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ABSTRACT

One of the most important issues in liberal democracies around the globe is the idea of equality. Politicians often talk about justice, fairness, and the equality of opportunity that abounds as a result of our democratic system. However, recent research has shown that there exists a southern or metropolitan bias; the idea that northern resource-based areas produce the majority of the export wealth for the economy, but the majority of the resources are used by the southern metropolitan population. This study undertakes to examine the possibility of a metropolitan bias with regard to funding for the performing arts. The question is: Do northern regions receive equal funding for the arts, compared to southern regions? To answer this question, this study examines two major performing arts disciplines; symphonic music, and theatre, and analyses the revenue sources associated with them in northern and southern regions. Based on a hinterland definition of northern, taking into account proximity to the closest metropolitan region, the study identified three cities that existed within three different arts funding models; Prince George, B.C. Canada; Fairbanks Alaska, USA; and Tromso, Troms, Norway. In order to study these three cities, the national models were determined through national statistics concerning arts funding. Three types of revenue were identified within each model: earned revenue, public funding, and private funding. Individual organizations within these cities were then compared to similar organizations within metropolitan regions, provincial averages, and national averages. In the analysis, a metropolitan to northern ratio was created to take the difference in population, and therefore, market size into consideration. Main findings are that northern performing arts organizations receive equal public funding when compared to their metropolitan counterparts on a percentage
and per capita basis. However, the Alaskan data differed greatly when compared to a large southern state, indicating that there may be a southern bias within the US model of funding, however it was not visible between northern and metropolitan regions within the state of Alaska. Rather the bias exists between the national average for public arts funding and the Alaskan average for arts funding. However, regardless of the model analyzed, this study determined that public funding sources provide an equal amount of funding on a per capita and percentage basis to northern performing arts organizations.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Throughout history art has played a significant role in creating and defining society and culture. Art acts as a testament to past generations and as an inspiration for the future. Works such as Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, or Shakespeare’s Hamlet, serve as reminders of the themes that unite humanity: sorrow and joy, love and hate. What a tragedy it would be if access to these and other great works of art were unavailable to thousands of people based on geography and resources.

This study will examine the access to the performing arts in northern regions and attempt to determine if the population in the north receives funding that is equal to that of populations in a southern metropolitan area. By examining revenues sources for non-profit performing arts organizations, such as theaters and symphonies, the study will compare funding levels from three sources: public, private, and internal. The revenue break-down of northern arts organizations will be compared to the revenue break-down of similar metropolitan arts organizations in order to establish whether income amounts from the three different revenue streams are similar or different. If inconsistencies are found, differences among the revenue streams will be assessed. In order to make these comparisons this study will define and examine three funding models that currently operate throughout Canada, the USA, and Norway. These three countries represent three different ideologies on how to fund the arts, and will allow insight as to which model best supports arts in the north.
To begin, the study will examine literature that discusses the need for equality in society, the fundamentals of core-periphery economic theory, the need for government support of the arts, and current arts funding policies.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

This chapter will discuss the literature surrounding the three main premises of the study starting with the need for equality of opportunity within a democracy. The burden on governments to meet this need will be discussed in terms of regional disparity with respect to the province of British Columbia, and inequality in terms of the distribution of resources. Finally, the economic and social need for government support of the performing arts will be examined, and there will be a review of studies that examine models and structures used by different governments to support the arts.

Equality

The central premise for examining the funding levels of non-profit performing arts organizations in the north is equality of opportunity. What if Mozart never had the chance to learn to play the piano, what if Goethe had never seen a play? The world would be robbed of their great contributions to our society and would be poorer for it. Providing equality of opportunity for artists and potential artists to experience and create live performances for populations in the north must be a goal for funding organizations and all levels of government.

At the heart of all liberal democracies lies the idea of equality. This idea, however noble and righteous in its intent, often defies a practical definition for political leaders and citizens. In his book “Sovereign Virtue”, Ronald Dworkin says that, “no government is legitimate that does not show equal concern for the fate of all those citizens over whom it claim(s) dominion”(Dworkin 1). But what does it mean to the
north and hinterland populations to show equal concern? Throughout his book, Dworkin attempts to define what equality means and how it can be manifest within our society.

“Dworkin’s conception of distributive justice, (and) equality of resources, requires equality in the distribution of impersonal resources and compensation for personal resource deficits, or their consequences, to be determined by a fair hypothetical insurance scheme” (Clayton 1). What Dworkin is suggesting is that resources should be distributed on an ‘equal’ basis subject to what he terms the “envy test” (Dworkin 67). “No division of resources is an equal division if, once the division is complete, any (person) would prefer someone else’s bundle of resources to his own bundle” (Dworkin 67). Using this envy test as a basis and his ideas on the equality of resources, Dworkin goes on to review many of the issues that were facing the United States in the late 1990’s. This test however is based on personal preference and does not address the issue of missed or unequal opportunities.

