TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

School of Business and Governance

Virgo Sillamaa

THE SOUND OF POLICY MAKING: HOW IDEAS AND DISCOURSE SHAPE MUSIC POLICY

Master's thesis

Programme: Public Administration and Innovation

Supervisor: Prof. Ringa Raudla, PhD

Tallinn 2023

I hereby declare that I have compiled the thesis/paper independently

and all works, important standpoints and data by other authors

have been properly referenced and the same paper

has not been previously presented for grading.

The document length is 14 646 words from the introduction to the end of the conclusion.

Virgo Sillamaa ……………………………

(03.01.2023)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

There is a perceived gap between cultural policy goals and implementation in many countries. This thesis argues that ideas and discourse have a role to play in shaping policies, including consistency between policy goals and implementation. Drawing on Discursive Institutionalism, the thesis focuses on the role of ideas and discourse in music policy making, investigating two case studies: The Netherlands and Latvia. Cultural, and more specifically music policies are shaped by actors' concepts of what culture is, why it is valuable and what the rationales are for public policy intervention. There are several legacy concepts and dichotomies exerting deeply ingrained, often implicit influence, such as "classical" and "popular" musics, "high arts" and "commercial culture", etc. Music policy actors organise themselves into discourse coalitions according to various logics of classification and aim to shape music policy making via discursive interactions through multiple venues – official policy strategies, advisory committees, arm's length expert bodies and other *ad hoc* means. The findings show that the Netherlands has a very broad and inclusive institutional music policy discourse, but there are perceived inconsistencies with actual implementation. This, however, is mostly viewed to be not a structural issue, but rather a time lag in the policy change. In Latvia, the national music policy discourse has until now reflected a traditional narrow focus on "professional" (understood as "academic", or mainly "Western classical" music), to the exclusion of other music scenes. Thus, it is consistent with implementation. However, the new cultural strategy foresees two music strategies, including one for "popular" music. This might necessitate a reappraisal of existing policy instruments and discourse.

Keywords: policy ideas, policy discourse, music policy, concept of culture

INTRODUCTION

It is an easily observed and unproblematic fact of life that music is ubiquitous, has many forms and functions and caters to a rich diversity of tastes. As far as policy is concerned, music with other well-established cultural and creative fields nests mainly within the cultural policy domain, which, however, has traditionally been mostly dealing with the management and funding of the "arts" (Hesmondhalgh, 2019, 177). Concepts such as the "arts" and culture more broadly have evolved throughout the past 150 years, driving correlating developments in cultural policy, or so it would seem. Modern cultural policy includes a number of themes, such as cultural excellence, access to and participation in culture, a diverse cultural offer and social and economic (spillover) value of culture, the latter variably referred to as cultural and/or creative industries (cf. Hartley, *et al.*, 2013, 70-72; Throsby, 2010; Bell & Oakley, 2015; Négrier, 2020, 18-21).

However, as noted by Esa Pirnes (2009, 155) contemporary policy making seems to be trapped in certain models of thought regarding the underlying rationale and the policy instruments chosen for these policies. The traditional cultural policy approach takes a narrow "high" arts view of culture (Bell & Oakley, 2019, 21, Hartley, *et al.*, 2013, 70-72;) and aims to fix the market failures of certain institutionalised forms of culture (the opera, the gallery, etc.) (Towse, 2014, 16). This, notes Pirnes (2009, 157), is losing its legitimacy and thus it can be seen that cultural policies, at least in rhetoric, are setting much wider scope of policy concerns and goals. However the policy instruments and institutional infrastructure are not always catching up, thus creating inconsistencies between policy discourse and implementation.

This thesis focuses on the role of ideas and discourse in music policy making and seeks to answer the following questions: 1) What are the main ideas in emerging and dominant music policy discourses? 2) What forms do the discursive interactions to shape music policy making take? 3) To what degree is there internal and vertical policy consistency in the music policy making? The thesis undertakes two case studies: The Netherlands and Latvia, representing cultural policy making in Western and Eastern European countries.

A case is made in this thesis that music (and by extension cultural) policies rely to an important extent on certain ideas, beliefs and concepts. Ideas, and discourse through which they are conveyed, matter in politics and policy making (Schmidt, 2002b, 190). The theoretical approach to interrogating these themes will follow Discursive Institutionalism and focus on both the substance of ideas at play and the discursive interactions through which policy actors bring their

ideas to bear on policy making processes (Schmidt, 2015, 171). In terms of the substance of ideas and discourse, concepts of culture and various artistic classifications (cf. DiMaggio, 1987, 441) of music (i.e "classical", "popular", "professional", "arts", etc.) are investigated.

Recent work on (mostly "popular") music policy has covered various thematic aspects of it, from city level music strategies to music export, digital music industry (cf. collections by Homan, *et al.,* 2015, 2016; Homan, 2021) and especially Street (cf. 2013) looking at issues of music policy and politics. However, there are no prior studies looking specifically at music policy making from discursive institutionalist perspective, focusing on the role and substance of ideas and discourse and thus the thesis seeks to contribute to extending this theoretical approach to music policy and more broadly cultural policy research.

The thesis is structured as follows: in chapter 1 a theoretical framework is constructed and main ideational categories provided. Chapter 2 explains the methodological approach taken. Chapters 3 and 4 provide the empirical case studies of the Netherlands and Latvia respectively and chapter 5 provides a discussion which answers the research questions and makes a few general conclusions.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. Why do we need to study ideas and discourse in policy analysis?

When New Institutionalism made a comeback in 1980-ies, solidifying into three distinct variants – Rational Choice, Historical and Sociological Institutionalisms (Hall & Taylor, 1996, 5; Beland & Cox, 2011, 6), it reasserted the role of institutions in policy stability (Schmidt, 2002, 209). However, these approaches struggle to properly explain policy change (outside of significant societal upheavals) (*ibid*). This is why Vivien A. Schmidt (2008, 304) has put forth a fourth institutionalism focusing on the role of ideas and discourse. As Schmidt notes (*ibid*, 306), suggesting to a politician or a policy maker that ideas and discourse might not matter in the affairs of the state and society would seem entirely outlandish, because ideas are "at the very centre of what they do, that is, generate ideas about what [policies] should be done and then communicate them to the more general public". From a commonsensical point of view ideas, however one defines them, penetrate everyday life, decision making and action to such degree that the burden of proof to claim the opposite should entirely lie with the critic making such an assumption (Mehta, 2011, 25). More specifically in the context of policy analysis, scholars who aim to "take ideas seriously" (Schmidt, 2010, 2) seek to account for changes in policy, politics and society at large through assigning greater weight to actors' agency including their capacity to come up with new ideas, organise around them and thus also change formal institutions and prevalent cultural norms.

1.1.1. Discursive Institutionalism

Discursive Institutionalism (DI), as proposed by Schmidt (2008, 2010, 2011, 2015) is an umbrella term that seeks to provide a common denominator for many approaches that in various ways introduce ideas, sometimes also discourse, into institutional context as a factor when seeking to explain policy change and stability.

At the centre of DI lies the notion that actors are sentient beings with agency, have ideas of their own and abilities to think and act both in the institutional contexts, but also critically towards them (Schmidt, 2015, 175-176). The process through which actors interact with each other and with the institutional context they find themselves in, is discourse, defined as "the interactive process of conveying ideas" (Schmidt, 2008, 303). Schmidt seeks to strip the discourse concept of its "postmodernist baggage" (*ibid*, 305) and uses it as a "more generic term that encompasses

not only the substantive content of ideas but also the interactive processes by which ideas are conveyed" (*ibid*). But institutions still matter as well as discourse always takes place in an institutional context, both shaping and being shaped by it (Schmidt, 2002. 250). DI seeks to find answers to important questions such as: why do some policy ideas succeed? Why do some political philosophies dominate for long periods of time?

1.3. Elaborating key concepts

1.3.1. Ideas

Schmidt defines "ideas" broadly, such as "narratives, myths, frames, collective memories, stories, scripts, scenarios, images, and more" (Schmidt 2008, 310). Specifically in policy making context, Schmidt follows Mehta (2011, 27) in organising ideas on three levels: (i) concrete policy solutions, as proposed by policymakers; (ii) more general policy programmes that underpin concrete policies and also define, or frame, policy problems; and (iii) political philosophies that carry world views, value positions, beliefs, etc. (Schmidt, 2008, 306-307).

In order to study ideas, or the subjective understanding of the world of agents, we have to focus on – due to obvious methodological limitations – ideas as made explicit by these agents through language in specific context and situation. However, as asserted by Wittgenstein, language is not "transparent" (Schmidt, 2015, 178; Hajer, 2006, 70), but comes with tacit presuppositions and frames, both personal and cultural (Turner, 2001, 67). Hajer uses the concept of "storylines" to refer to a "condensed statement summarising complex narratives", used by participants as "shorthand" in discussions, or when expressing themselves in written media (Hajer, 2006, 69). In essence, we often communicate through these "shorthands" assuming that others understand what we mean. In most cases these assumptions work well enough – otherwise our everyday communication couldn't effectively work (van Dijk, 2008, 83).

Ideas, in the sense as discussed above and in the context of cultural, or more specifically music policy context, can refer to general concepts to explain the phenomena such as culture and music, and notions of intrinsic, societal, economic, etc. value these might have. Also, important ideas in the music/cultural policy making context include what DiMaggio (1987, 451) calls "artistic classification systems", or ways to categorise practices and (cultural) artefacts into types, assigning them distinct meanings, value and other attributes.

1.3.2. Institutional context in DI

With the introduction of ideas, discourse and actors with heightened agency, Schmidt does not mean to diminish the importance of institutions. She still notes the important constraints and path-dependencies that can be introduced through institutionalised strategic interests of the powerful elites who wield their positions to shape policies and politics (Schmidt, 2002a, 252). Also, institutions are powerfully set to shape actors' opportunities through their established and widely accepted (legitimate) ways of operating. Thus, institutions provide the context within which actors can discursively and otherwise operate, in other words institutions frame discourse (*ibid*, 211). Ideas can drive institutional change, but not, at times, without significant resistance.

1.3.3. Discourse

Schmidt uses the term "discourse" broadly, to encompass both the substantive content of ideas, and the interactive processes through which actors convey their ideas (Schmidt, 2008, 305). Discourse in policy making is "not just what is said (ideas), but also who said what to whom, where, when, how, and why (discursive interactions)" (*ibid*). In DI, it is assumed that agents have abilities to interact with the social world in two dimensions: firstly, being able to orientate in the background social knowledge about what are the prevalent rules and norms and how to navigate the institutional landscape, we can essentially "read the room" in our social world and act in it. Schmidt (following Searle, 1995, 129-137) calls it *background ideational abilities* (Schmidt, 2008, 315). Secondly, actors have agency, including being able to actively and critically engage with the social-institutional reality by also taking a critical view of it, producing new ideas and acting upon them through discursive practices. Schmidt refers to it as *foreground discursive abilities*. The *background ideational abilities* enable us to understand and situate ourselves in the social world, the *foreground discursive abilities* empower us to also shape and change it (*ibid*).

Similarly to Schmidt, Hajer defines discourse also as a broad concept, including both substantive ideas and interactive processes of exchange into it. He defines discourse as "an ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categories through which meaning is given to phenomena, and which is produced and reproduced through an identifiable set of practices" (Hajer, 1995, 44). Hajer emphasises that "discourse, thus understood, is not synonymous to discussion: a discourse refers to a set of concepts that structure the contributions of participants to a discussion" (Hajer, 2006, 67). It can then be inferred that "underneath" any interactive mainly, but not exclusively

language-based exchange lies an "ensemble of ideas, concepts and categories" – essentially a background system of frames (Turner, 2001, 69) or shared social knowledge (van Dijk, 2008, 63; Berger and Luckmann, 1967, 41; see also Searle's concept of "background") – that are being more or less clearly articulated in a particular discussion, or a written document, but that they are never or rarely fully made explicit.

For Schmidt, actors exerting their agency and bringing the power of their ideas to bear through discursive practices seems to be mainly motivated to drive policy change. However, particular dominant discourses can also serve to maintain policy stasis. "Discourse can suppress the emergence of new interest coalitions, prevent the emergence of new norms and undermine the development of particular forms of institutions" (Hope & Raudla, 2012, 403). As will be seen later, in the field of culture and cultural policy, there are powerful legacy ideas keeping discourse in its ruts.

