

Even though the working periods in artistic residencies are not necessarily as long as the working relationships of artists and galleries from the interviews it became evident that the bonds established during the facilitating process between programmer and an artist and between the participating artists in the case of bigger residencies can be very strong and long lasting. Three of the programmers mentioned (interviewee 1, interviewee 9, interviewee 6) that the alumni from the residency become part of a small secret society. Interviewee 6 described the feeling as “club feeling”. This is also supported by the auction catalogue of Rijksakademie and Sotheby “Global Contemporary - Artists for Artists” (2010) in which an interview with the previous director Janwillem Schrofer describes the connection between the alumni artists as a “secret family”. The programmers working in large residencies refused to describe in detail how this relationship was maintained and how the participants continue to be in a close relationship. Interviewee 6 however stressed that:

“I6: There are also artists that know each other although they have never met, it is only because they both have been in here. But they still support each other because there is loyalty and feeling of belonging being part of it. (interviewee 6)

From these experiences we can state that the residencies provide important unofficial support system to young developing artists which has often proved to be crucial for their artistic growth and later popularity on the art market.

We can explain the creation of this strong bond between programmers and artists with the sense of “freedom” (interviewee 2, interviewee 3, interviewee 8, interviewee 4, interviewee 5) felt in their relationships. This finding relates to the value of freedom mentioned in the begging of the findings chapter which relates to the removal of obligations for the artists to create a product that needs to be presented and marketed. Thus, cultural programmers don’t need to pressure the artists to stick to similar production pattern or demand a certain tempo of artwork production. Thus, a deeper connection related to the artistic process can be established between the artists and the cultural programmers.

Further, during the interviews it became clear that the interactions between programmers and facilitators are very informal. They eat and work together. Moreover, all programmers stressed that the artists “live” in the residencies and this brings a feeling of “home” (interviewee 2) which colors the development of the relationships between artist and

programmer and amongst the participating artists. In addition, the programmers stressed that they feel “equal” to the artist in the way they live together.

“I5: We give them the key, they can use the things in the building..you know you built our relationship on trust. So they feel very welcome in that sense of like..very equal to us. It is a group of people working together, making something happen together.” (Interviewee 5)

“I4:..Informal ...that there is no director and there is nobody that you know..sitting or cleaning the toilets..so everybody is doing all the different things. So, it is very different in an institution that you come in and you have maybe a manager for the residencies anmm. Here there is just people.” (Interviewee 4; 41:37)

To interpret better these types of relationships and organisational culture we can use the Competing Value Framework (Cameron 2009; Ouchi, 1981). Within this framework the facilitating practices of programmers can be explained with the Clan type of organisation. In a nutshell my findings suggest that residencies operate in a very informal way similar to family type of structure or Clan (Ouchi, 1981; Cameron, 2009). Ouchi (1981) stresses that in clan organisations there is an informal environment of working such as in “extended family”. Further, trust and collaborative decision-making is of most importance to clan organisations. Team work is also highly valued. These organisations’ business models are built on humane, and friendly relationships and the key ingredient in clan organisations is trust (Cameron 2009; Ouchi, 1981). And as stated by Vethuis (2013) and Ouchi (1981) the building of long lasting relationships based on trust is a timely process. Thus, the development and sustainability of those connections might be a much longer process, than the perception of the instant high arts globalization practices constructed by the media.

Further, as stated by interviewee 9 the strong bond described above seemed to be very important for the initial flow of international artists for AiR A.

“I9: ...There were always a lot of students from Israel. And then you had year five or six years long a lot of people from Iceland. So, it was one person finding the way and then people from that country following. It was not very conscious international policy” (interviewee 9; 35:09)

From this excerpt we can read that the bonds created with an artist during the facilitating process helped the organisation to attract other artist from the same country from his/her circle. This type of relationship also fits in the “clan” profile of an organisation (Cameron, 2009). The first steps of organisational internationalisation as described by interviewee 9 are similar in an inversion to the way other programmers explain the results of the facilitation

process in smaller residencies. The programmers (interviewee 3, interviewee 4, interviewee 5) stressed that the residencies created “circulation”, this is well illustrated from the following excerpts:

“19: THE residency as the one we run is focused on a circulation. So, it is about creating possibilities for things to happen..and I mean A LOT OF things have happened...amm..this Spanish artist and the Iranian one have created the possibility for artists local artist to go other places.” (interviewee 4)

“13: Yeah..result as I said about Canada..that is a traceable result..amm..now this residency exchange project..now this Dutch artist that went to Iran..that will continue for the next year and at the same time..more or less we also had an exchange project in Spain..so we also send a local artist Dutch, The Hague based artists. So, though these connections we offer also Dutch artist the possibility to travel.” (interviewee 3)

This circulation is based on previous experiences and recommendations. Which indeed create long lasting and steady circulation. Nevertheless, it can create a boundary for international artists outside the established circles to be included in the program.