In the article, “Equality, Sufficiency, and Opportunity” Alexander Rosenberg defines equality in a slightly different way. He states that, “outcome equality means that the just society will have to equalize for natural and social advantages and disadvantages in order to ensure that attainment of equal outcomes” (Rosenberg 57). These natural and social advantages can be inferred to include geographic differences and inequalities. The implementation of the goal of equality is to attempt to equalize individual’s welfare and also the equalization of strictly monetary assets. Rosenberg dismisses these solutions as impractical and warns that they make “jealousy into an important moral measuring rod” (Rosenberg 61). Rosenberg’s solution is equality of opportunity. “Equality of opportunity seems to mean that each person faces the same balance of obstacles to the
attainment of goals or benefits that every other agent faces” (Rosenberg 62). This argument for the equality of opportunity as it pertains to any liberal democracy, including Canada, means that each citizen should have the same possibility of opportunities as any other citizen. The implications of this concept are potentially costly for governments when considering countries that are geographically large, and economically diverse. These issues of regional disparity will be discussed further following the next paragraph.

Canada, as the second largest nation in the world, has more defined challenges attached to regionalism then most countries. However, globalization is changing the world and it may be possible to separate different countries into similar geographic regions. In the book, “Democratic Equality” Edward Broadbent writes about globalization as a “contributing cause of the increase in inequality in the North Atlantic democracies” (Broadbent 9). Broadbent notes that corporations have greater power to outsource and therefore reduce their share of the tax burden. Globalization also has created much larger economies of scale within the market. Therefore organizations and populations that are restricted by geography become more and more disadvantaged as larger centers consolidate the resource and population base. There is a good deal of evidence to suggest that northern and rural communities are being treated inequitably in terms of the distribution of economic resources as a result of this heartland/ hinterland phenomena.

Regional disparity

The second major premise in this paper is that non-profit performing arts organizations exist in two different economies: the metropolitan heartland, and the non-metropolitan hinterland. The heartland is the base of economic and political power and
the hinterland supports this heartland with resources and raw materials. In his report, “Resource Dependency: The Spatial Origins of British Columbia’s Economic Base”, David Baxter and Ramlo point out that the hinterland areas of BC generate the majority of export revenue for the entire province. In short, the non-metropolitan areas are subsidizing the quality of life for those living in the lower mainland and the greater Victoria area. Baxter and Ramlo start their report with the idea, “that metropolitan regions have become the engines of economic growth...and are the generators of income ...for their provinces and country” (Baxter and Romlo 6). Baxter evaluates this idea through, “economic base analysis” (Baxter and Romlo 6), which essentially means that he measures how much income each region is generating based on their exports. On a per capita basis, non-metropolitan residents generate $24.00 of exports while metropolitan residents generate only $9.80. Baxter and Romlo conclude that, “it is in their (the metropolitan area’s) best interests to ensure that the non-metropolitan regions can attract and retain the people and investments that these resources need to produce the income that is to be shared” (Baxter et al. 4). The article demonstrates that there is an economic difference between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in BC, and that the north often receives less economic resources than it contributes.

The article, “Regional Economic Shifts in British Columbia: Speculation from Recent Demographic Evidence” also discusses geographic and service differences between the heartland and the hinterland. One of the major differences is, “a sense of isolation between regions” (Halseth et al. 2). The authors attribute this to the “mountainous topography” and the lack of “land available for settlement” (Halseth et al.
2). The metropolitan areas also housed the majority of “high order business and retail services” (Halseth et al. 2) as opposed to non-metropolitan areas.

Another article that further defines the differences between the heartland and hinterland in BC is Marc Lee’s article, “Bleeding the Hinterland: A regional analysis of BC’s tax and spending cuts”. Lee demonstrates that the metropolitan areas benefit from a greater share of tax cuts than the non-metropolitan regions.

“BC’s income tax cuts concentrated dollars in Greater Vancouver, which is already the wealthiest part of the province. The remainder was spread thinly over a very large geographic area, even though this more resource-dependent part of the BC economy was much more in need of attention.

- Only 29% of BC’s income tax cut pie went outside the Lower Mainland and Victoria, although such Hinterland areas comprise 34% of taxpayers” (Lee 3).

Lee goes on to say that “Economic development in BC’s Hinterland needs to be put high on the government’s agenda”. Lee also warns that if public policy in BC does not change to better reflect the need for development and economic support in the hinterland that, “the gap between the Lower mainland and the Hinterland will only continue to grow” (Lee 3).

This literature defines the economic issues that arise out of inequitable treatment based on regionalism. If differences exist in economic indicators as described earlier, then it is reasonable to infer that differences may exist in other industries such as non-profit performing arts as well. This study adds to the heartland/hinterland literature by analyzing performing arts organizations and examining the dissimilarity that exists
between organizations that exist in metropolitan areas and in non-metropolitan areas. Equality of opportunity dictates that the performing arts are a vital service that needs to be provided to the hinterland population in the same way that it is available in the metropolitan areas. The evidence that is presented in the literature above demonstrates that a lack of equality of resource distribution exists, therefore it is reasonable to infer that arts groups in northern regions are not receiving equal resources when compared to metropolitan counterparts.