1.3.4. Dominant ideas and discourses

Some ideas, whether policy rationales, programmes or overall value positions, are more prominent and established than others. Hajer (2006, 70) proposes to link ideas and discourse to power and dominance using two terms: ".. *discourse structuration* occurs when a discourse starts to dominate the way a given social unit … conceptualises the world. If a discourse solidifies in particular institutional arrangements, then we speak of *discourse institutionalisation*". Hajer thus proposes a simple two-step procedure for "measuring the influence of a discourse" (*ibid*): If a discourse is widely used and shared, but it has not yet been "fixed" into policy programmes, regulation, etc., it can be referred to as an emerging discourse (discourse structuration); "and if it solidifies into institutions and organisational practices, we have discourse institutionalisation. If both criteria are fulfilled we argue that a particular discourse is dominant" (*ibid*).

Discourses, especially dominant discourses, can bring policy actors together to form *discourse coalitions*, that is a group of actors sharing particular "idea sets" (Howlett, *et al.*, 2022, 47) and storylines (Hajer, 2006, 70).

1.3.5. Policy subsystem – actors and process

Ideas do not exist in any meaningful way without agents to carry them, and discourse always takes place in institutional context. In order to analyse ideas and discourse properly, the particular policy making context needs to be mapped, as in the main policy actors identified and

the policy making process charted. "The actors and institutions with … sufficient knowledge of a problem area, or a resource at stake … can be understood to constitute a policy subsystem" (Howlett, *et al.*, 2022, 157-9). In most democratic countries governments fail (or do not seek) to centralise and insulate decision making and thus the policy making process is open to many more types of actors (Cairney, 2020, 8).

Thus, in general, policy actors are simply those who "exercise some influence over policy processes and outcomes", including elected politicians, the public bureaucracy, interests groups, research organisations, media, academic policy experts, etc." (Howlett, *et al.*, 2022, 111). The policy subsystem has an institutional structure that limits what kind of (policy) ideas can come to play, whether due to political or administrative feasibility, or the compatibility of problem definitions and policy rationales with the dominant political philosophies, etc. The policy subsystem thus "shapes the policy discourse by conditioning the members' perception of what is desirable and possible, and affects the selection and use of policy instruments" (*ibid,* 158).

1.3.6. Policy consistency

What if the policy discourse, that is the ideas being presented in high level political agendas or even policy guidelines in the implementation agencies are expressing certain values and goals, but the actual decision making in the ground produces different results? How to then understand the dominance (i.e institutionalised nature) of ideas and discourse?

The concept of *policy consistency* is used to analyse alignment between political rhetoric and policy implementation in the case studies. The notion of three dimensions of policy consistency – internal, vertical and horizontal – is derived from Leslie Pal (2014, 13-14). Given that the "[p]olicy statements are normally fairly abstract and general [and t]hey must be actualized through an implementation process that elaborates programs and activities to give the policy effect", the internal consistency refers to whether there is consistency between the broad policy goals and the institutional arrangements and policy instruments chosen to achieve them. Vertical consistency, in turn, refers to whether policy implementation actually achieves the desired outputs and impact. Given the focus on the role of ideas and discourse, the policy consistency will be analysed through these levels:

Internal policy consistency:

1. Policy rhetoric – the necessarily broad policy goals and rationales;

2. Policy design – the instruments chosen and the goals set for these;

Vertical policy consistency:

3. Policy implementation (committee decisions, resulting effects, etc.),

The wider sector and public discourse surrounding the policy making (and its institutionalised discourse), including reactions and responses by the sector actors to policy and implementation decisions provides additional insight into the consistency analysis.

1.4. Ideas, concepts and classification in music (cultural) policy discourses

It is an easily observed and unproblematic fact of life that music is ubiquitous, has many forms and functions and caters to a rich diversity of tastes. "Music" defies easy definition and is possibly too diverse a phenomenon to submit to any single consistent theoretical or practical description (Keller, 2019b, 1508). The position assumed here is one of "sociological indifference" (towards any definition of music), that is, focused on understanding the "beliefs held and meanings taken by real people in actual situations" (Martin, 2015, 99). For this thesis it is pertinent how the various music policy actors think about music, conceptually and practically. Furthermore, how they, then, discursively construct a rationale for having music policies and try to convince policymakers why it should be a concern for public policy in the first place.

In the focus of this thesis are the various actors that play a role in creation, production and distribution of music in all its forms[1]. These actors organise themselves into groups according to various logics, such as music industry or industries, referring to several vertical "value chains", or horizontally across all these industry sectors, for example trade associations of cultural workers, musicians. For other issues, more or less clear-cut groups can form around musical genre communities, music scenes or legacy concepts such as "art" and "popular" musics, or "high" and "popular" culture, which still exert a powerful influence on thinking about music throughout the society (DiMaggio, 1987, 445).

Cultural policy, at least in the "Western world", has by now a long-standing and established position in public policy (see next section). Concepts and values of culture have been to some degree articulated in various policy documents and are reflected in institutional arrangements of

---

[1] From a broader music sector view, audiences and especially fans are an important actor too, but in an actor-centric analysis of policy making, they rarely play a direct role.

funding and other instruments. Therefore, it can be argued that there is a pronounced institutional(ised) discourse of cultural policy that has a "top down" structuring influence on any particular issue requiring its attention and the surrounding discourse.

1.4.1. Cultural policy and the concept of culture

Any cultural policy needs to define the remit of its focus and thus, whether implicitly or explicitly, needs to rely on some notion of culture (Bell & Oakley, 2015, 2). Raymond Williams has identified "culture" as a very complex word (Williams, 1981, 10). As a multivalent term, culture can refer more broadly to a "way of life" (*ibid*, 11), that is customs and behaviours of social groups in particular "cultures"; or more specifically to "products of artistic pursuits" (Behr, 2015, 277), defining certain types of artistic creative activities as cultural expressions. While the concept of culture can be broad, cultural policies (at least in the "Western" world) have in a very practical sense dealt mainly with funding the "arts" and cultural "heritage" (Hesmondhalgh, 2019, 177; Mulcahy, 2006, 320). The "arts" refers mostly to so-called classical, or "fine arts", that have enjoyed a long-standing legitimate status as a public policy concern (Hesmondhalgh, 2019, 177). Various themes have motivated cultural policies in Europe since the mid-twentieth century:

Cultural heritage – Culture is thus a collection of tangible artefacts or intangible practices that exemplify the cultural legacy from the past and that we need to pass on to the future generations. This notion is currently also at the heart of UNESCO definition of cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2023).

National culture – great works of art and great artists can be seen (and shown) as expressing national cultural might and prowess. Culture is thus mobilised into the service of constructing a national identity (Bell & Oakley, 2015, 112).

Artistic excellence – the notion can be traced back to the 19th century Victorian thinker Matthew Arnold who understood culture to be the "best that has been thought and written in the world" (Arnold 1993, quoted in O'Brien, 2014, 2) and which has influenced the modern view of 'culture' as "creative achievement and production of artistic work" (O'Brien, 2014, 2).

Democratisation of culture – providing access to "high art" and cultural heritage, often previously restricted to only elites, to all citizens, while also stressing the importance of cultural

education and audience development. This approach still involves an inherently normative understanding of which forms of cultural expressions are to be considered of high quality and this has historically reflected the preferences and choices made by the "elites" (Lewis & Miller, 2003, 3; Bell & Oakley, 2015, 20-21; Mulcahy, 2006, 323-324; Mangset, 2020, 400).

Cultural democracy – Throughout the last and current century there has been a steady movement towards broadening the concept of culture to include other forms of artistic expressions (Bell & Oakley, 2015, 17), including so-called "traditional" and "popular" cultural activities. This is to counterbalance the traditionally dominant view of "high arts" as valuable while the rest is delegated to the market or hobby. Still, the traditional notions of "high art" and the institutions that embody it have proven remarkably resistant to change (*ibid*, 20-21).

Social value of culture – While cultural policy makers primarily concern themselves with "artistic forms of culture" they increasingly feel the need to include other policy rationales in order to find new arguments and legitimise cultural support (Bell & Oakley, 2015, 19). For example, by turning to advocating the "arts" and culture as combating various social ills, such as social exclusion (Hesmondhalgh, 2019, 181).

Economic value of culture – In parallel, and in conjunction with other developing discourses around information and knowledge economy, the merits of innovation, entrepreneurialism, etc., ideas of the role of "creativity" were, somewhat opportunistically, used to conflate the more traditional fields of art with newer sectors of media and communication to form a new concept – creative industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2019, 70-71, 187-191). The creative industries discourse has sought – and often succeeded in – enhancing the political profile of cultural policy concerns by showing the potential of cultural and creative sectors for driving economic growth, job creation, regeneration of urban and rural areas, etc. (Hartley, *et al.*, 2013, 59-62; Mulcahy, 2006, 326-327).

1.4.2. The "performing arts" concept

The traditional cultural forms tied into the "(high) arts" notion include the categorisation of "performing arts", referring to all art forms that are performed on stages and has by today developed a connection with public cultural subsidy (as in: performing arts are those scenic arts that are funded by the government). A link that is evoked very often casually and unproblematically (cf. Towse, 2014, 2, 26). Performing arts involve also musical performances, but due to the "high arts" roots of the concept, it in practice mostly refers to performances of

"classical" music (see below), that is types of ensembles (symphony orchestras, choirs) and a selection of repertoire in certain types of concert venues.

1.4.3. The "art" and "popular" music concepts

In "Western" societies music discourse, the notion of "art music" almost invariably refers to "Western art music" and is for all practical purposes overlapping with the term "classical" music – both complex and in current times contested (cf. Alfaro, 2019, 204; Keller, 2019a, 561-566). The idea of "art", including "art music", arguably developed at the end of the 18th century in Europe and in the "high arts" discourse "art"/"classical" music represents the excellence that was at the heart of early cultural policy rationales (Alfaro, 2019, 204). The implicit identification of "art music" with "Western" forms of "classical" music, a canon of repertoire, certain forms of performance, types of ensembles, even venues, etc. has been linked with ideals and interests of the traditional elites (cf. DiMaggio, 1982, 303-304).

Homan (2021, 2-3) provides an overview of the main arguments why "art" ("classical") music is or should receive a privileged status in cultural policy attention: (i) it derives from a centuries long legacy of societal traditions; (ii) it is considered to express the height of excellence in music; (iii) without policy support it is in danger of being a "lost cultural phenomenon"; (iv) the unique institutional arrangements and required competencies incur extremely high costs and cannot survive in market conditions, necessitating public subsidy[2]; (v) "Classical" music is also situated within wider "heritage" discourses.

The concept of "popular" music is equally difficult to pin down. Initially evoked as the negative alternative for "arts" music by the Frankfurt school of cultural critics (most notably Adorno) and linked to sinister capitalist machinations of the culture industry (Bell & Oakley, 2015, 22), "popular" music has grown into a an object of study for a rich multidisciplinary research field (Dawe, 2015, 21). This, however, has not yielded any clarity as to the meaning of the term. As Bell and Oakley (2015, 22-23) list the different connotations that "popular" evokes: (i) popular as popular with the people, enjoyed by many; (ii) mass culture which often refers to industrially produced cultural goods to condition the masses; (iii) commercial i.e for-profit intent of cultural producers; (iv) as the undefined and vague "other" to the notions of "high" or "traditional"

---

[2] This is broadly referred to as the Baumol's cost disease and more generally connected to the market failure argument. The eminent economist William Baumol produced a study of the performing arts in the 1960-ies, laying the foundations for the argument that performing arts is not scalable through means available to other human endeavors, such as technology-driven efficiencies, etc. Cf. Baumol, W.J. & Bowen, W.G. (1966). Performing Art—the Economic Dilemma. Cambridge, MA: Twentieth Century Fund.

culture (cf. Homan, 2021, 3); (v) whatever the "people" do and enjoy themselves (overlapping the idea of "folk" culture).

1.4.4. Music genre and scene communities

In addition to the above mentioned terms, music is most often categorised by genre and linked to various music scenes and subcultures. "Genre" is yet another vague term, but can in a very general sense refer to some "aggregation principle [that] enables observers to sort cultural products into categories … on the basis of perceived similarities" (DiMaggio, 1987, 441). In music, genres are often used on very different levels of generalisation, from niche (or micro) genres to sweeping labels such as "classical" or "pop" music. For many music fans, genres can be useful to identify certain stylistic or aesthetic characteristics so that they can find music similar to what they already like and are interested in. Pop music can refer to whatever is the set of hit songs charting in any given year, though there are many attempts to link this to an aesthetic or construct a historic genealogy of styles (cf. Regev, 2015, 35). The notion of "classical" music tends to evoke all the trappings of "art" music and implicitly refer to a thousand year legacy – a problematic after-the-fact construction, ignoring the many historic discontinuities and other nuances (Keller, 2019a, 561-563).