Further, this finding is oppositional to the way residencies have been previously described in sources. Residencies were thought to be places for intense mobility which does not leave long-lasting connections (Styhre & Eriksson, 2008; Poisson-Cogez, 2012; Matias, 2016). Moreover, these sources point out that the participating artists and organisation were strongly connected only during the working period provided during the residency. The findings above however show that in fact, the relationships between the artists and the programmers and between the participating artists are much more durable and intense than the described by previous sources.

5. Conclusion

To answer the main research question in the current study: *“How do programmers in artistic residencies select and host artists in the context of high arts globalization?”* We can state that programmers operate in programming committees which are themselves matched to each institution by its directors. The committees are formed based on multiple considerations such as diversity in occupation, diversity in gender, social capital and work experience. In relation to globalization of the high arts, it is important to note that smaller residencies built their programming committees around a national network, thus including cultural programmers from each major region in the country. Larger residencies establish committees on an international level by grouping experts from world centres of art such as New York, LA, Berlin and Moscow. Thus, the committees structure is meant to create interconnectedness between different cultural centres. However, we can positively state that these hubs are not perceived as operating in one globalized art field. Instead, each programmer brings their local knowledge to add to the network of the committee. These findings are oppositional to Wu (2007) and Bydler (2004) according to whom the contemporary art sector is globally unified. However, they fit with Velthuis’ study (2013) and Velthuis and Curioni (2015) according to whom globalization does not result in one global art field.

This research also revealed that the interviewed programmers perceive their selection practices as matching and their hosting practices as facilitating. Further, the study shows details about how the matching practices of programmers occur. The final decisions of programmers are taken collectively during meetings. A key feature of the matching process is the disagreement between programmers. When disagreement occurs, programmers engage in negotiation and convincing practices they end when all committee members have reached an agreement about the final selection of artists. These findings on matching enrich the current literature on gatekeeping (Becker, 1982; Janssen & Verboord, 2015; Kawashima, 1999) because they show subtleties in the negotiation process of cultural programmers which are for example lacking in Kawashima’s study from 1999. Further, during the process of matching the programmers’ choices are guided by organisational values which are forming the centrality and continuity of the perceived identities of their institutions. All residencies shared the following values: freedom, experimentation, talent development and internationality. However, from the data became evident that internationality was perceived verbally as crucial by all interviewees, however it was stated as a value only in two of the public profiles

of residencies namely in AiR A and AiR B. Thus, even though the programmers considered it as an essential value, and they did pursue their aspirations, pragmatic and symbolic barriers did not allow them to develop internationalisation to the fullest. For one the matching process of the programmers is influenced by local regulations, and due to their governmental funding artistic residencies need to reserve at least 50 percent of their places for local artists. This rule exposed a home bias in artistic residencies. The quota regulation placed upon residencies relates to the study of Janssen and Verboord (2015) who state that in the context of cultural globalization gatekeepers might protect local culture by legal regulations. In the case of this study, cultural programmers as gatekeepers do not create these rules, but they need to follow them. State regulations concerning cultural products are also studied by Crane (2002), she points out that popular culture channels such as television and radio need to fill their programs with a set percentage of local production. The current study also adds to these sources by revealing that the high arts sector, in particular artistic residencies also needs to follow similar local regulations. Nevertheless, the interviewees working in larger residencies which also need to match the participating artists with each other use the government restrictions as a strategy which benefits both local and foreign participants. The majority of local artists help their international counterparts to settle in the context of the Netherlands by introducing them to friends and family as well as practically helping them to navigate around the city and the country. While as perceived by interviewee 6 the participating Western foreign artists have a higher artistic quality and are better motivated and business oriented. Thus, the Dutch artists learn and benefit from working around artists who are more developed than them. These findings contribute to the role of a connector which gatekeepers exercise outlined by Janssen and Verboord (2015). The current study uncovered that cultural programmers in residencies connect local and international artists in a way that both groups benefit from the interaction while being in the artistic residency. Nevertheless, the detected home bias was strengthening when it came to non-Western artists. In the course of this study it became evident that cultural affinities play a role in the matching process and programmers are not so willing to accept non-Western creatives due to cultural differences. First, artists who were well embedded in their non-Western home countries were not encouraged to apply. Second, they were perceived as incapable to work autonomously in a studio in the same manner as their Western colleagues. Thus, unlike Velthuis (2013) research on galleries in Amsterdam in which cultural affinities were not detected, we can state that they do play a role in the selection procedure in artistic residencies. Further, this finding is oppositional to the work of Kravagna (as cited by Buchholz & Wuggening, 2005) and Griffin (et al. 2003)