**Arts Funding**

There are three generally accepted revenue streams within the performing arts; public funding, private funding, and earned income. These three revenue streams will be defined and discussed further in the methodology chapter when funding models are created from available statistics. The third premise of this paper is that government intervention in arts through funding is vital, and that government arts funding agencies have the ability to monitor and affect the distribution of arts funding in northern/hinterland regions.

"In the performing arts, crisis is apparently a way of life" (Baumol and Bowen 1). In order to determine whether the arts organizations in the north receive equal funding, it is important to understand why the arts require any type of public funding at all. There have been a number of books written on the reason for and process of government and private arts funding. The seminal book was written in 1966 by Baumol and Bowen entitled, “Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma”. Although this book dates back forty years the economic theory presented continues to be relevant today and paints an accurate picture of basic market principles that make government and private funding of
the arts a necessity. In the introduction, the authors dismiss the regular factors seen as causes of financial problems for the performing arts including: inflation, unions, corruption, and perhaps the most relevant today, waste and mismanagement. The authors instead state that, “we believe we shall be able to demonstrate that the basic difficulty arises, not from any of these sources, but from the economic structure of live performance” (Baumol and Bowen 10). The introduction ends stating that these problems, whatever they are, are chronic and not going away, but possibly getting worse.

The book goes into the financial state of arts organizations foreshadowing that, “the performing arts do not pay their own way” (Baumol and Bowen 137). Although the information is 40 old, the same ratios are apparent: the “critical financial item (is) the gap between expenditures and earned income” (Baumol and Bowen 147). Rather then talking about this as an “operating deficit” (Baumol and Bowen 147) the authors prefer to use the term “income gap” (Baumol and Bowen 147) because in for profit organizations the word deficit has very negative connotations. The income gap in 1966 was calculated at 46%. This means that orchestras in the US were generating 54% of their budgets from earned income (tickets, recordings, and tours). The study also suggested that the “income gap” exists in all genres of performing arts and that when for-profit Broadway productions were included in the calculations theater came the closest to breaking even on earned income alone. Even then the gap remained at best 15%. After calculating the income gap in each market segment the authors determine the “total gap: the amount with society must be prepared to contribute” (Baumol and Bowen 150) to the nation’s performing arts. This calculation is based only on non-profit organizations with the exception of off-Broadway theater productions. Unfortunately, the number is based on
an actual sum of money equaling 20-25 million dollars. This is not broken down into a percentage of the total operating budget and therefore, is not a good tool for projections or comparisons. It does, however, put into perspective that non-profit performing arts organizations needed to raise, through private and corporate sponsorship and grants from all levels of the government, only 20-25 million dollars a year to have a solvent industry for the USA in 1966.

"Because of the economic structure of the performing arts, these financial pressures are here to stay, and there are fundamental reasons for expecting the income gap to widen steadily with the passage of time" (Baumol and Bowen. 161).

In chapter VII the performing arts are treated as an equal sector of the economy and analyzed dispassionately in light of technology and productive activity. Recording and mass media technology has allowed performances to become much more productive in that many more people can see the concert when viewed on television than can fit into a concert hall. This however has had an adverse effect on live performing arts rather than a positive one. Man hour productivity and technological changes within the manufacturing sectors have increased productivity enormously. However, in the performing arts, “the performers’ labours themselves constitute the end product which the audience purchases” (Baumol and Bowen 164). “For, unlike workers in manufacturing, performers are not intermediaries between raw material and the completed commodity – their activities are themselves the consumers’ good” (Baumol and Bowen 164). The authors give some examples of how the performing arts are different in terms of productivity than manufacturing.
“Whereas the amount of labour necessary to produce a typical manufactured product has constantly declined since the beginning of the industrial revolution it requires about as many minutes for Richard III to tell his “sad stories of the death of kings” as it did on the stage of the Globe Theatre. Human ingenuity has devised ways to reduce the labour necessary to produce an automobile, but no one has yet succeeded in decreasing the human effort expended at a live performance of a 45 minute Schubert quartet much below a total of three man-hours” (Baumol and Bowen 164).

There is little room for improving efficiency by updating equipment through capital expenditures. By purchasing new instruments, new costumes, or new lights, man hour production would not increase. Productivity is directly related to cost and because the productivity of a live performance is stationary in an economy that is based on growth through increased productivity, the cost of producing the product will grow indefinitely. As the cost of producing the performing arts increases as a result of the widening income gap, public support must also increase in percentage terms if the performing arts are to continue producing at their current level.