1.4.5. The music industries and sectors

Due to market dominance, the music industry in the twentieth century used to refer implicitly to the recorded music industry (Williamson & Cloonan, 2007, 312; quoted in Shepherd & Devine, 2015, 13), but by today other sectors have grown in importance and so increasingly often the music industries are referred to in plural (Hughes, *et al.*, 2016, 3). Most often music industries refer to value chains of the production and marketisation of recorded music (the recorded music industry), managing the rights of musical works (music publishing), or organising concerts (the live music industry) (Tschmuck, 2017, 2). Depending on the size of the national market and the level of organisation in the music sector, actors in these industries can organise themselves into representative groups on several levels.

Alternatively, actors might form groups more horizontally across the industry sectors, for example trade associations of cultural workers, musicians, SMEs, or employers, etc. Constructing a "sector" around an industry can provide economic arguments of relevance (the turnover, value added, job creation and IP, etc.) as the foothold to get policy attention.

1.4.6. In summary – constructing music policy discourses

In summary, music policy discourses are constructed by policy actors, both in the government and in the music sector. These discourses rely on some concepts of the value of music as cultural, social, economic, etc. good that can be articulated in various degrees of clarity or remain tacit. The concepts of the meaning and value of music (nested in the wider concept of culture) are necessarily reflected in certain classification logics and are expressed in various types of policy documents. The discursive struggles emerge when the different actor groups use different underlying concepts and classifications, or when a policy initiative runs against legacy institutional arrangements with their own discursive foundations.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Ontological and epistemological assumptions

Every researcher, whether explicitly or tacitly, relies on some ontological and epistemological presuppositions and these shape the orientation to their subject (Furlong & Marsh, 2010, 17). The current thesis has adopted an interpretivist approach, which is more concerned with understanding then providing causal explanations (*ibid*, 21; van Thiel, 2014, 34; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, 6). Following Searle (1995), it is assumed that the social reality (social facts) is socially constructed and thus cannot be assumed to have an observer-independent existence. As meanings and interpretations are created and understood within certain discourses, no "objective" analysis or predictive theory in social science is strictly speaking possible (Furlong & Marsh, 2010, 26; Flyvbjerg, 2006, 223). This is equally valid for studies in public administration and policy analysis, which often focus on actors' "mental constructs" (van Thiel, 2014, 29).

2.2. Research aims and questions

Following the interpretivist focus on context-specific meanings (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, 23), the main aim of the research is to articulate and thus bring forth the "mutable and constructed character" (Shepherd & Devine, 2015, 1) of conventional categories, typifications and processes that would otherwise be taken for granted (Fischer *et al.*, 2015, 8).

The research aims can be seen as both exploratory and descriptive. As an exploratory study the thesis focuses on those aspects of music policy making of which little is (at least explicitly) known about and asking a fairly open-ended main research question (van Thiel, 2014, 17). However, the study also has a descriptive dimension, guiding the exploration through certain categories and concepts (*ibid*) – in this case particular ideas and discourses of music policy making. In case of a general main research question, sub-questions need to be formulated as well (*ibid*, 19).

In this thesis the research questions are:

Main question: How do ideas and discourse shape music policy?

Sub-questions:

- What are the main ideas in emerging and dominant music policy discourses?

- What forms do the discursive interactions to shape music policy making take?

- To what degree is there internal and vertical policy consistency in the music policy making?

2.3. Design and method choices

2.3.1. Two case studies

A case study is an in-depth investigation of a phenomenon in the real-world context (Johnson, 2002, 51) and is especially suitable when the boundaries of the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident from the beginning (Yin, 2018, 45). An interpretivist approach where hypotheses, variables and sampling are mostly missing (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, 3) matches well with the case study methodology, producing context-dependent knowledge of actors' interactions (Flyvbjerg, 2006, 221; van Thiel, 2014, 35).

The current thesis conducts two country based case studies focusing on music policy subsystems – the Netherlands and Latvia. The selection of these particular countries follows the logic of having two cases that together can be expected to produce a more diverse description of the phenomenon (cf. Gerring & Cojocaru, 2016, 396). Without much prior research in this particular area, the guiding logic was that the Netherlands is a Western European country with a longer tradition of public cultural policies, while Latvia as formerly occupied by the Soviet Union, has had several decades less time to develop their own culture and music policy. Furthermore, there might be differences in cultural policy traditions and core concepts.

Another important factor that plays into the selection is a pragmatic one. As noted by Yin (2018, 50), access to sufficient data is a crucial aspect of a case selection. This also includes access to relevant people for interviews. Both the Netherlands and Latvia are countries where it was possible for the researcher, due to professional networks, to establish connections with a sufficiently diverse selection of interviewees.

The main sources of data in the case studies are policy and other relevant documents and semi-structured interviews.

2.3.1. Document analysis

Documents can provide relevant background information, including guiding preparation for the interviews (Yanow, 2007, 411). The documents reviewed and coded were policy strategies and guidelines, regulations, guidelines and meeting minutes and decisions of relevant organisations, research reports, public letters between relevant policy actors and other public reports or articles addressing connected themes.

2.3.2. Interviews

The interviews were semi-structured in the sense that an interview guide was designed, but in the actual process, questions were pursued in a more open manner. An "interpretive interviewing bears a family resemblance to common conversation, .. the interpretive researcher typically seeks to draw the speaker out" (Ynaow, 2007, 410). The open approach to elaboration is needed for context-specific understanding. Representatives of different epistemic communities can use the same key terms and concepts, but have fairly different meanings for them (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, 7), evident in the ways some interviewees use concepts such as "classical" and "popular" music in an unproblematic way, while others contest them. Furthermore, the tacit connotations of key terms are not made visible by the interviewees themselves, unless asked and even then they might struggle to articulate thoughts and beliefs they are not themselves actively aware of. This means that the researcher unavoidably influences the results as "no method is methodologically neutral" (*ibid*, 4).

In total, 24 interviews were conducted, 11 in the Netherlands and 13 in Latvia. The selection of interviewees followed the logic of three groups: policy makers (officials and staff of implementation agencies, etc.), policy experts (sector experts called to make decisions in advisory councils, funding committees, etc.), and "policy takers" as representatives of sector organisations who while seeking to influence policy also are its targets. In this way, interviews are not restricted to "elites" (policy makers in the government and politicians), but also include non-elite actors who are equally playing a role in shaping policies (Yanow, 2007, 410).

2.3.3. Analysing findings, drawing conclusions

The documents and interviews were coded following a set of general keywords and concepts derived from the theoretical framework, such as "policy process", "policy discourse", "policy actor" and "policy subsystem" (for institutional arrangements). Substantive keywords were, for

example, "art music", "classical music", "popular" or "pop" music, "genre", "culture concept", etc. However, new keywords and approaches were picked up inductively from the interviews as some meanings and interpretations can only be understood in certain discourses and not anticipated (Bradburn, *et al.*, 2004, 9). An emergent set of classifications in the thesis was the several ways sector actors organise themselves around certain concepts – a very useful aspect of policy research (Yanow, 2007, 413).

The resulting case studies are compared, but not through seeking equivalent principles or variables. Rather, the comparison attempts to make better sense of how ideas and discourses operate in music policy making context in both countries, thus informing the conceptual approach itself (cf. Yanow, 2014, 143).

3. EMPIRICAL CASE STUDIES: THE NETHERLANDS

3.1. The cultural and music policy subsystem in the Netherlands

The legal basis for cultural policy in the Netherlands is the Cultural Policy Act (1993), mandating the Dutch government to allocate a financial contribution towards cultural institutions and funds (Brom, 2019, 4). Cultural policy, as all governance in the Netherlands, is divided between the national, regional and municipal levels, thus creating a three-tier system. The focus in the current thesis is only on the national level. Although the central government only provides *ca* one third of the total cultural expenditure, it has the task of creating the regulative and institutional conditions in which the other levels of government can operate. Also, in defining the overall policy goals, the government can be seen "setting the tone" (*ibid*, 7) – thus most relevant for a discourse analysis. Cultural policy in the Netherlands is planned and implemented in four year cycles, the current one being 2021–2024.

3.1.1. Policy actors

Dutch cultural policy is in the remit of the **Ministry of Education, Culture and Science** (OCW). The minister (or the responsible state secretary) is responsible for providing a vision and policy guidelines for the four year cultural policy cycle. However, in accordance with a principle that the government does not meddle directly in the affairs of the cultural sector, the OCW leaves substantial amount of decision making to the main legal advisory body the national **Council of culture** (RvC) (Brom, 2019, 8). The Council advises on policy issues and grant applications (RvC, 2023.). The RvC consists of a council of up to eight members with extensive experience in the sector and a bureau with 22 staff members (*ibid*). In addition, the RvC has a pool of (at the time of writing) 170 advisers that can be called on for sector expertise and organised into temporary committees.

In addition to governmental organisations, a crucial role in the designing of policy instruments and implementation is performed by national cultural foundations acting mainly as funds. Out of the six national cultural funds, the **Performing Arts Fund NL** (FPK) is the most relevant for the music sector. FPK is funded through the Basic Infrastructure system (see next section) and is the national culture fund for music, music theatre, dance and theatre in the Netherlands.

There are many **music sector actors** who in various ways seek to play a role in policy making. While the above-described cultural policy institutions tend to see music under the umbrella of performing arts, widening the scope to include all kinds of music styles and scenes, the sector actors tend to group into scene or industry based clusters.

There are many **trade associations**, uniting and representing members with a certain function in the overall music ecosystem (i.e VNPF[3], VSCD[4] NAPK[5], IFPI[6], STOMP[7], NMUV[8], VMN[9] and MMFnl[10]), as well as There are several **employers associations** and **labor unions** (for example BAM![11]). Buma/Stemra and Sena, the collecting management organisations in the Netherlands, and Dutch Music Export are also relevant actors in the music policy area.

Finally, in 2014 the many sector actors organised into **coalitions** along the music style/genre/scene boundaries. The Pop Coalition was the first and includes members with very diverse profiles and roles in the so-called pop music sector.

3.1.2. Policy process

As mentioned above, the Dutch cultural policy is planned and implemented in four year cycles. The main policy instrument to allocate direct government subsidies for these periods is the **National basic infrastructure** (BIS). Launched in 2009, BIS was designed to better structure the principles and process of allocating direct subsidies to cultural organisations and to separate setting more broad policy goals in the government from the actual decision making of subsidy allocation (Van der Leden, 2021, 2). Many cultural institutions, including six national cultural funds apply directly for a subsidy from BIS. The applications are sent directly to the ministry, but are thoroughly reviewed by the RvC who provides the minister an advice report containing evaluations and recommendations for granting the subsidies. The advice report is public and thorough, containing commentary on each applicant.

---

[3] VNPF is the association for Dutch stages and festivals dedicated to popular music.
[4] VSCD is the association of stages of theatres and concert halls.
[5] NAPK is the Dutch association for producers in performing arts.
[6] IFPI stands for International Federation of the Phonographic Industry and has national branches in most countries.
[7] STOMP is the umbrella organization for independent music producers in the netherlands.
[8] NMUV is the Dutch Music Publishers Association.
[9] VMN is the association of sheet music publishers and traders representing the music publishing sector actors.
[10] MMFnl, or Music Managers Forum NL unites artist managers.
[11] BAM! is the association for pop artists, musicians and songwriters in The Netherlands.

3.2. Main ideas and discourses

3.2.1. The discourse of national cultural policy goals and rationales

The dominant (institutionalised) discourse of cultural policy goals and the underlying rationale for government intervention in principle is captured in the policy agendas and guidelines of the OCW, the policy goals suggested by the RvC and are aligned with the coalition programme (OCW, 2020). The main themes tackled relate to the overall concept of culture, explaining why culture is valuable to the society, why the government needs to have a policy toward cultural life and what are the main policy goals.

In her 2018 policy letter "Culture in an open society" minister Ingrid van Engelshoven[12] sets out her cultural agenda, naming the following five themes (van Engelshoven, 2018, 5) with summary comments on their content: (i) "**Culture makes curious**" – mainly focused on cultural themes and participation in education; (ii) "**Space for new creators and culture**" – mainly focused on broadening the genres and forms of cultural expressions falling under the cultural policy purview, including "urban arts" (hip hop, spoken word, dance music and urban film and theatre); (iii) "**A living environment with character**" – mainly focused on tangible and intangible cultural heritage, "cultural landscapes", architecture, etc.; (iv) "**Culture is boundless**" – effectively the international cultural policy dimension; and (v) "**A strong cultural sector**" – featuring cultural labor market themes, such as strengthening fair practices, social protection and also the conditions for cultural entrepreneurship.