according to whom the mechanisms in contemporary art are inclusive, and actors do not make differences between Western and Non-Western artistic qualities. For example, during their residency period artists are required to work autonomously in a studio environment, a notion of artistic practice which deprives from Eurocentric understandings of the artistic genius. Those as perceived by my interviewees differ from artistic practices for example in Africa and India which focus on the collective expression rather than individual development. Lastly, the matching practices done with only by invitation method also creates boundaries for foreign artists to be matched. During this process programmers seek to select artists themselves due to funding limitations, time limitations and uncertainty the programmers heavily rely on their local social network for recommendations. This method leads to predominately local suggestions and thus local selection. These findings fit with the findings of Velthuis (2013) and Kawashima (1999) who also found that gatekeepers lean on their local social network resulting in local selection. However, the current study has revealed another dimension of in this process by contextualising these practices within the “only by invitation” matching method. Further, only by invitation method has a positive side for the cultural programmer because it gives programmers a more prominent space for their personal artistic vision to flourish. Thus, this method leads to a more significant agency of the programmers regarding the formation of the organisational identity of their residencies.

Facilitating is the second central practice of programmers in artistic residencies. We can state that programmers contextualise their role during facilitation as an alternative to curating. For example, programmers stressed that they do not use overarching themes to explain the practice of the participating artists. Further programmers stressed that they do not follow the current trends in contemporary art but frame the artists through their own practice. Secondly, the study discovered that programmers in artistic residencies need to “choreograph” (interviewee 9) their relationships with the art market. On the one hand, in residencies where there is too much interest from various actors in the art market, the participating artists are sheltered from external influences of collectors, galleries and media. However, to maintain international status and relationship with the art market, the programmers redirect the interested actors towards the open days of the artistic residencies. On the other hand, the residencies which are somewhat isolated from the art market seek connection to international venues such as art fairs. This way programmers can verify for themselves the artistic quality of their program and evaluate the position they hold in the art world, therefore strengthen the organisational identity of their residency. These findings add new insights to the protector role of gatekeepers which Janssen and Verboord mention in

their 2015 study. They conceptualise the protector role from the perspective of the policy workers who only protect local art, while the current study shows that cultural programmers are protecting both local and international artists while they are residing in AiRs. Further, the study also revealed that the facilitation practices in artistic residencies forge strong bonds between programmers and artists and between the participating artists. Such strong relationships can flourish due to the informal communication between programmers and artists, the “home” environment which residencies create, and the freedom of the obligation to produce a homogeneous type of works. This finding revealed new dimensions in our understanding of artistic residencies: they operate as “a clan” (Cameron, 2009), where trust is a key ingredient. However, in relation to Velthuis (2013) and Ouchi (1981) we can state that trust is built much slower than the way the media portrays working relationships in the contemporary art as instant. Thus, issue of trust could be perceived as another barrier for international artists outside the established trust bonds to be accepted.

The second research question in this study is *“In what ways do the selection and hosting practices of cultural programmers shape the identity of their organisations?”* First, it became evident that programmers take decisions collectively. Thus, they influence the organisational identity as a collective entity and not as individuals. Further, we can state that the identity of the organisation is formed by the perception of programmer regarding the artistic climate in The Netherlands. On the one hand, the programmers who consider the artistic climate in the country as international aim to match and facilitate the international artists residing in the country and through these practices they form the international identity of the organisation. On the other hand, the programmer who view the artistic climate in the country as closed circulation aim to invite foreign artists in their program and therefore consider the organisations they work in an international. Moreover, programmers in AiRs give space to the artists to develop outside current trends in the contemporary art world. Thus, they consciously disregard global trends and built the organisational identities through the artistic practices of the residing artists instead of trough overarching themes. These findings add new insights to the studies on organisational and perceived identities (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Whetten, 2006; Gioia, 1998; 1991) by revealing the key values and practices held by cultural programmers in artistic residencies and the way they relate to those and practically exercised them.