“The central point of the argument is that for an activity such as the live performing arts where productivity is stationary, every increase in money wages will be translated automatically into an equivalent increase in unit labour costs – there is no offsetting increase in output per man-hour as there is in a rising productivity industry.”
"The faster the general pace of technological advance, the greater will be the increase in the over-all wage level, and the greater will be the upward pressure on costs in any industry which does not enjoy increased productivity"

(Baumol and Bowen 171).

After discussing the issues surrounding the performing arts and the static growth of productivity possible, the authors talk about the "economics of ticket pricing" (Baumol and Bowen 172). They acknowledge that one would expect prices to rise with inflation and that these prices should be in "reasonably close relation to costs" (Baumol and Bowen 172). Therefore the income gap should grow at a constant rate but should "not increase relative to total expenditures" (Baumol and Bowen 172). This is not the case, and ticket prices have lagged behind the rising costs of performance. Chapter VIII looks at cost trends over approximately the last 100 years for orchestras, theaters, and opera houses. This trend analysis clearly shows that costs have risen at a much higher rate than the wholesale price index demonstrating the hypothesis put forward in the previous chapter. There are three reasons cited to explain why ticket prices have not risen in accordance with rising costs: first, moral grounds – the arts should not be elitist, secondly, attending performances are low on the hierarchy of needs, and finally, competition from cheaper mass media alternatives. Due to these reasons for not increasing ticket prices, one can understand the mounting cost pressure on the performing arts.

The performing arts clearly fail the market test for supporting themselves through earned income. There is an argument for comparing the performing arts to other segments of the society that also fail the market test, but are considered vital enough that
the public must pay for them; the examples include, the defense establishment, the courts and the public school system. The comparison between the performing arts and these other non-profit segments include a number of arguments; first, on egalitarian grounds.

“The first ground for government intervention in the economy is inequality of opportunity. We generally take it as an article of faith that it is undesirable for anyone to be kept from achieving as much as he can through the abilities with which he is endowed. It is, therefore, widely agreed that no market test need support the flow of public funds devoted to the opening of opportunities to the impecunious” (Baumol and Bowen 378-379).

The second argument exempting the performing arts from the market test is the education of minors. The chapter states that children are not allowed to decide for themselves on a great many issues and therefore the support of the arts allows minors to be “exposed to artistic performance during their minority,” (Baumol and Bowen 380) thereby creating patterns of behavior and taste.

The third argument in favor of public support for the performing arts is “the class of commodities and services which the economist calls ‘public goods’. Public goods are items which, when provided to one person, automatically and unavoidable become available to other members of the community as well” (Baumol and Bowen 380). “The profit motive and free enterprise...are subject to a fatal limitation as regulators of the supply of public goods. The reason is that commodities of the latter type lack the basic requisite of the market – saleability” (Baumol and Bowen 380).
The performing arts can be classed as a public good; however unlike many other public goods, such as defense, they do earn a measure of income and therefore should be called “Mixed Commodities” (Baumol and Bowen 381).

In order to be determined a mixed commodities the authors give four types of “general benefit” (p Baumol and Bowen 382) that the arts give to society as a whole;

1. “The prestige conferred on a nation by it performing arts” (Baumol and Bowen 282)
2. “The advantage that the availability of cultural activity confers on business in its vicinity – the fact that it brings customers to shops, hotels, restaurant, and bars.” (Baumol et al. 283)
3. Provision for future generations (Baumol and Bowen 384)
4. “Educational contribution” (Baumol et al. 385)

The prospect for the performing arts is not an easy one. However, if government bodies, private corporations, and society as a whole start to understand the general benefits of the performing arts on society then funding should be available much as it is for education.

The survival of the performing arts depends on the determination of the performing arts organizations as they make their case to the public and the public’s acceptance or rejection of the argument made. This book presents defensible arguments for the public and private support of the arts. It is impossible for non-profit performing arts organizations to reduce man hour labour costs through capital expenditures, therefore these organizations can not exist on earned revenue alone. These ideas clearly demonstrate the fact that the arts industry must be subsidized by both public and private funding if they are to survive, and that as the income gap grows, these revenue streams
will need to increase in order to maintain the arts. As the populations continue to grow in the metropolitan regions of the world, the northern areas require an even greater effort to overcome the income gap created by ever increasing efficiencies and economies of scale.