The letter also notes that "culture" is considered broadly, including the "arts, heritage and creative industries" and seeking to extend its focus to include ""alternative" forms of art and new generations", as the government "particularly hopes to reach groups that may not currently engage with the stories being told in "traditional" theatres, concert halls and museums" (*ibid*, 5).

In developing its specific cultural policy, the government adopts the objectives formulated by the Council for Culture, (*ibid*, 6):

1. "Creative and artistic talents are given chances and opportunities to flourish;
2. Everyone, regardless of age, cultural background, income and place of residence, has access to culture;

---

[12] Ingrid van Engelshoven was the minister of education, culture and science between 2017 - 2022 (January) and presided over the cultural policy for the ongoing period 2021-2024.

3. The range of culture on offer is pluriform, with established forms cherished and new forms embraced;

4. Culture is given a safe haven within which to reflect on society and its citizens, and to criticize them."

Equally broad vision for the values and functions of culture is mirrored in the Council's work plan for 2022/23, noting that the future cultural system offers every inhabitant of the Netherlands access to cultural offer, education and ways to participate in cultural activities. This offer must reach everyone, regardless of their age, background, place of residence. Equally, this offer must include every cultural discipline and genre (RvC, 2022, 7).

Finally, the RvC 2017 report "De balans, de behoefte" dives deep into analysing the whole music ecosystem with the intent on formulating an integrated vision for the music sector and proposing a radically renewed policy approach to achieve it. In developing an integral and inclusive music policy, the RvC calls for considering all genres, actors and functions in the ecosystem and not excluding any makers or audience groups. While artistic excellence remains of key importance, attention must also be paid to innovation and artistic experimentation – in all scenes and on all levels (RvC, 2017, 7). The report highlights that the current policy instruments (mainly the BIS, but also programmes in the FPK) still reflect the era where only the opera and symphony orchestras were subsidised and is not fit for purpose to deliver a much broader approach (*ibid*, 9). Much attention is drawn to the observation that the currently subsidised music offer does not reflect well the Dutch society in its full diversity, but rather only caters to a (diminishing) segment of it (*ibid*, 60). The recommendations were also worked into the more general advice report "Cultuur dichtbij, dicht bij cultuur" (RvC, 2018).

How could an inclusive cultural policy be implemented? There are two parallel discourses being produced around two logics of policy implementation in the Dutch music sector. The first builds on the traditional concept of performing arts, aiming to broaden the scope of what cultural expressions and scenes should be brought under its conceptual remit. The second is a relatively more recent endeavour to construct a new discourse around "pop" music as a sector to present the policy makers with a strong and unified narrative and converge the otherwise fragmented influence of the many sector actors behind it.

3.2.2. Broadening the performing arts concept

In the Netherlands, the "performing arts" concept has been considerably and explicitly widened – at least in policy rhetoric – to include all sorts of "independent", "alternative" forms of artistic expression, not mostly cultivated in the legacy institutions, such as theatres, opera houses, etc. This discursive legitimation of broadening the scope of the existing and well established set of performing arts policy instruments and institutions can be a valuable and robust way forward to implementation.

The Performing Arts Fund (FPK) is an already existing organisation with processes, capacity, experience and staff competent in subsidy management in place. Also, FPK has equally explicitly committed to a performing arts offer that is both versatile and of high-quality (FPK, 2020, 2), noting that the great artistic diversity rising from the field of both institutional and independent creators and artists contributes to a cultural offer that reaches and touches as many different people as possible (*ibid*). The policy plan specifically mentions "pop music" which the Fund understands as including the full breadth of "popular" music genres and styles, from rock and hip-hop to singer-songwriter and dance music (*ibid*, 19).

And it's not only rhetoric, as an interviewee puts it, "in the 1980-ies … there was a clear wall between subsidised and non-subsidised parts of music scenes. I think that we couldn't say now that pop music was not part of the Performing Arts concept." (NL6). The overall logic of the fund's policy toolkit is mostly a functional and transversal one: the whole field is viewed as an ecosystem with a "value chain" logic – there are programmes for creators, producers, presenters, etc. Many of these programmes are not genre or scene specific. However, when certain scenes are felt to be in need of specific targeted instruments, special programmes are designed (i.e Upstream: Music).

On the other hand, there are several critical points to take note of, as perceived by the interviewees. Firstly, when looking at the actual funding allocations in the FPK programmes, then in music, a genre/scene bias is still visible and most of the funding is awarded to applicants representing traditionally subsidised music scenes (classical and jazz music mostly) (NL10, NL2). Secondly, the committee guidelines stress artistic quality in the criteria. As most of the committee members come from traditionally subsidised scenes and have a specific understanding of artistic quality, they tend to direct the allocation decisions towards those areas they see as artistically sophisticated and of high quality. An implicit "undercurrent" of the "high arts" value

attitude can still be felt even if not used in the actual language anymore (NL8). For example, if a hip hop artist is competing for the same funding with a classical violinist and the criteria is focused on the excellence of musicianship and virtuosity, then this doesn't really work for the hip hop artist (NL5).

Inclusivity towards new forms of artistic expression is not only "letting people in", but also making sure that the institutional and organisational arrangements fit these new forms (NL8). The programmes have to be described in a way and in a language that the artists and creators recognise as directed to them (NL10). If the application forms require input in a certain language or structure that is alien to applicants, they will either have to adapt artificially their mode of expression to fit the "language" of the programme or face lower odds of winning a grant. (NL9, NL8).

Finally, it's unclear to what degree for example pop music specific needs can and should be incorporated in the general performing arts concept, which has its roots in the 19th century understanding of the arts and will always thus maintain a structural bias (NL2). "I'm not sure pop music wants to push itself into the template of the performing arts. It can be a straight jacket, a double edged sword" (NL5).

The need for a revision of music sector policy was also recommended by the RvC in their report De balans, de behoefte (2017, 7).

While making critical remarks about the current[13] (2021) state of affairs, most of the interviewees felt things are changing, albeit slow (NL4, NL, NL5, NL, 10, NL2, NL9). Also, many noted the need for a more concentrated efforts by those new to the system and the need to educate them to better be able to navigate a system of grant application and simply write better applications (NL10, NL4).

3.2.3. Constructing the "pop music sector"

Due to the several perceived difficulties outlined above of achieving the inclusive policy goals in practice, but also for other reasons, there is an alternative discourse in the making – that of the "pop music sector".

The need to build a more unified sector image and structure for "pop" music is likely stemming from the view that the "classical" music sector is perceived to dominate the cultural policy

---

[13] The interviews were conducted in late 2021.

resources, even if not anymore the institutional discourse of policy goals and language. "The classical music sector has a very strong lobby. A director of a classical concert hall or a symphony orchestra can call directly to the minister. We cannot. And that is because classical music is still so important, because it's called high art and so on" (NL3).

There are several perceived needs to form a more united front. "Pop" music has a deep-seated public image problem when it comes to cultural policy. It is often still connected to being "low art", artistically less sophisticated, commercial and therefore having enough resources from the market alone, and less educated, that is pop musicians don't (supposedly) need long training, higher music education nor to be virtuosos with excellent instrumental skills, etc. Such views are perceived to be held by many ordinary citizens, perpetuated in the media and also by some politicians. Famously, a Dutch politician quipped that "pop" comes from "popular" and thus can rely entirely on the market and doesn't need government subsidy (Kwint, 2021, 3).

"It's hard for some people to believe that the girl with the guitar or the producer with her software also needs some form of government support to develop her art as an art, and not only the boy with the violin or the symphony conductor (NL7)". Another described an ordinary attitude towards pop music as culture: "... so theatre, dance, classical music – yes, that's what people call culture. Pop music? Hmm. You mean, those kids hanging out in a club somewhere? Drinking too much, making nasty music? Do you think that's really culture?" (NL3).

The many actors connected to "pop music sector" in various ways need a more organised way to come together, identify common interests and articulate common positions for, among other reasons, political lobby. They also have varied links to and influence with policy makers, but as long as the agenda is not harmonised, the effect will always be weaker. There is a perceived need for a united front that can align behind certain key messages and thus increase the impact. It has been noted that in the past audience with politicians and policy makers was regularly achieved, but the messages delivered were not coherent, essentially the policy makers on the other side of the table were not always able to understand what is being asked of them (NL3).

In addition to the needs, there are several fairly clear value offers that can be attributed to the "pop music sector". Firstly, while "commerciality" can have a negative connotation in an artistic quality discourse, the commercial potential can project an equally positive image in the alternative discourse of creative industries. Especially the Dutch electronic dance music, or EDM, has much to show for it and can present a clear case for a wider sector. This has been

pitched for a long time by the recorded music industry, seeking less government subsidy per se, rather tax exemptions and investment opportunities (NL1). It has also been noticed by politicians, especially in the international dimension – often when a high level Dutch political delegation dispatches, a world famous Dutch DJ might do an appearance showcasing the economic prowess of Dutch creative industries (NL1, NL3).

Secondly, the "pop music sector" through all its genres and scenes is a living example of the inclusivity and diversity sought for in the cultural policy goals. "We have the knowledge, everyone could learn from us. Look at our festivals – without subsidy, we can be inclusive and diverse. It's an important point we got across the table and with the politicians these are important things.." (NL8). Pop music (in its broadest sense) has all the audiences otherwise missing from the subsidised music offer and is thus needed to fulfil the mission of national cultural policy.

In 2014 Pop Coalition (*Popcoalitie*) was created[14] to unite *ca* 15 very different organisations, all somehow connected to the "pop music sector", including trade associations and unions such as VNPF, but also companies (Spotify, Mojo, etc.), festivals (ESNS), etc. For the first two years the coalition had a chairperson who actively organised and structured the agenda, including managing to set up regular meetings with policy makers (NL8). However, after two years, she didn't extend her position and currently no chairperson or coordinator is employed. During the first years the coalition managed to draw up a 10 point plan, publish letters and policy commentary[15], participate in debates and make themselves – and the "pop music sector" as an idea – visible.

There are other initiatives that have helped to solidify the "pop music sector" discourse in their own ways. Firstly, there are two editions of "The Value of Pop" (Zoutman & de Groot, 2013; Van Vugt, 2018), comprehensive sector overview created by VNPF and POPnl and aimed at municipal governments and cities to explain how pop music is much more than a cultural phenomenon and how having festivals, venues and a vibrant music life generates other values, both economical and social, as well (Zoutman & de Groot, 2013, 7-10). Another very high level

---

[14] Pop Coalition was soon followed up by two other coalitions: the Classical Music Coalition and the Jazz, World and Contemporary Music Coalitions. The first exists, but is not really active (NL11), the second seems not to have survived after initial launch. There is no website nor scarcely any other information or activity to be found after a few panels and announcements of the launch.

[15] For example a public response to the cultural policy guidelines 2021-2024 noting several bottlenecks and gaps in the policy designs disregarding the needs of the pop music sector (Pop Coalition, 2020).

document issued was a report "Forward! SP Plan for a Healthy Pop Sector". A memorandum written by an MP Peter Kwint and aiming to explore the pop sector in all its breadth (2021, 4). The report praises the pop music sector for the many values already mentioned – its diversity, accessibility and inclusion, its economic potential and social significance, but also highlights the vulnerability of the infrastructure that often remains hidden from the public – and the politician's – eye. The report presents a list of recommendations for the parliament to discuss and in general continues the effort to give the sector a distinct face (*ibid*, 3).

Most interviewees agree that something like the Pop Coalition is needed and uniting different actors behind a single front carries potential. However, most also note that there are problems with the initiative. Firstly, the coalition can only act upon reaching a unanimous agreement on an issue. Given the diverse profiles of the participants, who in other situations regularly find themselves on different sides of the negotiating tables, this is likely to happen only rarely. This holds the coalition back. (NL3, NL5, NL8, NL2).

The initial 10 point plan wasn't followed up with any significant political action (NL8) and while it is easy to point out imbalances in the public funding and ask for more money, agreeing on actual policy solutions on how to allocate it further in effective ways is a different thing entirely (NL5, NL10). After the initial chairperson left, the coalition has seemingly not been able to mobilise sufficient resources to hire a new person[16]. To many interviewees this reflects a weak actual commitment by the members (NL2, NL8, NL10).

In summary, there are signs that the efforts of the Pop Coalition and other initiatives have raised awareness of "the pop sector" as somehow a unified sector of cultural and economic activity. While the communication front has been successful, the followup of actual organised steps, actionable plans and sustained targeted activities have remained modest.