5.1. Strengths, limitations, recommendations

Strengths of the current research

The strength of this study lies in uncovering the matching and facilitating practices and exploring the international and local dimensions of these processes. Thus, this study contributes to study of Velthuis (2013), by revealing how cultural workers deal with globalization in non-profit organisations. For example, this study added to his research by uncovering a new home bias, namely the pragmatic choice for local artists due to funding limitations. Further, the study sheds new light on programmers' role in cultural institutions, in her 1999 research, Kawashima only outline the selection and hosting process of programmers in British cultural centers, the current study adds to the knowledge on gatekeepers by revealing precisely what values are taken into account during the matching process in the case of artistic residencies in The Netherlands. The study also exposed how the negotiation process between programmers takes place. Further, the research revealed that even though residencies host artists temporarily, very long lasting and strong bonds are created between the programmers and the artists, as well as between the participating artists, thus residencies serve as an essential informal network which helps artists accelerate in their careers. Until now artistic residencies have been studied only from the perspective of artistic mobility studies, which hav

Je created an understanding that AiRs host predominately nomadic artists (Matias, 2016; Menger, 1999; Magkou, 2012; Staines, 2012; Grabski 2011; D'Andrea, 2006; Bernava & Bertacchini, 2016; Styhre & Eriksson, 2008; Laaksonen, 2016). Contrary, the current research revealed that selecting and hosting practices are predominately locally oriented. With these unexpected findings, the study proposes that artistic residencies should be instead perceived as talent development centres, then art institutions for facilitating nomadistic practices.

These are also the elements that can give besides an academic contribution, practical insights to the programmers themselves since it is evident that they are struggling with finding a precise definition for their practices. In addition to that, this master thesis delivers a new knowledge that can allow AiRs to determine their position and vision according to the Dutch cultural climate regarding artistic residencies and its respective subjects.

Limitations of the current research

One of the main limitations of this research is the sample size. Bigger sample size could of provide the study with a richer data. Further, a more extensive data could have given more prominent differences and similarities, therefore provide us with more irrefutable results.

Another limitation was the access. Even though contact was established with the programmers during the interviews, it would have been beneficial to approach the study in an ethnographic tradition and be present on selection procedures and hosting process in the studied artistic residencies. This data could have provided me with insightful processes which are happening at the moment of the selection. Also, the non-verbal communication and body language could have been very revealing and enriched the data.

The sample was organised in a way that there were multiple programmers from one organisation so that different opinions could be compared and see how those together form the identity of the organisation. However, one of the organisations (AiR B) participating in this research has been presented with only one programmer. Thus, the data collected by this organisation might lack the consistency of the data gathered for the other organisations.

Further, there was a language fog regarding how the programmers were identifying themselves. In residencies the professionalisation has not reached concrete levels, thus still there are different names for the same positions such as programmers, jury, facilitators, tutors. In addition, residencies have slightly different structures, and some programmers are busy with only matching or facilitating. For example, interviewee 1 does not actively participate in the matching process. Thus, data extracted from her interview could relate only to the facilitating process.

Recommendations for further research

During the interviews, it became evident that the programmers had a hard time to verbalise precisely the practices occurring during their facilitating process. Thus, also as briefly mentioned above it would be beneficial to immerse oneself further into the topic of practices in artistic residencies through the conduction of full-scale ethnographic research. Via observations and participatory field work, I could retrieve essential data regarding the relationships formed between artists and programmers in artistic residencies and gain a better understanding about the informal communication, everyday life in a residency as well as the

working process rooted in talent development.

Lastly from the research, it became evident that there is a connection between the art market and the artistic residencies, it would be beneficial to understand how collectors, galleries and auction houses understand the artistic process occurring in artistic residencies and why do they seek connections with AiRs.

List of references

- Albert, S., & Whetten, D.A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L.L. Cummings, & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263-295). Stamford: JAI Press.
- Alexander, V. D. (2003). *Sociology of the Arts: Exploring fine and popular forms*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, culture & society*, 7(2-3), 295-310.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization* (Vol. 1). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2003). Illusion of permanence: Interview with Arjun Appadurai by perspecta 34. *Perspecta*, 34, 44-52.
- Babbie, E. (2014). *The Basics of Social Science Research* (6th Edition). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). On glocalization: Or globalization for some, localization for some others. *Thesis Eleven*, 54(1), 37-49.
- Beck, U., & Sznaider, N. (2006). Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda. *The British journal of sociology*, 57(1), 1-23.
- Becker, H. S. (1982). *Art worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Belting, H. (2009). Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Estimate. In A. Buddensieg, & H. Belting (Eds), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets, and Museums* (pp. 28-73). Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz.
- Belting, H., Buddensieg, A., Weibel, P., Birken, J., Clark, J., Diawara, M., & Hauschild, T. (2013). *The global contemporary and the rise of new art worlds*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bernava, S., & Bertacchini, E. (2016). *Artistic Mobility: Views from European Cities and Artists*. Torino: University of Torino. Retrieved from: <http://nws.euocities.eu/MediaShell/media/Artistic%20mobility%20in%20cities%20views%20from%20European%20cities%20and%20artists%202016.pdf> (April 27, 2018)