Different countries have answered the question about how to fund the arts in different ways. The essay, “Comparing Cultural Patronage: Traditions and Trends”, discusses the difference in arts funding policy between Canada, the US, Norway and France. The article begins by defining the three revenue sources for the arts, “earned income, philanthropy, and public subsidy” (Mulcahy 95), and the fact that a majority of people agree that the arts should receive some amount of public funding. The author creates models for each of the four countries summarizing their “national cultural polic(ies)” (Mulcahy 96), and constructs four “ideal types” of sociohistorical traditions including: Nationalist – France; Social democratic – Norway; Liberal – Canada; Libertarian – US (Mulcahy 96). These ideal types reflect the cultural policies and therefore the national identity of the country. Although they are all committed to some level of cultural support they “differ significantly” (Mulcahy 97) in how they implement cultural funding. With reference to the ideal types apparent in each country, the article analyzes three areas of arts policy: administrative structures, funding policies, and cultural politics. It is concluded that each of these policies reflect the national identity of the respective nation. For example the US’s federal government is said to have an indirect role in cultural policies and that the nature of public culture is weak. Therefore they support the arts through tax exemptions, as opposed to France whose federal government is considered direct and the nature of their public culture is strong; they support the arts through direct subsidies. Clearly, different countries have different arts
funding models that reflect their ideology and economic policy. The author does not compare these models with respect to regional disparity or per capita amounts, but establishes that models represent different attitudes and policies about governmental support of the arts.

"The Patron State" by Cummings Jr. et al, looked more in depth at different national arts funding models. It focuses on thirteen countries mostly from Western Europe, but also including the US, Canada, and Japan.

Similarly to Mulcahy, the authors describe different national funding models based on historical ideological differences. Instead of four models they create three different categories of nations: The absolutist states where almost complete patronage of the arts is expected, the mercantilist states have "much less lavish government patronage" (Cummings, Jr. et al. 6), and new states such as Canada and the US "where...public opinion was generally opposed to government support for the arts" (Cummings, Jr. et al. 6). The authors again recognize that France has a strong central government and is considered an absolutist state, where the US believes that less government is good government and funds the arts through tax incentives.

Although the articles agree about the fact that there are different types of national funding models based on national ideology, the "Patron State" goes further in comparing the different forms of support and what the role of government should be. They attempt to answer questions such as "What should the primary objective" (Cummings, Jr. et al. 8) of the government be in the arts? How do you decide who gets money and who doesn’t? What is the role of art in the society and what projects should be funded? The answers to these questions are different based on national arts policies that exist within each model.
There are three factors presented that must be considered when analyzing arts policy; the decision-making model, the source of money for direct support, and different types of indirect funding. These three factors are directly related to each of the three models already introduced. The absolutist states handle arts policy in the same way they handle other governmental services, through a ministry of culture with “regular state employees” (Cummings, Jr. et al 10), and by providing indirect support to the arts through public education channels and ‘legitimizing’ the arts as important to the society by funding and generally supporting the arts. Mercantile states make decisions about the arts through a publicly funded arts council, providing direct support through grants, and indirect support through tax exemptions for arts organizations. The third model is defined as a US model that is a market-directed system which funds projects based on their success in the market. Direct support for the arts is through a special endowment that provides grants, or matching grants based on fundraising efforts, and tax incentives for private donations. These three models are more clearly defined than the four presented by Mulcahy, and represent a much broader sample. Analyzing countries within each of these three models may determine which arts funding model best creates equality for arts organizations in the north.

While there are many differences between specific governments and arts funding policy there has been a universal increase in arts funding since the second world war, peaking in the 1960’s and 70’s, followed by a universal “retrenchment” (Cummings, Jr. et al. 7) or cutback to arts funding during the 1980’s. Another observed trend is the decentralization of arts. This has happened in order to try and make arts accessible to citizens throughout the country as opposed to only those in the metropolitan areas.
Literature suggests that there are at least three different arts funding models at work in the western democratic world. Two questions now arise: how do you analyze and compare organizations that operate within the same model; and how do you compare organizations that operate in different international models? The article "The Search for International Models", criticizes a per capita approach to international arts funding analysis because of the many factors that are at play in the calculation: factors such as exchange rates, tax incentives, and multi-level government funding make per capita analysis nearly impossible to calculate accurately. The author instead takes a "bottom-up" (Schuster 'International Models' 24) approach and looks at individual organizations including; a theater, a museum, a ballet company, and an orchestra. These organizations are then analyzed with respect to their three revenues sources; earned income, private donations, and government support. A percentage analysis is used as opposed to a dollar amount. The author doesn't discuss the drawbacks of the percentage analysis leaving the reader to assume that these organizations all receive a similar total amount of revenue and it is only the sources that are different. The article goes on to discuss why tax incentives and matching grants that are popular in the US should be considered a type of direct government funding. The argument follows that if not for these government incentives the non-profit would receive less funding and be more inefficient than if the government simply granted the money to the organizations. This article suggests that many countries are looking to the US model and adopting both tax incentives and matching grants in order to help increase funding for arts groups. Another assumption that is not mentioned in the article is the relative level of artistic achievement. It is assumed that all countries produce the same quality and quantity of arts and therefore the only difference is in the
funding models. Although this study defines clearly how the arts should be qualitatively analyzed, it still falls short of creating a truly international comparative model.