3.3. Policy consistency

In terms of <u>internal consistency</u> between policy goals and the instruments chosen for them, the following analysis can be provided. Compared to the stated cultural policy goals, the BIS is still too restrictive in its designs and categories and does not support the diversity and inclusivity aimed for in the policy rhetoric. It is not clear why minister van Engelshoven decided to ignore

---

[16] The current Popcoalitie website notes a management of four people, but no full capacity director. It is unclear what the current status is as of the writing (2022). More info: https://www.popcoalitie.nl/contact/

RvC recommendations to broaden the categories of the organisations that can apply for funding. For example, RvC suggested creating a "music" category instead of "symphony orchestra" and "ensembles, choirs" categories, as these are too classical music centric. In the current cycle, one pop group De Staat managed to get a subsidy from the BIS. This was welcomed on the one hand as a sign of diversity, yet on the other hand it sits oddly in the current design of the BIS and can thus increase confusion around who should apply to where and on which terms (NL6, NL7).

In terms of <u>vertical consistency</u>, there are several important gaps in the actual implementation of the policy goals.

Firstly, due to the remaining restrictions in the BIS, the allocation of the structural funding looks bleak to the "pop music sector". In an open letter, VNPF summarises the allocations and notes that from the BIS allocations, *ca* 0.15% of the performing arts budget went to "pop" music whereas 61% went to so-called classical music (Schans, 2021, 2). The result is all the more frustrating given that the minister decided to move a portion of funds from the FPK (which is more open to genre diversity) into the BIS in the name of diversity. A move that was critically noted already in the brief reaction to earlier OCW policy guidelines from the Pop Coalition (Popcoalitie, 2019).

Secondly, given that the main mechanism to allocate funds are expert advisory committees who have to review the applications and interpret the programme guidelines to evaluate them, it can be argued that the experts in these committees actually make a good deal of the cultural policy with their decisions. As noted in several interviews, it is not easy to get experts into these committees even if there are openings. Also it is then the "job" of this one "new genre" expert to try to explain the specificities of new applicants. A task extra difficult if the programme goals and guidelines are still reflecting an older more narrow "performing arts" mindset.

Finally, in order to achieve change towards the desired diversity and inclusivity several elements have to change in step and this is not easy to orchestrate: the programmes must be made suitable for a more diverse pool of applicants, from the language use they are described with to the criteria ascribed in the guidelines for the experts; new genre experts need to be found and to a degree educated (partly through experience); the "older" committee members also need to be educated in terms of the new genres they will be evaluating.

In summary, the Netherlands cultural policy system, faults aside, is well organised. An important value is the relatively high transparency of the system: The official communication between the

RvC and the minister (requesting advice and receiving it, etc.) is public. Also, in addition to the necessarily broad cultural policy goals, there is a clear public overview of the instruments designed and also the decisions are commented publicly (for example in the RvC advice on the BIS). RvC and FPK both have clear policy documents, work programmes and self-evaluation documentation publicly available. There is comparatively extensive sector research done by both organisations.

4. EMPIRICAL CASE STUDIES: LATVIA

4.1 The cultural and music policy subsystem in Latvia

An indirect legal basis for public cultural policy in Latvia could be derived from the preamble of the Constitution which talks about the "Latvian and Liv traditions, Latvian folk wisdom, the Latvian language, universal human and Christian values", etc. (Tjarve, 2019, 37). Direct legal basis is derived from the "Regulations of the Ministry of Culture" which stipulates that the ministry is responsible for developing cultural policy and organising the implementation of it, among other things (Kultūras ministrijas nolikums, 241, art 4.1, 4.2).

4.1.1. Policy actors

Cultural policy is in the remit of the **Latvian Ministry of Culture** (KM) which "plays the most important role in the development of cultural policy and financing national art and culture institutions, and particularly taking responsibility about professional art" (Tjarve, 2019, 7). For the music sector, both arts and creative industries departments of the ministry are relevant, as "academic" (or "classical") music is considered as part of the first and "popular" music is currently seen as belonging to the creative industries (LV9).

To improve social dialogue with the cultural sectors the ministry can establish councils and working groups and for the music sector the most important official advisory body is the **Latvian Music Council** (LMC)[17]. The LMC consists of music sector representatives, mostly associated with the "classical" music organisations (LV7, LV9, LV1, LV6). According to the LMC regulation, the main role of the council is to cooperate with various partners to develop the sector strategy for "art" music, give feedback to policy planning, raise pertinent issues and make proposals that are shaped and informed by sector specific expertise (KM, 2014). For the ministry one of their main roles is to provide expert input into making the 7-year culture strategy (LV6). In addition, a **popular music working group** is working under the coordination of the creative industries department of the ministry and an **events producers' working group** that also includes concert and festival organisers (LV8).

While some key cultural institutions receive direct subsidy from the ministry (see next paragraph), funding to the sector through grant programmes has been delegated to the **State**

---

[17] Not to be confused with the Latvian National Music Council, a non-governmental non-profit organisation.

Culture Capital Foundation (KKF), an arm's-length body, operating since 1998 (Tjarve, 2019, 5). KKF is, thus, the main policy instrument to support and stimulate the non-governmental and private sector to contribute to cultural policy goals.

Among the **music sector actors** are important the state funded private companies[18], such as the Latvian National Opera and Ballet[19], Latvijas Concerti, Latvian National Symphony Orchestra, Liepāja Symphony Orchestra, etc. Other organisations include the collective management organisations **AKKA/LAA** and **LAiPA**, **Music Export Latvia, Self-employed musicians association** and **The Latvian National Music Council**.

4.1.2. Policy process

A cultural strategy, essentially cultural policy guidelines, is created by the ministry for a seven year period. The previous strategy was "Creative Latvia" for 2014-2020 and the current one is "Cultural State" for 2022-2027. The period matches the main government strategy, the National Development Plan of Latvia 2021-2027 which serves as an important framework for the cultural strategy, along with the current government coalition agreement (LV6).

Sector strategies are created next to the general policy guidelines by the sector councils. In the music sector, the LMC is tasked with working on the music sector strategy together with the ministry. Historically, from the ministries point of view, the music sector has in practice meant "academic" or "classical" music, more recently also jazz (LV6). In the light of the recent initiative to also bring "popular" music into the music policy remit of the ministry, a separate sector strategy for the popular music is also being prepared (KM, 2022a, 21). The sector strategies are also updated after a few years to reflect actual developments in the field (LV9).

The sector councils and working groups serve as sounding boards for the ministry on an ongoing basis and also as channels to raise urgent issues. As confirmed by several interviews, the ministry is open and might be able to flexibly respond to *ad hoc* issues, even sometimes managing to secure extra funding from the government within the budget year. Such flexibility is both possible and necessary as the cultural strategy is quite broad and general (LV6, LV9).

---

[18] These are limited liability companies where the Latvian state isthe 100% shareholder.
[19] The Latvian National Opera and Ballet operates under specific law. More info: https://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=63108

4.2. Main ideas and discourses

4.2.1. The discourse of national cultural policy

On the most general level of national strategic planning, culture is mainly mentioned as part of Latvian identity and way of life (Latvijas Republikas Satversme, 1922), Latvian language, cultural and spiritual values (PKC, 2020, 5). Culture is broadly and in a similar vein considered in the coalition agreement: "investment in culture will strengthen Latvia as a superstate of culture and boost its visibility and reputation" (KM, 2020, 12). The main channel for the national cultural policy discourse, the cultural strategy "Cultural State" aligns its main goal with the national development plan, aiming to ensure sustainable and publicly available culture for the growth and development of the people and the nation state (KM, 2022a, 6). The strategy identifies the following principles that are transversal and not sector specific: "cultural offer available to the public, active public participation in cultural processes, preservation and creative use of cultural heritage, as well as the generation of talent and the professional development of cultural workers" (Cane & Steinbergs, 2022, 427).

Important recurring themes in the strategy are accessibility to culture so that everyone can enjoy a rich cultural offer, regardless of where they live, how old they are and how much income they earn (KM, 2022a, 6). This is naturally matched by a concern towards the diversity and quality of that cultural offer (*ibid*, 23). Here, the issues "related to the cultural infrastructure and material and technical base, opportunities to work professionally in the field of culture, receiving equal and competitive remuneration for equivalent work, as well as supporting the availability of tools for specific cultural sub-sectors, types of cultural organizations" (Cane & Steinbergs, 2022, 427) matter. Finally, the economic value of cultural and creative industries is always connected to its export potential and the international visibility and competitiveness of Latvian culture (KM, 2022a, 50).

The main logic of policy intervention to achieve these goals is through tackling specific market failures with public subsidies, whether through direct financing of institutions, or through project funding (via KKF) (LV9, LV6, LV7).

The cultural strategy comes with a glossary where key concepts have been explained, giving insights into the conceptual groundwork of culture in the dominant national cultural policy discourse. "Culture" is defined broadly as a set of specific "spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional characteristics" that are manifest in the creative expressions of the people and

reflected more broadly in the ways of life, value systems, traditions and beliefs (KM, 2022b, 1). A system of relations is developed in the glossary between actors, processes are results in the "cultural and creative industries", defined as areas of human activity with cultural heritage, cultural goods and services and expressions of individual and collective creativity are the basic resources used (*ibid*, 2). More specifically, "creative persons" and "cultural organisations" engage in "cultural processes" which result in "cultural values", defined as artistic, industrial or artisanal creative activities which produce, in addition to their potential commercial value, also symbolic meaning and cultural value (*ibid*, 1-3). It is important to note that "creative persons" can be authors or performers who usually are assumed to have appropriate education and skills needed to do them, and are able to earn an income as well (*ibid*). Finally, "professional art" is referred to as cultural processes that result in the cultural offer available to the public, created by cultural organisations and creative persons. As can be seen from below sections, the issue of who is a "professional" creator or artist and what is "professional" art is at the heart of debates and discussions.

4.2.2. The dominant music policy discourse

As the cultural policy goals and priorities are defined broadly, it will remain for the new "music" and "popular music" strategies to interpret and specify how exactly these translate into music policy implementation and discourse. As of the writing in December 2022 both sector strategies are still in the making.

In the previous "Music Sector Strategy for 2015-2020", which is the sectoral planning document for the Latvian state cultural policy for 2014–2020 "Creative Latvia" (KM, 2018, 3), the scope of national music policy has been defined through consistent use of the terms "professional" and/or "art" music in "all its forms" (*ibid*). In setting its own priorities, the strategy is following the general priorities of "Creative Latvia"[20], laying out music-specific goals and recommendations for activities, across all themes, from participation and access to music culture, cultivating education, creativity and competitiveness, etc.

As confirmed by the all the interviews, a context-aware reading of the strategy reveals, that what is implicitly assumed to be the scope of "professional" and/or "art" music, is essentially the

---

[20] These are: "Preservation and development of cultural capital through public participation in cultural processes", "Creativity in lifelong learning and labor market-oriented cultural education", "Competitive Culture and Creative Industries", "Accessibility of Creative Territories and Cultural Services" (KM, 2018, 12).

"Western classical" or "academic" music with perhaps jazz music also now considered as part of the latter term.

Everything outside of the scope of "professional art" music is widely considered to be "popular" music and in the cultural policy period 2014-2020 connected with the creative industries concept and department in the ministry. While "professional art" music is viewed as having cultural and educational value and thus in need of public subsidy regardless of its market performance, "popular" music is mainly viewed as having commercial potential, suitably aligned with the overall notion of the creative industries policy orientation (LV1, LV9, LV7). While in the new strategy and period, the sharp distinction between the "arts" and creative industries has been rolled back, using the all-encompassing term "cultural and creative industries", the two music strategies in the works still reflect this legacy differentiation with the "music" strategy being developed by the LMC and *de facto* focused on "academic" music and the "popular" music strategy being developed in the creative industries department (LV7).

4.2.3. The "professional" music and musician discourse

As is evident from the interviews, there is a dominant discourse around distinct views on what constitutes a "professional" musician and "art" in music: "professional" music is equated with "Western classical" music, higher "academic" music education and the relevant institutional landscape.