- Bourdieu, P., & Nice, R. (1980). The production of belief: contribution to an economy of symbolic goods. *Media, culture & society*, 2(3), 261-293.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brandellero, A. (2015). The emergence of a market for art in Brazil. In O. Velthuis, & S. Curioni (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan Canvases: The Globalization of Markets for Contemporary Art* (pp. 215-237). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Buchholz, L., & Wuggenig, U. (2005). Cultural globalization between myth and reality: The case of the contemporary visual arts. *Art-e-Fact: Strategies of Resistance*. Retrieved from: http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_buchholz_en.htm (April 8, 2018)
- Bydler, C. (2004). *The Global Art World, Inc.: on the globalization of contemporary art* (Doctoral dissertation). Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Uppsala.
- Cameron, K. (2009). An introduction to the competing values framework. *Organizational culture white paper. Haworth*. Retrieved from: http://www.thercfgroup.com/files/resources/an_introduction_to_the_competing_values_framework.pdf (April 9, 2018)
- Chen, L. & Nath, R. (2005). Nomadic culture: cultural support for working anytime, anywhere. *Information Systems Management*, 22(4), 56-64.
- Crane, D. (2002). *Culture and Globalization. Theoretical Models and Emerging Trends/Global Culture: Media, Arts, Policy, and Globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- D'Andrea, A. (2006). Neo- nomadism: A theory of post- identitarian mobility in the global age. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 95-119.
- Deakin, H., & Wakefield, K. (2014). Skype interviewing: Reflections of two PhD researchers. *Qualitative research*, 14(5), 603-616.
- Digne, J., & Pacquement, A. (1995). *Guide of Host Facilities for Artists on Short-Term Stay in the World*. Paris: Association Française d'Action Artistique (L'AFAA).

- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Collective rationality and institutional isomorphism in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of management journal*, 34(3), 517-554.
- Erić, Z. (2007). Glocalisation, art exhibitions and the Balkans. *Third Text*, 21(2), 207-210.
- Friese, S. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS. ti* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Giddens, A. (2013). *The consequences of modernity*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gielen, P. (2010). The art institution in a globalizing world. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 40(4), 279-296.
- Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sense giving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic management journal*, 12(6), 433-448.
- Gioia, D. A. (1998). From individual to organizational identity. *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations*, 11, 17-31.
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of management Review*, 25(1), 63-81.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Grabski, J. (2011). Market logics: how locality and mobility make artistic livelihoods in Dakar. *Social Dynamics*, 37(3), 321-331.
- Griffin, T., Meyer, J., Bonami, F., David, C., Enwezor, O., Obrist, H. U. & Shonibare, Y. (2003). Global tendencies: Globalism and the large-scale exhibition. *Artforum*, 42(3), 152-163.
- Guerzoni, G. (2011). *Apollo and Vulcan: The Art Markets in Italy, 1400-1700*. East Lansing: MSU Press.
- Halle, D., & Tiso, E. (2008). New York's Chelsea district: a "global" and local perspective on contemporary art. In H. Anheier, & Y. Raj Isar (Eds.), *The Cultural Economy* (pp.292-306). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Hanna, P. (2012). Using internet technologies (such as Skype) as a research medium: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 12(2), 239-242.
- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hannerz, U. (1989). Notes on the global ecumene. *Public culture*, 1(2), 66-75.

- Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human relations*, 55(8), 989-1018.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2003). Political globalization: trends and choices. In I. Kaul (Ed.) *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization* (pp. 185-224). Cambridge: Politi.
- Janssen, M.S.S.E, & Verboord, M.N.M. (2015). Cultural Mediators and Gatekeepers. In J. D. Wright (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences* (2nd Edition, Vol 5, pp. 440–446). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Jerolmack, C., & Khan, S. (2014). Talk is cheap: Ethnography and the attitudinal fallacy. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 43(2), 178-209.
- Jones, M. O. (2016). *Regional Identity Beyond the Collective: The Institutional Identities of ASEAN and MERCOSUR*. (Master's Thesis). Leiden University, Leiden.
- Kawashima, N. (1999). Distribution of the arts: British arts centres as 'gatekeepers' in intersecting cultural production systems. *Poetics*, 26(4), 263-283.
- Kharchenkova, S., Komarova, N., & Velthuis, O. (2015). Official art organizations in the emerging markets of China and Russia. In O. Velthuis, & S. Curioni (Eds.) *Cosmopolitan canvases: the globalization of markets for contemporary art* (pp. 78-101). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramer, D. (2001). Andere Lebenswelten der Kunst. Künstler aus dem Süden in der" Galerie 37" des Museums für Völkerkunde in Frankfurt am Main. In B. Wagner (Ed.), *Kulturelle Globalisierung. Zwischen Weltkultur und kultureller Fragmentierung*. (pp. 178-183). Essen.
- Laaksonen, A. (2016) *IFACCA D'Art Report N. 49, Supporting International Arts*
IFACCA - International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies. Retrieved from:
http://media.ifacca.org/files/DArt49_International_Culture_Networks.pdf (May 1, 2018)
- Lechner, F. (2005). Globalization. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social theory* (pp. 330-333). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Louargant, S., & Szary, A. L. A. (2010). Urban moving and learning: a European artists' insight. In *5èmes Rencontres Internationales de Recherche en Urbanisme de Grenoble La ville créative en questions*. Grenoble, France. Retrieved from:
<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00540749/fr/> (March 28, 2018)
- Negus, K. (2002). The work of cultural intermediaries and the enduring distance between

- production and consumption. *Cultural studies*, 16(4), 501-515.
- Magkou, M. (2012). Geographies of Artistic Mobility for the Formation and Confirmation of European Cultural Citizenship. In *The Cultural Component of Citizenship an Inventory of Challenges* (pp. 54-78). Brussels: European House for Culture. Retrieved from: <http://www.houseforculture.eu/upload/Docs%20ACP/ACPtheculturalcomponentofcitizenshiponlinecopy.pdf> (April 2, 2018)
- Matias, R. (2016). *International artists-in-residence 1990-2010: mobility, technology and identity in everyday art practices*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä studies in humanities 300.
- McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. R. (1989). *The global village: Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Menger, P. M. (1999). Artistic labor markets and careers. *Annual review of sociology*, 25(1), 541-574.
- Oelsner, A. (2013). The institutional identity of regional organizations, or Mercosur's identity crisis. *International Studies Quarterly*, 57(1), 115-127.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Organizational paradigms: A commentary on Japanese management and Theory Z organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(4), 36-43.
- Peterson, R. A., & Anand, N. (2004). The production of culture perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 311-334.
- Poisson-Cogez, N. (2012). *Questioning the artistic residency*. La Favril: Chambre d'Eau and Opale Association. Retrieved from: <http://www.lachambredeau.com/pdf/enjeux-crois%C3%A9s-gb.pdf> (May 3, 2018)
- Pousette, J. (2011). Artists in flux. In A. Ptak (Ed.), *RE-tooling RESIDENCIES: A Closer Look at the Mobility of Art Professionals* (1st Edition, pp. 40-59). Warsaw: A-I-R Laboratory CCA Ujazdowski Castle. Retrieved from: www.re-tooling-residencies.org (April 14, 2018)
- Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.). (2012). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Quemin, A. (2006). Globalization and mixing in the visual arts: An empirical survey of 'high culture' and globalization. *International sociology*, 21(4), 522-550.
- Quinn, R.E. (2011). Competing values framework. In R. E. Quinn, & K. S. Cameron *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture* (3rd Edition, pp. 35-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of management journal*, 49(3), 433-458.

- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture* (Vol. 16). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Rösler, B. (2015). The case of Asialink's arts residency program: towards a critical cosmopolitan approach to cultural diplomacy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(4), 463-477.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative science quarterly*, 23(2), 224-253.
- Salwen, M. B. (1991). Cultural imperialism: a media effects approach. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8(1), 29-38.
- Schultheis, F., Single, E., Köfeler, R., & Mazzurana, T. (2016). *Art Unlimited? Dynamics and Paradoxes of a Globalizing Art World*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- Schrofer, J. (2018). Transformation and Innovation. In *Ephemeral Space*. Vienna: 57BOOKS. Unpublished manuscript.
- Seitz, S. (2016). Pixilated partnerships, overcoming obstacles in qualitative interviews via Skype: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 16(2), 229-235.
- Serino, A. (2015). *International Meeting of Residences. Residences as learning environments*. Milan: The AIR – artinresidence network. Retrieved from: https://issuu.com/air-artinresidence/docs/international_meeting_of_residences/4 (April 22, 2018)
- Steiner, L., Frey, B. S., & Resch, M. (2013). Home is where your art is: the home bias of art collectors. *Working Paper Series, 135*. Zurich: University of Zurich, Department of Economics. Retrieved from: <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/92393/1/773024646.pdf> (April 4, 2018)
- Stephens, K. (2001). Artists in residence in England and the experience of the year of the artist. *Cultural trends*, 11(42), 41-76.
- Straubhaar, J. D. (2013). Mapping “global” in global communication and media studies. In K. Wilkins, J. Straubhaar, & S. Kumar (Eds.), *Global Communication* (pp. 10-34). New York: Routledge.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research* (Vol. 15). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Styhre, A., & Eriksson, M. (2008). Bring in the arts and get the creativity for free: A study of the artists in residence project. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 17(1), 47-57.
- Scheurman, W. E. (2006). *Globalization*. Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.