In summary, it is important to ensure equality of opportunity for all citizens for all public services. The arts clearly need and warrant public funds in order to survive based on both economic and social principles. Despite the recognition of the need for public support of the arts, governments disagree about the best system for financing the arts and, as a result, there are different arts funding policies and models in place throughout the western world. Given the differences within each model and the importance of equality of access the question becomes, which model creates the highest level of public funding equality for northern arts organizations? By examining this question this study will add to the literature regarding arts models and arts funding, but in a more geographic way. Although this study will focus on three different countries, and therefore three different funding models, it will not attempt to create an international comparative model. Rather it will focus on disparities in arts funding between north and south within the three different funding structures, and then examine if one model stands out as more or less effective than the others at supporting arts in the north. The organizations will be compared using percentage break-downs and per capita figures with respect to historical exchange rates.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The first step in determining whether there is a disparity between northern and metropolitan arts funding is to define a model that represents the regular pattern of funding throughout the country. In the literature we find many different models for arts funding currently being used throughout North America and Europe. There is, unfortunately, no literature that simply and succinctly defines these models and therefore comparative studies are difficult to conduct. However, when examining statistical data, there is clear evidence that national models exist and are based on public spending norms created by historical trends and underlying political and market ideology. This study will undertake to examine regional differences within countries that have a recognizable geographic difference between a southern economic heartland, and a northern hinterland with respect to the identifiable national model of arts funding. This chapter will begin by defining the meaning of northern hinterland for the purpose of this study, and then define the different sources of arts funding, including public, private, and earned income.

Finally, the chapter will create normal models of funding for each of the nations chosen for the study with which to compare specific northern/hinterland examples.

This study will examine communities that are located in a northern hinterland region that are non-adjacent to metropolitan regions. In order to select these communities, definitions are needed for three selection criteria: hinterland location, non-adjacent to a metropolitan area, and northern location.
Hinterland

In traditional heartland/hinterland theory (Baldwin et al.) the hinterland is defined as different from the heartland in a number of ways. First, the hinterland is resource based, as opposed to the heartland which is mainly service based. Secondly, the hinterland is not the seat of political or economic power. Therefore the hinterland does not include national capitals. Likewise, economic power is also located in the heartland as opposed to the hinterland. Although, as mentioned in the literature review, the hinterland may generate a greater percentage of export income through resources, the economic decisions and the majority of the jobs exist in the heartland. Population also plays a role in heartland/hinterland theory with the majority of the population located in the heartland region giving credibility to centralizing both political and economic power in this region.

Non-adjacent and northern

There are many definitions of rural and metropolitan and most are based on population. The Beale codes were created by Dr. Calvin Beale for the Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (ERS) in the US in the early 1970’s. They classified counties into “various degrees of urbanicity” (Navigating Resources for Rural Schools). Although these codes are not directly applicable to this study, they serve as an example of possible classifications for metropolitan and rural areas. For the purpose of this study a metropolitan region will have the same characteristics that were outlined earlier when describing the heartland. The important factor now becomes how close a hinterland community is in relation to a metro area. If a hinterland community has the potential for daily access to a major metro area then it is considered adjacent. If,
however, a hinterland community is located a day or more away then it will be considered non-adjacent. This definition is based on the concept that if travel time to attend a concert or production is prohibitive due to lost time or direct transportation cost, then the service is not accessible to the population located in the hinterland community. The definition of north for this study is that the cities to be studied will be located to the north of the defined heartland.

Three countries and their respective arts funding models will be examined in this study. The countries and cities chosen are as follows: Prince George, BC, Canada; Fairbanks Alaska, USA; Tromso, Troms, Norway (See Appendices 5, 6, and 7). The organizations that were chosen within each city represent the organizations with the largest overall budgets in the region. Budget size indicates the size and scope of the organization, and the largest budgets indicate flagship organizations for the specified discipline within their region.

Prince George is located 800 kms north of Vancouver in the center of the province of British Columbia. It has a population of 85,035 (City population) and is considered the ‘Northern Capital’ of B.C. It is located inland at the confluence of the Fraser and Nechako rivers. The organizations that will be studied will be; the Prince George Symphony Orchestra, and Theater Northwest (Appendix 5).

The city chosen for the American model will be Fairbanks, Alaska. The population is 30,970 (City population) and it is the largest city in the interior region of Alaska. It is located inland near the confluence of the Tanana and Chena rivers. The organizations that will be studied will be: the Fairbanks Symphony Association, and Fairbanks Shakespeare Theater (Appendix 6).
To examine the Norwegian model the project will be examining Tromso, Troms, Norway. The population is 61,897 (City population) and it is the largest city in the county of Troms. The organizations that will be included in the study will be: the Tromso Symfoniorkester, and Halogaland Teater (Appendix 7).

**Revenue Streams**

Public funding is money given from tax revenue or other governmental sources to an individual, organization, or entity (Wikipedia). Within the arts community public funding consists of money granted or tax rebates given to the organization from any level of government including: municipal, provincial or state, and federal.