For some interviewees this constitutes a non-problematic and widely accepted state of affairs that is grounded in both historical traditions and universal values related to music:

"...they need to keep the national values, this is the aim of government. It means they need to take care of national music, like the National Symphony Orchestra, the National Opera and so on. It's why always from government point of view it will be a priority." (LV2)

"... the classical music for our country is not only for the leisure time, it is very related to our national identity. ...[C]lassical music and jazz is … professional music because it is impossible to be a good jazz musician without a background of music education. ... [commercial music] is for this moment, but not permanent. But that is the main main purpose of classical music – to keep those genres and styles through the times". (LV10)

"[C]hoirs or orchestras are professional institutions in the sense that [the musicians working there] are educated. And they are professional also in the sense that they have stable [public]

financing. … Of course, excellence comes thanks to this professionalism. I cannot imagine excellence provided without professionalism, and this means education". (LV4)

Others agree that this is a dominant view institutionalised on a high level (in the LMC and the music strategy), however, they feel that it is unfair, simplistic, outdated and needs to be changed:

"Nowadays, we have so many young musicians who did their studies abroad. … Is he considered professional [if he then] plays with the hip hop artists? ... those lines are very blurred". (LV11, LV13)

"[P]rofessional musicians have been considered only the ones to have finished a conservatory. And that's it. So they basically have a legitimate musical background and they work either in opera or in an orchestra. ... a good example here is the band Instrumenti, they have the same educational background, but they aren't perceived as professional musicians, meanwhile, that's the only thing they do. And they earn all of their income only by producing music, doing shows, creating songs, etc." [LV8]

"from the academic music side, they [talk about] education, quality, and etc. [With] popular music, [they are] speaking about profit, about money, export, and music business" [LV3]

"[T]he argument is that academic music should be supported because it educates people. It should educate society, give society good cultural values. And that's why we should support academic music. With non-professional [popular] music the view is that if they can't sell themselves, they they are not good enough. (LV1)

The issue of defining exactly who is a "professional" musician and what kind of music can be considered "professional art" music is not merely a semantic argument and has potentially important implications for those involved. For example:

"The Law on the Status of Creative Persons and Professional Creative Organizations" defines a "creative person" and specifies the terms and conditions of certain types of support available (Saeima, 2017, art.12 (1)), including that they contribute "to the development of professional art and culture with his creative activity" (*ibid*, section 3). Musicians working in other "non-academic" scenes might not qualify due to a view of that particular type of music not being viewed as "professional" by whoever decides on the application (LV11, LV13);

The experts in the music branch committee in KKF evaluate applications, among other criteria, based on the "professional" level of the applicant. In the past, this has entailed certain

applications getting negative responses not only due to a personal evaluation of the applicant's professionalism, but due to the fact that the whole genre or kind of music is viewed as not part of the "professional art" music scope (LV1, LV11, LV13).

4.2.4. The emerging alternative discourses

The perspective for a new "popular" music strategy laid out in the Cultural strategy has (at least seemingly) created a pathway for an emerging discourse around "popular music" as a sector with its own logic and legitimate cultural policy agenda. The views on this are mixed. On the one hand this presents a pragmatic path forward, one that would not be easy or possible through the LMC which is viewed to be dominated by "academic" music interests actively seeking to maintain this position (LV11, LV12, LV8, LV5, LV13). On the other hand, some feel that ultimately there should be one music strategy that has a broad view on the sector (LV11, LV13).

While there is much criticism on the "professional vs popular music" binary view, all the interviewees use the language of "two sides", the "academic and popular music side", etc. – indicating how deep these dichotomies run and how the ambitions to reshape the music sector discourse are still very much emerging and seeking alternative concepts and logics of classification. However, among those critical of the currently dominant discourse, there are attempts to challenge the traditional links between characteristics, asserting for example, that (i) academic education shouldn't be a necessary prerequisite of professionalism (LV11); (ii) "Western classical" music shouldn't have an exceptional status in the context of Latvian national music culture (LV3); (iii) "popular" music is not only nor essentially commercial, rather has it's own artistic value (LV11, LV13); and (iv) if other sectors besides "classical" music would be invested into, we would see more high level success stories there as well (LV3).

While there could be several ways to argue for the value of a wider scope of music policy, one line of reasoning stands out: the economic potential of the music sector for cultural policy that is perceived to have been overlooked so far. Cultural policy field, especially due to the traditionally narrow focus on non-profit organisations and heritage (which includes "classical" music as well) institutions, is viewed as essentially a spending ministry, a field that is "kind of fancy, artsy, but just spending money and drinking wine in the evening" (LV8). This view became especially clear during the COVID crisis when the cultural minister was perceived to lack sufficient political power to secure enough funds for wider support to the cultural sectors. This image could be changed by showing how the music sector – in a wider definition and including also

private actors – also earns revenue from the markets, creates jobs, all the while producing artists, music and events that cater to a wide segment of the population (thus culturally relevant).

4.3. Policy consistency

When assessing policy consistency based on the previous cultural and music strategies and actual implementation through direct ministry subsidies and KKF programmes, it comes down to interpreting the scope of the term "professional music". If the scope is narrow and focuses on the "academic" and "professional" music – which, as explained above, is implicitly the case – then the policy could be argued to be very consistent. The consistency of the new cultural strategy cannot yet be determined as the music strategies have not been finalised.

Even so, there are two aspect having an important bearing on the policy consistency: Firstly, the ministry of culture is generally responsive to direct needs and can sometimes mobilise resources also on an *ad hoc* basis. This can be valuable for the sector, but also weaken the consistency between strategies and implementation. Secondly, the general language of the cultural strategies does not give enough guidance for the implementation level, for example for the KKF to organise their programmes. Thus, the experts in the KKF committees are fairly free to interpret the framework of funding decisions based on their implicit ideas (i.e what is "professional art", etc.). This is potentially a significant consistency gap.

In summary, the Latvian cultural policy has perhaps not been in Pirnes' trap in the past due to narrow and traditional policy focus and concept of culture. Whether there will be consistency problems in the near future depends on the new music sector strategies.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Main ideas in music policy discourses

RQ1: What are the main ideas in emerging and dominant music policy discourses?

The main ideas shaping music policy discourses, as evidenced by the case studies, reflect the concepts of music as "art" or more broadly "culture", which in turn contain, either implicitly or explicitly, legacy dichotomies, such as "art" vs "entertainment", "classical" vs "popular" kinds of music, "professional" vs "non-professional" ways of music making, non-profit vs for-profit modes of operation and artistic excellence vs commercial intent.

The music policy discourse in the Netherlands as expressed in official policy documents reflects a recognition of the diversity of musical scenes and styles and the need to have a policy that caters to all these in appropriate ways. Furthermore, there is a clear drive on the RvC level to realise the broader vision of music policy articulated in their 2017 report, considered very progressive by most interviewees. This vision largely rejects all the traditional binary views affording a privileged cultural policy status to "art" or "classical" music and seeks to value every music scene in its own terms.

In Latvia, the dominant music policy discourse as expressed in the previous music sector strategy by the LMC, is more traditional and reflects the dichotomous concept of music as split into "professional art" music and "commercial" "non-professional" music. The exclusive and direct links between "Western classical" music, higher education, artistic excellence and professionalism are implicit in the strategy, but clearly felt and expressed by all the interviewees. The most crucial issue revolves around defining who is a "professional" musician and what is "professional" music. The new cultural strategy made for 2022-27 is broad and could allow for a widening of the music policy discourse. However, by foreseeing two sector strategies (for "music" and "popular music") it might also perpetuate the binary concepts of music as "art"/culture vs "popular" music as commercial entertainment.

Another set of ideas is reflected in the logics following which the music sector organise into discourse coalitions. These might be according to the legacy categories of "arts" and "popular" musics, music genres and scenes (i.e "jazz music sector"), functional segments (i.e authors, performers, venues, etc.), or industry sectors (i.e live or recorded music sector, etc.).

5.2. Main forms of discursive interactions

RQ2: What forms do the discursive interactions to shape music policy making take?

The most visible forms of written documents reflecting discourses are cultural and music sector strategies in Latvia and cultural policy guidelines, funding recommendations (for BIS), sector reports (i.e RvC 2017) in the Netherlands. In the latter, various forms of other reports are visible as well, such as "Forward!" by MP Peter Kwint (2021) reaffirming the "pop music sector" discourse within the Parliament.

The most important formal venues for discursive interactions are the Council of Culture (RvC) in the Netherlands and the Latvian Music Council (LMC) in Latvia. These provide official advice to the ministry and represent sector expertise. Similar in the function, these bodies are very different in weight. RvC in the Netherlands is a well resourced organisations with a staff and a large pool of paid experts organised into committees. RvC has the capacity to conduct research, monitor funded organisations and write detailed funding recommendations for the ministry. LMC is a group of sector representatives working on a voluntary basis and mostly reacting to issues or questions put forth by the ministry. There is no budget for research or knowledge development. Also, LMC has no direct bearing on the funding decisions by the ministry of the sector institutions and there is no structural way for a new organisation to be included in the direct ministry funding line via an open application process as would be possible via BIS in the Netherlands.

Other important venues for discourse are the expert committees in the funds (FPK and KKF). While there are guidelines for funding decisions in both, the experts have a wide scope of discretion to interpret them when evaluating the applications. Thus, it is possible that the expert committee members can effectively shape their own music policy that might not be aligned with the higher level government policy.

Finally, there are other discursive interactions possible. In the Netherlands, it is possible to directly raise issues through the parliament and/or using public media as a support. In Latvia, the ministry is flexible and responsive to the issues raised by the sector actors and might secure *ad hoc* funding from the government above and beyond the yearly budget.

5.3. Policy consistency

RQ3: To what degree is there internal and vertical policy consistency in the music policy making?

In the Netherlands there is a perceived lack of consistency between the highly inclusive policy agenda and the actual decisions and funding allocations (see 3.3). Also, while the policy language is very inclusive, there are less visible structural factors reflecting narrower concepts and criteria. For example, the music categories in the BIS are still "symphony orchestras" and "ensembles" and thus the committees in the RvC evaluating these applications are still mostly populated with people from these types of organisations. Furthermore, many experts in the committees, both in RvC and FPK, are noted to be from "classical" music field and sometimes lack knowledge and appreciation to less "classical" music scenes leading to inherently biased decision making. Finally, even the language of the programmes documents, i.e explanations to application forms, sometimes contain hidden structural bias towards certain types of applicants and not others. Still, the consistency gap is perceived as not structural, but rather a time lag with slow but positive improvements ongoing.

In Latvia, based on the previous cultural and music sector strategy, there is no particular policy consistency gap as the policy discourse is largely reflecting and describing the *de facto* narrow music policy of long-term *status quo*. Such a gap might open as and when the new two strategies are finalised and especially the "popular" music strategy might necessitate changes in policy designs on all levels, most importantly in the KKF fund programmes and guidelines. Until then, however, the policy system remains in a structurally fairly closed loop as the main consultative body, the LMC, is populated largely by experts representing the traditionally narrow music policy discourse and having no logical incentive to change it, are perceived as perpetuating it through the music sector strategy.

In summary, the Netherlands music policy seems to be still in the Pirnes' trap, but might be closing the gap in the near future. Latvia has not yet entered it, but might do so soon, depending on the two music sector strategies.

CONCLUSION

This thesis builds from the discursive institutionalist premise that ideas and discourse matter in policy making (Schmidt, 2002b, 190) and analyses the perceived policy consistency gap in contemporary cultural policy making (Pirnes, 2009, 155). More precisely, the focus was set on music policy making in two countries – the Netherlands and Latvia, representing cultural policy making in Western and Eastern European countries. The main research question "How do ideas and discourse shape music policy?" led to three sub-questions: (i) what are the main ideas in emerging and dominant music policy discourses?; (ii) what forms do the discursive interactions to shape music policy making take?; and (iii) to what degree is there internal and vertical policy consistency in the music policy making? The main findings can be summarised as follows.

Firstly, there are certain foundational concepts, such as what is "culture" or "art" music, and deeply ingrained dichotomies, such as "art" vs "commercial", "classical" vs "popular", etc., that have some influence on how cultural policy rationales are articulated and policy instruments are designed. Thus, these concepts and classifications function as political ideologies or philosophies, comparable to Schmidt's and Mehta's third level of ideas (Schmidt, 2008, 306-307; Mehta's 2011, 27). And, as can be seen to some degree in both cases, these concepts function as socially shared background knowledge that many take for granted.

Secondly, the main forms and venues for discursive interactions between policy actors are national cultural policy strategies, constituting the dominant institutional discourse of cultural policy. In addition, high level advisory bodies, such as Council of Culture in the Netherlands and Latvian Music Council, provide sector representatives a venue to wield significant influence over the shaping of cultural strategies. Another important venue are the expert committees of arm's length bodies where the experts have high levels of discretion to make funding decisions and thus implement cultural policy. Finally, non-governmental music policy actors seek other ways to highlight issues politically and publicly (i.e Kwint's report "Forward!" Presented in the Parliament) or then directly through the ministry (i.e KM's flexible responsiveness to sector actors' issues).

Thirdly, there is a perceived policy consistency gap in the Netherlands where the broad cultural policy aims are not met in implementation. Still, this gap is not perceived to be structural, but rather reflects a time lag between policy development in rhetorics and implementation. In Latvia,

the previous music sector policy is perceived as narrowly focused, representing an "academic" music centric policy rationale and traditional institutional settings. The strategy reflects actual funding logic well and is thus internally and vertically consistent. Yet, with two new music sector strategies in the making, music policy might have to open up to new actors, adding to the pressures of current funding and other arrangements. Policy consistency is a good framework for analysing to what degree policy discourse is actually carried out in practice.