- Retrieved from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/> (May 13, 2018)
- Sullivan, J. R. (2012). Skype: An appropriate method of data collection for qualitative interviews? *The Hilltop Review*, 6(1), 10.
- Tomlinson, J. (2001). *Cultural imperialism: A critical introduction*. London: A&C Black.
- Velthuis, O. (2013). Globalization of markets for contemporary art: why local ties remain dominant in Amsterdam and Berlin. *European Societies*, 15(2), 290-308.
- Velthuis, O., & Curioni, S. B. (Eds.). (2015). *Cosmopolitan canvases: the globalization of markets for contemporary art*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Waters, M. (2001). *Globalization* (2nd edition). London and New York: Routledge.
- Whetten, D. A. (2006). Albert and Whetten revisited: Strengthening the concept of organizational identity. *Journal of management inquiry*, 15(3), 219-234.
- White, R. (1983). A backwater wash: The Australian experience of Americanization. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 1(3), 108-122.
- Wu, C. T. (2007). Worlds Apart: Problems of Interpreting Globalised Art. *Third Text*, 21(6), 719-731.

Appendices

Appendix A Interview guide

Interview Guide

Introduction:

Hello! Good Morning/evening/afternoon. Thank you for making time for participating in the interview. The topic today aims to explore how the institutional identities are shaped and negotiated in times of cultural globalization and the practices that take place in your residency. As mentioned in our previous correspondence the interview will be recorded. Are you still ok with that?

Background

Lets start with some of your personal background:

1. What is your age? Where are you from? What is your education?
2. How did you get involved with the residency?

Artist's Residency

3. Could you tell me a bit more about the background of the residency? How did it start?

- 3 A. What staff currently works in the residency?
- 3 B. From what nationalities is the staff?
- 3 C. What activities take place in the residency?
- 3 D. Which are the core activities of the residency?
- 3.E. What is the main language in the residency?

4. How would you describe the actual building/ space that the residency offers? (Maybe put this on the questions with the artists)|

Residency Core Values / Purpose

Moving to the residency core values and purpose

5. How would you describe the mission, vision and values of the residency?

5 A. According to you how are they connected to the activities that take place in the residency?

6.How were the values, vision and mission of the residency established?

6 A. Who was involved in the process?

- 6 B. According to you what were the most important aspects to take into consideration when establishing those?
- 6 C. From where did you gather inspiration when establishing those?

7. How often are the mission, vision and values renewed, reviewed?

- 7A. What is at the heart of renewing them?
- 7 B. What motivates your team to renew them?

Local Art Scene

- 8. In what way does the residency relate to the local area and its inhabitants?
- 9. Would you say there is a local art scene?
- 10. How does the residency relate to the local art scene?
 - 10A: What collaborations occur on a local level?
 - 10 B: What is the impact of the residency on the local art scene?

International Art Scene

- 11. How does the residency fit in an international context?
- 12. With which international organisation does the residency collaborate with?
 - 12A. How does that shape and affect the residencies practice?
 - 12B. How does that shape and affect your own practice?

Practice of the cultural programmer:

- 13. Could you describe your professional practice as a whole?
- 14. Could you describe what are your responsibilities in the residency?
- 15. In order to do your tasks what are the most important skills that you have developed?

Follow up questions of practice

Programming as an artistic vision

- 16. Could you tell me what is your artistic vision about the program of the residency?

Awareness of cutting edge contemporary developments

17. What are your strategies to be aware of contemporary art developments?
18. How are your colleagues involved in this process?
19. To which institutions do you look up to for inspiration regarding your practices?
20. Have you already implemented some strategies borrowed from other institutions? From other programmers?

Artists selection

21. What are the criteria's for selecting artists?
22. How does the residency approaches artists by invite or by open call? Or both?
23. Could you describe the selection procedure of artist step by step?
24. How does the selection procedure between local and international artists differ?
25. How are other institutions that the residency works with involved in the process?
26. How do you approach artists from different cultures?