Private funding or financing is to provide capital (funds), which means money for a project, a person, a business or any other private or public institutions. Those funds can be allocated for either short term or long term purposes (Wikipedia). Typically private funding for an arts organization refers to money, time, or other resources that have been donated by businesses, private individuals or foundations. Private funding includes fundraised revenues generated by raffles, bingo, and other special events.

Earned income consists of money brought into the organization through ticket sales, subscriptions, and royalties that come from performances, radio and/or television broadcasts and recordings. Interest generated from investments, program advertising revenue and sales revenue from merchandise and gifts/ souvenir shops is also considered to be earned income (British Columbia Arts Council).

**Data Collection**

Data will be collected for this study using publicly available databases that annually record financial statistics for non-profit charitable organizations. Both Canada
and Norway have national organizations within the federal government that compile
statistics for many industries including the non-profit sector. These statistics are available
to the public through the internet and can be easily accessed and understood. In Canada
there is also a private organization called “Business for the Arts” that publishes an annual
report detailing statistics specifically for the performing arts. The United States’ system
is somewhat different. Although charities are tax exempt, they are still required to file a
990 tax form to the Internal Revenue Agency. Financial statistics about non-profit
performing arts organizations are complied from tax forms and available through an
organization called National Center for Charitable Statistics. Unfortunately, this data is
slightly out of date and difficult to break-down. Like “Business for the Arts” in Canada,
there is a private US organization called “GuideStar” that compiles non-profit data and
statistics. Through this database it is possible to view actual 990 tax forms for the
majority of performing arts organizations in the US. Using these publicly available
statistics resources, it is possible to compare northern arts organizations with
metropolitan arts organizations with a similar mandate.

The Canadian Model

Although the Canada Council for the Arts does not have a basic model that they
expect non-profit performing arts organization to follow, it is possible to track the
revenue sources for these organizations, and therefore deduce the working revenue
model. Statistics Canada tracks the level of funding throughout the country. “Focus on
Culture” produced a break-down of funding for performing arts organizations across the
country.
Table 1 – Canadian Arts Funding Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Earned Revenue</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ million</td>
<td>$ million</td>
<td>$ million</td>
<td>$ million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>240.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>130.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>234.6</td>
<td>474.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by author from (Lavallee-Farah)

This table illustrates the three different sources of revenue as defined above for performing arts organizations in Canada: public funding, private funding and earned income. Based on this statistical evidence for Canadian arts organizations as a group, 50 percent of the revenue arises from earned income, 30 percent from public funds, and 20 percent from private sources.

**The American Model**

The United States of America also provides most of its cultural services through non-profit organizations. As such, much of the US funding structure is similar to Canada’s. However, the US is ideologically more capitalist than Canada, and this is reflected in the way that the US funds the arts. The National Endowment for the Arts is the major federal organization that supports the arts. In a report titled, “How the US funds the Arts” written by the National Endowment for the Arts in 2004, the distribution of the revenue among the three revenue streams are identified.
Table 2 – American Arts Funding Model

| Source: Adapted by author from (Cowen et al.) |

This table demonstrates that the same three sources of funding exist in the US as do in Canada. However, they represent different percentages of total revenue for arts organizations. Earned income is the same at 50%, but public funding is very low at only 10% while private funding is at 40%. These numbers reflect a different model of funding for arts organizations and therefore a different way of doing business.

**The Norwegian Model**

European countries traditionally have a different model for funding performing arts organizations. For the purpose of this study Norway will represent a third model of funding. Norway again uses non-profit organizations to deliver arts and culture services to the country, but they also have a Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs within the federal government. This is different than the Canadian and American models that have organizations at arms length from the government. Norway also keeps federal statistics on culture that provide the data to create a funding model for Norway.

The table below presents a national inter-disciplinary arts funding model for Norway.
Table 3 – Norwegian Arts Funding Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opera and Theater</td>
<td>$1,172,763</td>
<td>$941,559</td>
<td>$219,100</td>
<td>$12,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkester</td>
<td>$347,867</td>
<td>$302,631</td>
<td>$35,889</td>
<td>$9,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,520,630</td>
<td>$1,244,190</td>
<td>$254,989</td>
<td>$21,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages: 100% 82% 17% 1%

Source: Adapted by author from (Kulturstatistikk 2003)

To summarize, Norwegian arts groups receive 82% of their revenue from public funding, 17% from earned income, and only 1% of revenue comes from private funding sources. This is clearly a different model than observed in the other two target countries.

Based on the three models described above, the Canadian (50, 30, 20) the America (50, 10, 40) and the Norwegian (82, 19, 1), the next chapter will examine arts organizations located in northern hinterland cities. Two arts organizations within each selected city will be analyzed with respect to their income within each city; the symphony orchestra, and the theater.