By identifying some of the main foundational concepts and classification systems, and forms of discursive interactions specific to music, or more broadly cultural policy making, the thesis has contributed to a research gap in music policy analysis from the discursive institutionalist perspective. It has also laid the groundwork for future research in several directions.

Further research could conduct in-depth case studies on some of the foundational concepts and dichotomies, mapping how different actors in a music policy subsystems articulate these concepts and to what degree these are articulated (vs left tacit) in music policy discourses. In addition, further case studies could look into how music policy actors discursively construct "sectors" around various concepts, such as genre, music scene, or a "kind" of music – as can be seen in the Netherlands with the "pop music sector" example; and how these discursive constructions are translated into policy rationales and proposals for instruments.

One of the venues most open to discursive interactions are expert committees, especially in arm's length bodies, or advisory councils. The very need of an expert committee for certain decisions marks the highly contextual and qualitative nature of the decisions (otherwise such a body could be substituted by a regulation). As is visible from the case studies, experts can remain independent of the general cultural policy and rely on their personal ideas, beliefs and values. This is a strength and a design element of these committees. But it can also serve as a policy consistency gap where such committees do not follow the overall policy goals, but the idiosyncratic views of its members for decisions. It can thus be asserted that to an important degree such committees implement their own music policy.

Further research could take into focus the functioning of such committees and aim to analyse what kind of ideas and concepts shape policy strategy making or funding allocation through decisions and how these discursive interactions play out in practice.

KOKKUVÕTE

Poliitikakujundamise kõla: kuidas ideed ja diskursus mõjutavad muusikapoliitikate kujundamist

Kaasaegne kultuuripoliitika on mõningatel hinnangutel oma eesmärkide seadmisel ja poliitikainstrumentide kujundamisel teatud mõttemustrite ja toimimisloogika lõksus (Pirnes, 2009, 155). Traditsiooniline "kõrgkultuuri" keskne kultuuripoliitika (Hesmondhalgh, 2019, 176) on kaotamas legitiimsust (Bell & Oakley, 2019, 17–20,) ja võib märgata, et vähemasti retoorikas on kultuuripoliitikale seatud eesmärgid järjest laiahaardelisemad ja avatumad, nii teemade kui ka sihtgruppide lõikes. Samavõrra kiiresti ei näi aga arenevat poliitikate elluviimiseks tarvilikud poliitikainstrumendid ja üldine institutsionaalne keskkond (Pirnes, 2009, 155) ning seega ilmneb kultuuripoliitika diskursuse ja rakendamise vahel teatavaid erisusi.

Käesolev uurimus võtab lähtekohaks diskursiivse institutsionalismi teesi, et ideedel ja diskursustel, mille kaudu ideid väljendatakse ja neid diskursiivselt kujundatakse, võib poliitikate kujundamisele olla oluline mõju (Schmidt, 2002b, 190). Võttes fookusesse muusikapoliitika kujundamise Hollandis ja Lätis, on peamiseks uurimisküsimuseks: kuidas mõjutavad ideed ja diskursused muusikapoliitikate kujundamist? See on täiendavalt jagatud kolmeks alaküsimuseks: (i) millised on peamised ideed, mis muusikapoliitikate kujundamisel domineerivad?; (ii) milliseid vorme võtavad muusikapoliitikaid kujundavad diskursiivsed praktikad?; (iii) mil määral võib täheldada muusikapoliitikate sisemist ja vertikaalset kooskõlalisust?

Diskursiivsest institutsionalismist lähtuvalt analüüsib töö ühelt poolt ideede sisu ehk millised mõisted, kontseptsioonid, raamistused, uskumused, müüdid (Schmidt, 2008, 310; Hajer & Laws, 2008, 254-258) või ka kategoriseerimise loogikad (DiMaggio, 1987, 451) mängivad muusikapoliitikate kujundamisel olulist rolli. Näiteks, mida võivad erinevate osapoolte jaoks tähendada täiendavad määratlused "klassikaline", "populaarne", "professionaalne", "kommertsiaalne" jmt muusika ja kuidas need seostuvad poliitikate sekkumisloogika alustega. Lisaks ideedele on olulised ka diskursiivsed praktikad, mille kaudu ideid väljendatakse, kuid neid ka aktiivselt poliitikakujundamise protsessis kasutatakse (Schmidt, 2015, 171). See hõlmab nii kirjalikke dokumente, nt kultuuri- ja muusikastrateegiaid, kui ka erinevaid gruppe ja üksusi, kus kujundatakse eksperthinnanguid ja tehakse rahastusotsuseid.

Uurimus lähtub interpretatiivsest metodoloogiast ning peamised meetodid andmete kogumiseks on dokumentide analüüs ja poolstruktureeritud intervjuud. Kokku viidi läbi 24 intervjuud, Hollandis 11 ja Lätis 13.

Peamiste tulemustena võib esile tuua järgmised: Esiteks mängivad muusikapoliitikate kujundamisel olulist rolli väga üldised kontseptsioonid, nagu "kunsti" ja "kultuuri" määratlused (iseäranis poliitikakujunduslikust vaatest) ning traditsioonilised vastandused, nagu "klassikaline" vs "populaarne" muusika, "professionaalne" vs "mitteprofessionaalne" muusikaline tegevus või "kunstiline" ja "kommertsiaalne" või "meelelahutuslik" loometöö motivatsioon. Sääraste mõistete tähendusi ja tõlgendusi peetakse sageli iseenesestmõistetavaks, võttes neid üldkehtivatena, ehkki reaalsuses võivad need osapoolte vahel paljuski erineda.

Teiseks, olulisteks kultuuri- ja muusikapoliitika diskursuse kandjateks on ametlikud poliitilised strateegiad ja arengukavad, mis moodustavad n-ö dominantse diskursuse, kuna on kõrgel tasemel poliitiliselt legitimeeritud (nt kultuuriministeeriumite valdkondlikud strateegiad jmt). Neile lisaks on olulisteks diskursiivsete praktikate toimumispaikadeks erinevad nõukogud ja komisjonid, kuhu kaasatakse valdkondlikud eksperdid ning kellel on sealsete arutelude käigus võimalik muusikapoliitikate sisu ja teemade valikuid mõjutada või rahastusotsuseid teha. Hollandis on kõige olulisemateks Kultuurinõukogu (Raad voor Cultuur), ametlik kultuuriministeeriumi nõuandev üksus; ning Etenduskunstide fondi (Fonds Podiumkunsten) ekspertkomisjonid. Lätis kujundab muusikastrateegiat Läti Muusikanõukogu, valdkonna esindajatest ministeeriumis moodustatud üksus[21].

Kolmandaks, poliitikate kooskõlalisuse (*policy consistency*) analüüs tõi esile, et Hollandis võib märgata lünka muusika (ja laiemalt kultuuri-)poliitika väga selgelt väljendatud laiapõhjaliste ja kõiki sihtgruppe kaasavate eesmärkide (diskursuse) ning nende reaalse täideviimise vahel. Teatud valdkonna huvigruppide kriitika kohaselt eraldatakse kaasavast retoorikast hoolimata valdav osa rahalisi vahendeid kitsale, pigem traditsioonilistele, peamiselt "klassikalise" muusika esitamisele suunatud asutustele. Samas möönavad enamik intervjueeritutest, et ehkki muutused on aeglased, on need siiski toimumas ning seega pole rakenduslünk struktuurne, vaid pigem on tegemist ajalise lõtkuga eesmärkide seadmise ja nende elluviimise vahel. Läti senine muusikapoliitika on seevastu olnud traditsioonilise ja kitsamalt "kõrgkultuuri" fookusega, mis muusikas väljendub valdavalt n-ö Lääne "klassikalise" muusika viljelejatega, kelle seas domineerivad suured riigiasutused, nagu ooperiteater, sümfooniaorkester ning

---

[21] NB! Läti muusikanõukogu ei ole sama, mis eraõiguslik Läti Rahvuslik Muusikanõukogu.

kontserdikorraldaja Latvijas Koncerti. Seega on Läti muusikapoliitika eesmärgid ja elluviimine kooskõlas. See võib aga lähiajal muutuda, kuna uus kultuuristrateegia näeb esimest korda ette kahe muusikastrateegia loomise, millest teine keskendub "populaarse" muusika arendamisele. See võib tingida surve muuta ka reaalset poliitikat.

Edasised muusikapoliitika diskursiivse kujundamise analüüsid võiksid keskenduda viidatud alusmõistete täpsemale analüüsile. Samuti oleks kasulik tuua selgemalt esile alusloogikat, millele tuginedes muusikavaldkonna toimijad erinevaid diskursiivseid kogukondi moodustavad ning püüavad poliitikakujundamises teatud mõju saavutada. Kindlasti vääriksid täpsemat analüüsi erinevate nõuandvate ja rahastusotsusi langetavate ekspertkogude toimimised – mil määral on sealsetel liikmetel ruumi otsustamist ise diskursiivselt suunata ja põhjendada ning kui hästi on nende kogude tegevus vastavuses kõrgema taseme muusikapoliitika eesmärkide täideviimisega.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Alfaro, O. (2019). "Art music". In: Sturman, J. (Ed.). *The SAGE International Encyclopedia Of Music And Culture.* (Vols. 1-5). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483317731

Behr, A. (2015). "Cultural Policy and the Creative Industries". In (Ed.) Shepherd, J., Devine, K. (2015). *The Routledge Reader on the Sociology of Music*. (277-298). Routledge. New York.

Beland, D., & Cox, R. H. (2011). "Introduction: Ideas and Politics". In: Béland, D., Cox, R. H. *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. (3-20). Oxford University Press.

Bell, D., Oakley, K. (2015) *Cultural Policy*. Routledge. New York.

Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction Of Reality: A Treatise On The Sociology Of Knowledge*. Anchor. Garden City, NY.

Bradburn, N. M., Sudman, S., Wansink, B. (2004). *Asking Questions* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.

Brom, R. (2019). "Country profile: the Netherlands. Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends", *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends*, 20th edition 2019. Available under: ISSN: 2222-7334.

Cane, R., Steinbergs, K. (2022). "The role of digital transformation in creative industries companies in regions". In: Auzina, A. (Ed.). *Economic Science for Rural Development 2022. 23rd International Scientific Conference.* 11-13 May 2022, Jelgava, Latvia (424-434). Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies, Faculty of Economics and Social Development, Latvia.

Cairney, P. (2020). *Understanding Public Policy: Theories and Issues* (2nd ed). London: Red Globe Press.

Dawe, K. (2015). "The many worlds of popular music: ethnomusicological approaches". In: Bennett, A., Waksman, S. (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Popular Music*. SAGE Publications Ltd, https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473910362

DiMaggio, P. (1982). "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston, II: The Classification and Framing of American Art". *Media, Culture and Society* 4:303-22.

DiMaggio, P. (1987). "Classification in Art". *American Sociological Review*, *52* (4), 440–455. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095290

Fischer, F., Torgerson, D., Durnova, A., Orsini, M. (2015). "Introduction to critical policy studies". In: Fischer, F., Torgerson, D., Durnova, A., Orsini, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of critical policy studies*. Routledge. New York. 10.4337/9781783472352.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. (2006). "Five misunderstandings about case-study research". *Qualitative Inquiry*. 12. 219-245. 10.1177/1077800405284363.

FPK, Fonds Podiumkunsten. (2020). Bewegende contouren. Beleidsplan 2021-2024. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://fondspodiumkunsten.nl/content/nieuws/i_1051/Beleidsplan20212024.pdf

Furlong, P.,Marsh, D. (2010). "A skin not a sweater: ontology and epistemology in political science". *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. 10.1007/978-0-230-36664-0_10.

Gerring, J., Cojocaru, L. (2016). "Selecting cases for intensive analysis: a diversity of goals and methods". *Sociological Methods & Research*. 45. 10.1177/0049124116631692.

Johnson, G. (2002). *Research Methods for Public Administrators*: First Edition (1st ed.). Routledge. New York.

Hajer, M.A. (1995). *The Politics Of Environmental Discourse*. Oxford University Press: New York.

Hajer, M. A. (2006). "Doing discourse analysis: coalitions, practices, meaning". *Words Matter In Policy And Planning: Discourse Theory And Method In The Social Sciences*, 344: 65-74.