Relationship with the artist

27. What is your relationship with the artist you have programmed?
28. What is your involvement in their process while they are in the residency?
29. What is your relationship with the artists after the residency?

Conclusion:

This was all. Thank you for your participation. Do you have other in practice projects coming up? It would be great if I can come and see your work place. As I mentioned previously the interview and all the information is confidential. Here is the consent form. It is a formality, but it guarantees your confidentiality. If you have any further questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Appendix B Operationalisation

Concepts	Dimensions	Sub dimensions	Topics List
Artistic residency's organisational identity	Intangible manifestation of organisational identity	<i>Continuity and Centrality of values</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to you What do you think have to be the core values of a artistic residency? - What was the process of establishing the mission, values and vision of the organisation? - Who was involved in this process? - From where did you gather inspiration for establishing the mission, vision and values? - What are the core values of (name of residency)? - How are they being implemented in the program? - Have the values changed over time? - If yes what motivated the change? - Who was involved in the process of this change?
		<i>Local values and goals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What goals does the (name of residency) have related to the local inhabitants of the area? - What goals does the (name of residency) have related to the local art scene? - What collaborations take place between the residency program and the local art scene? - How does the residency impacts the local art scene?
		<i>International values and goals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which goals of the (name of residency) are related to the international art scene? - With which international organisations does (name residency) collaborate with? - How do you go about inviting international artists to the residency?
Cultural Programming as a Practice	The programming as an artistic vision		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you tell me what is your vision about the program of (artistic residency) as a whole? - Which are the mile stones of the program? - How are the international artists embedded in the program?
	Awareness of cutting edge contemporary art developments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are your strategies to be aware of the contemporary art developments?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How are your colleagues involved in this process? - To which institutions, events do you look up to for inspiration regarding your programming practices? - Have you already implemented some strategies borrowed from other institutions - from other programmers?
Artists selection procedure	<i>Selection procedure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you describe the selection procedure of artists step by step? - How does the selection process of an international and local artist differ from each other?
	<i>Criteria</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the criteria for selecting artists?
	<i>Outside influences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How are other institutions that the residency works with involved in the selection process?
Relationship with the artists		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is your relationship with the artists you have programmed? - What is your involvement in their process while they are in the residency? - What is your relationship with the artist after the residency period?

Artists' residencies and cultural programmers

CONSENT REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATING IN RESEARCH

FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY, YOU CAN CONTACT:

Nia Konstantinova, air.research.nk.eur@gmail.com, 0634359000

DESCRIPTION

You are invited to participate in a master thesis research about the organisational practices in Artists' residencies in relation to globalization of the high arts. Further the interview will explore the programming strategies and practices applied in the organisation. Your acceptance to participate in this study means that you accept to participate in an interview. In general terms,

- the questions of the interviews will be related to the residency's everyday practices/strategies/identity and meaning making among colleagues. Unless you prefer that no recordings are made, the interview will be audio recorded. Even if you agree to participate now, you can withdraw at any time and refuse to answer any questions, without any consequences.

RISKS AND BENEFITS

For the following interview there are no risks associated with participating in this research.

Nevertheless, we are aware that there is a possibility that participating in this study may involve risks for professional/personal reputation, social relations, etc. In that case, you are free to decide whether we should use/not use your name or other identifying information in the study. If you prefer, we can make sure that you cannot be identified, by using a pseudonym, or general identification (only mentioning age and gender, etc.) Unless you prefer to be identified fully (first name, last name, occupation, etc.)— we will not keep any information that may lead to the identification.

The material from the interviews will exclusively be used for academic work, such as further research, academic meetings and publications.

TIME INVOLVEMENT

- Your participation in this study will take around 90 minutes.
- You may interrupt your participation at any time.

PAYMENTS

There will be no monetary compensation for your participation.

PARTICIPANTS' RIGHTS

- If you have decided to accept to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
- You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. If you prefer, your identity will be made known in all written data resulting from the study. Otherwise, your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

CONTACTS AND QUESTIONS

If you have questions about your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact, anonymously, if you wish, my supervisor Amanda Brandellero via brandellero@eshcc.eur.nl .

SIGNING THE CONSENT FORM

-If you sign this consent form, your signature will be the only documentation of your identity.

Thus, you DO NOT NEED to sign this form.

-In order to minimize risks and protect your identity, you may prefer to consent orally. Your oral consent is sufficient.

I give consent to be audiotaped during this study:

Date:

Signature:

I prefer my identity to be revealed in all written data resulting from this study

Date:

Signature:

This copy of the consent form is for you to keep.