Hajer, M., Laws, D. (2008). "Ordering through discourse". In: Goodin, R., Moran, M., Rein, (M). (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. (2008; online edn, Oxford Academic, 2 Sept. 2009), https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199548453.003.0012

Hall, P.A., Taylor, R.C.R. (1996), "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms". *Political Studies*, 44: 936-957. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb00343.x

Hartley, J., Potts, J., Cunningham, S., Flew, T., Keane, M., & Banks, J. (2013). *Key concepts in creative industries*. SAGE Publications, Inc. London. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781526435965

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2018). *The cultural industries* (Fourth). SAGE Publications. London.

Homan, S., Cloonan, M., Cattermole, J. (2015). *Popular Music and Cultural Policy*. Routledge. New York.

Homan, S., Cloonan, M., Cattermole, J. (2016). *Popular Music industries and the State. Policy Notes*. Routledge. New York.

Homan, S. (2021). "Introduction: Situating popular music policy". In Homan, S. (ed). *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Popular Music Policy*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Hope, M., Raudla, R. (2012) "Discursive institutionalism and policy stasis in simple and compound polities: the cases of Estonian fiscal policy and United States climate change policy". *Policy Studies*, 33:5, 399-418, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2012.722286

Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., Perl, A., Xiol Y Ferreira, E. H. (Eds.). (2022). "Policy studies". In: *Dictionary of Public Policy*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. Cheltenham, UK.

Hughes, D., Evans, M., Morrow, G., Keith, S. (2016). *The New Music Industries. Disruption and Discovery*. Palgrave Macmillan. Cham.

Keller, M. (Ed.) (2019a). "Classical music". In: Sturman, J. (Ed.). *The SAGE International Encyclopedia Of Music And Culture*. (Vols. 1-5). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483317731

Keller, M. (Ed.) (2019b). "Music, definitions of". In: Sturman, J. (Ed.). *The SAGE International Encyclopedia Of Music And Culture*. (Vols. 1-5). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483317731

Kwint, P. (2021). "Naar vore! SP-plannen voor een gezonde popsector". Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.sp.nl/sites/default/files/popnota_naar_vore.pdf

Kultūras ministrijas nolikums, 2003. gada 29. aprīļa noteikumi Nr. 24

KM. Kultūras ministrija. (2014). Latvijas Müzikas padomes nolikums. Nr. 5.1.-4-. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.km.gov.lv/lv/padome-3

KM. Kultūras ministrija. (2018). "Muzikas Nozares strategija." Kultūrpolitikas pamatnostādnes 2014.-2020. gadam "Radošā Latvija" https://www.km.gov.lv/lv/media/162/download?attachment

KM. Kultūras ministrija. (29.10.2020). Declaration of the Intended Activities of the Cabinet of Ministers headed by Arturs Krišjānis Kariņš. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.km.gov.lv/en/declaration-government

KM. Kultūras ministrija. (2022a). "Pamatnostādnēs lietoto terminu skaidrojums" "Kultūrpolitikas pamatnostādnes 2022.–2027. gadam „Kultūrvalsts"".https://www.km.gov.lv/lv/media/22336/download?attachment

KM. Kultūras ministrija. (2022b). "Pamatnostādnēs lietoto terminu skaidrojums". 2 pielikums Kultūrpolitikas pamatnostādnēm 2022.-2027. gadam „Kultūrvalsts".https://www.km.gov.lv/lv/media/22342/download?attachment

Latvijas Republikas Satversme., 1922. gada 15. februāra kopsēdē pieņemtā.

Lewis, J., Miller, T. (2003) (eds). *Critical Cultural Policy Studies, A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mangset, P. (2020). "The end of cultural policy?". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 26:3, 398-411.

Martin, P. (2015). "Music and the sociological gaze". In: Shepherd, J., Devine, K. (Eds.). *The Routledge Reader on the Sociology of Music*. Routledge. New York.

Mehta, J. (2011). "The varied roles of ideas in politics: From "whether" to "how"". In: Béland, D., Cox, R. H. (Eds.). *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. (23-46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mulcahy, K. V. (2006). "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches". *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 35:4, 319-330.

Négrier, E. (2020). "Introduction". In: Dupin–Meynard, F., Négrier, E. (Eds.) *Cultural Policies in Europe: a Participatory Turn?* (11-29). Toulouse: Èdition de l'attribut.

O'Brien, D. (2014). *Cultural Policy: Management, Value and Modernity in the Creative Industries*. Routledge. New York.

OCW, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (2020). "Uitgangspunten Cultuurbeleid 2021-2024". Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://open.overheid.nl/repository/ronl-20e8457f-f019-40b4-a8d7-8a658fc59a9c/1/pdf/Uitgangspunten%20Nieuw%20Cultuurstelsel%20.pdf

Pal, L. (2014), *Beyond Policy Analysis – Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*. Fifth Edition, Nelson Education, Toronto

Pirnes, E. (2009). "Cultural policy in a sectoral trap – but how to escape it". *Nordic Journal of Cultural Policy*.

PKC, Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs (02.07.2020). Latvijas Nacionālais attīstības plāns 2021.–2027. gadam. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://pkc.gov.lv/lv/nap2027

Popcoalitie. (26.06.2019). Reactie Popcoalitie op alsnog verstrekte subsidies. Accessed in January 2022. (no longer available online).

RvC, Raad voor Cultuur. (2023). Over Ons. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.raadvoorcultuur.nl/over-ons

RvC, Raad voor Cultuur. (2017). De balans, de behoefte. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.raadvoorcultuur.nl/documenten/adviezen/2017/12/05/advies-de-balans-de-behoefte

RvC, Raad voor Cultuur. (2018). Cultuur dichtbij, dicht bij cultuur. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.raadvoorcultuur.nl/documenten/adviezen/2019/04/11/advies-cultuurbestel-2021-2024-cultuur-dichtbij-dicht-bij-cultuur

RvC, Raad voor Cultuur. (2022). Werkprogramma 2022-2023. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.raadvoorcultuur.nl/over-ons/werkprogramma-2021-2022

Regev, M. (2015). "Notes on Sociological Theory and Popular Music Studies". In: Bennett, A., & Waksman, S. (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of popular Music*. SAGE Publications Ltd, https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473910362

Saeima. (2017). Radošo personu statusa un profesionālo radošo organizāciju likums. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://likumi.lv/ta/id/295594

Schans, B. (23.06.2021). Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal. Ter attentie van de cultuurwoordvoerders per e-mail verzonden. Accessed in January 2022 (no longer available online).

Schmidt, V. A. (2002a). *The Futures of European Capitalism*. Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, V. A. (2002b). "Does discourse matter in the politics of welfare state adjustment?". *Comparative Political Studies* 35. 168-193. 10.1177/0010414002035002002.

Schmidt, V. A. (2008). "Discursive institutionalism: the explanatory power of ideas and discourse". *Annual Review of Political Science*. 11:303-326.

Schmidt, V. A. (2010). "Taking ideas and discourse seriously: explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fourth "new institutionalism"". *European Political Science Review* 2:1, 1–25.

Schmidt, V. A. (2015). "Discursive institutionalism: understanding policy context". In: (Eds) Fischer, F., Torgerson, D., Durnova, A., Orsini, M. *Handbook of critical policy studies*. 10.4337/9781783472352.

Schwartz-Shea P., Yanow D. (2012). Interpretive research design: concepts and processes. Routledge. New York.

Searle, J. R. (1995). The Construction of Social Reality. Penguin Books. London.

Shepherd, J., Devine, K. (2015). "Introduction. Music and the Sociological Imagination – Pasts and Prospects". In: Shepherd, J., Devine, K. (Eds.). *The Routledge Reader on the Sociology of Music*. Routledge. New York.

Street, J. (2013). "Music, markets and manifestos". *International Cultural Policy*, 19 (3), 281-297

Throsby, D. (2010). *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tjarve, B. (2019). "Country profile Latvia. Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends", *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends*, 20th edition 2019.

Towse, R. (2014). *Advanced Introduction to Cultural Economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Tschmuck, P. (2017). *The economics of music*. Agenda Publishing. Newcastle upon Tyne.

Turner, M. (2001). *Cognitive Dimensions of Social Science: The Way We Think About Politics, Economics, Law, and Society*. Oxford University Press. New York.

UNESCO. (2023). Cultural Heritage. UNESCO. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://en.unesco.org/fieldoffice/santiago/cultura/patrimonio

Van Engelshoven, I. (2018). Culture in an Open Society. Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.culturalpolicies.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/189.057-Cultuurbrief-Open-Samenleving-ENG_03-1.pdf

Van der Heijden, J. (2014). "Selecting cases and inferential types in comparative public policy research". In: Engeli, I., Allison, C.R. (Eds.). *Comparative Policy Studies. Research Methods Series*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137314154_3

Van der Leden, J. (2021). "Ontstaan en ontwikkeling culturele Basisinfrastructuur. Functies en subsidiecriteria". *Trends in kunst en cultuur*. Boekman Extra 25. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.boekman.nl/verdieping/boekman-extra/boekman-extra-25-ontstaan-en-ontwikkeling-culturele-basisinfrastructuur/

Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Van Thiel, S. (2014). *Research Methods in Public Administration and Public Management: An Introduction* (1st ed.). Routledge. New York. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203078525

Van Vugt, J. (2018). De Waarde van Pop 2.0. De maatschappelijke betekenis van popmuziek. POPnl, VNPF. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://vng.nl/files/vng/waardevanpop2_def_download.pdf

Williams, R. (1981). *Culture*. Fontana. London.

Yanow, D. (2007). "Qualitative-interpretive methods in policy research". in: Fischer, F., & Miller, G.J. (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods* (1st ed.). Routledge. New York. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315093192

Yanow, D. (2014). "Interpretive analysis and comparative research". In: Engeli, I., Allison, C.R. (Eds.). *Comparative Policy Studies. Research Methods Series*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137314154_7

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zoutman, R., de Groot, M. (2013). De Waarde van Pop. De maatschappelijke betekenis van popmuziek. POPnl, VNPF. Accessed on 03.01.2023 https://www.dsp-groep.nl/wp-content/uploads/17rzpopnl_De_waarde_van_Pop.pdf

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. INTERVIEWEES

#	THE NETHERLANDS	DATE
NL1	Music industry professional	12.11.2021
NL2	Music industry professional	19.11.2021
NL3	Music industry professional	26.11.2021
NL4	Expert committee member	08.12.2021
NL5	Expert committee member	29.11.2021
NL6	Cultural organisation staff	01.11.2021
NL7	Government official	14.12.2021
NL8	Music industry professional	01.12.2021
NL9	Expert committee member	17.12.2021
NL10	Expert committee member	30.11.2021
NL11	Music industry professional	23.11.2021

#	LATVIA	
LV1	Cultural organisation staff	06.10.2021
LV2	Cultural organisation staff	06.10.2021
LV3	Music industry professional	27.10.2021
LV4	Cultural organisation staff	16.11.2021
LV5	Music industry professional	09.11.2021
LV6	Government official	06.10.2021
LV7	Government official	30.11.2021
LV8	Music industry professional	19.11.2021
LV9	Government official	15.12.2021
LV10	Cultural organisation staff	23.11.2021
LV11	Music industry professional	14.10.2021
LV12	Music industry professional	12.11.2021
LV13	Music industry professional	14.10.2021

APPENDIX 2. NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE

A non-exclusive licence for reproduction and publication of a graduation thesis[1]

I, Virgo Sillamaa

1. Grant Tallinn University of Technology free licence (non-exclusive licence) for my thesis
The Sound Of Policy Making: How Ideas And Discourse Shape Music Policy

supervised by prof. dr. Ringa Raudla,

1.1   to be reproduced for the purposes of preservation and electronic publication of the graduation thesis, incl. to be entered in the digital collection of the library of Tallinn University of Technology until expiry of the term of copyright;

1.2   to be published via the web of Tallinn University of Technology, incl. to be entered in the digital collection of the library of Tallinn University of Technology until expiry of the term of copyright.

2. I am aware that the author also retains the rights specified in clause 1 of the non-exclusive licence.

3. I confirm that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe other persons' intellectual property rights, the rights arising from the Personal Data Protection Act or rights arising from other legislation.

03.01.2023

---

[1] *The non-exclusive licence is not valid during the validity of access restriction indicated in the student's application for restriction on access to the graduation thesis that has been signed by the school's dean, except in case of the university's right to reproduce the thesis for preservation purposes only. If a graduation thesis is based on the joint creative activity of two or more persons and the co-author(s) has/have not granted, by the set deadline, the student defending his/her graduation thesis consent to reproduce and publish the graduation thesis in compliance with clauses 1.1 and 1.2 of the non-exclusive licence, the non-exclusive license shall not be valid for the period*