In order to determine whether northern/hinterland non-profit performing arts organizations receive an equal amount of funding they will be compared using two different measures: first: the percentage break-down of funding within the entire funding model; second: metropolitan regions within the same funding model. Two revenue streams will be specifically examined: public funding, and private funding. If either of these two revenue streams are lower than the average, or the metropolitan funding levels, than some level of inequity exists, because it places extraordinary pressure on the organization to generate more revenue through the earned income revenue stream.

Within the literature it was determined that arts groups could not support themselves
through earned income alone, and therefore, organizations that do not receive an equal percentage of income from the other two revenue streams are at a disadvantage.

A limitation on these measures of equality is that no minimum amount of funding is suggested. Although performing arts organizations in both metropolitan and northern regions are expected to produce the same form of art, to relatively the same standard, there is no minimum amount of funding suggested by any of the models to create a base budget from which to begin.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis

Canada

The Canadian model of arts funding as determined above is 50% earned income, 30% public grants from all levels of government, and 20% private funding from individuals, corporations, and foundations. The table on the following page shows the distribution of revenue among the three revenue streams for music and theater in Canada, British Columbia, and organizations within the metropolitan area and northern hinterland area for the year 2003.

It is clear from these figures that, in fact, the northern performing arts organizations receive a higher percentage of government funding than the metropolitan areas, the provincial average percentage and the national average percentage. There are a number of possible factors that may have contributed to a higher percentage of public arts funding in the north. The first is the size of the overall budget: the metropolitan symphony and theatre budgets are 28 and 13 times larger than their northern counterparts, respectively. Therefore granting agencies may be prone to looking at the amount granted without taking the context into full consideration. Granting the Vancouver Symphony 2.9 million dollars seems like a huge amount when compared to the Prince George Symphony which receives less than 200,000 dollars, especially when they are expected to provide relatively the same service. A second factor that may cause increased public funding to northern performing arts organizations is the market size in which they operate. A larger market means that there are more opportunities for earned income and private funding. By using a metropolitan to northern ratio (m/n ratio) it is possible to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Earned Revenue</th>
<th>Public Funding</th>
<th>Private Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Total (all disciplines)</strong></td>
<td>$512,586,608</td>
<td>$258,810,211</td>
<td>$146,783,748</td>
<td>$106,992,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Total Music</td>
<td>$110,441,924</td>
<td>$41,351,606</td>
<td>$37,020,823</td>
<td>$32,069,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Total Theatre</td>
<td>$219,175,864</td>
<td>$137,990,400</td>
<td>$42,738,479</td>
<td>$38,446,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Columbian (all disciplines)</strong></td>
<td>$55,479,090</td>
<td>$26,976,750</td>
<td>$13,907,224</td>
<td>$14,595,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Total Music</td>
<td>$12,079,168</td>
<td>$4,645,927</td>
<td>$3,825,046</td>
<td>$3,608,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Total Theater</td>
<td>$21,309,832</td>
<td>$13,507,186</td>
<td>$3,602,531</td>
<td>$4,200,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Symphony</td>
<td>$10,263,198</td>
<td>$4,149,656</td>
<td>$2,906,420</td>
<td>$3,207,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Club Theater</td>
<td>$8,470,248</td>
<td>$6,649,462</td>
<td>$710,428</td>
<td>$1,110,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Symphony</td>
<td>$366,331</td>
<td>$138,135</td>
<td>$178,642</td>
<td>$49,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Northwest</td>
<td>$654,741</td>
<td>$356,383</td>
<td>$176,585</td>
<td>$121,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by the Author from (Business for the Arts)
compare the differences between the two regions based on the difference in population, and therefore market size. One would expect the m/n ratio for the overall budget, and for the individual revenue streams to be similar to the population m/n ratio. Using this methodology the m/n population ratio for Vancouver/Prince George is 26. Below is a table of the m/n ratios for each revenue stream.

Table 5 Canadian Metropolitan/Northern Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan 2,173,100</td>
<td>$10,263,198</td>
<td>$4,149,656</td>
<td>$2,906,420</td>
<td>$3,207,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Symphony</td>
<td>$8,470,248</td>
<td>$6,649,462</td>
<td>$710,428</td>
<td>$1,110,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Club Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern 85,035</td>
<td>$366,331</td>
<td>$138,135</td>
<td>$178,642</td>
<td>$49,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Symphony</td>
<td>$654,741</td>
<td>$356,383</td>
<td>$176,585</td>
<td>$121,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Northwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M/N Ratios 26

| Symphony | 28 | 30 | 16 | 65 |
| Theatre | 13 | 19 | 4  | 9  |

Source: Created by the author from Table 4 and population data from (City population)

The total budget of the Vancouver Symphony (VSO) is larger proportionally than the Prince George Symphony (PGSO). However, when the specific revenue streams are analyzed, there are major variances within each stream that account for the larger budget. The earned income from the VSO is two points higher than the total budget and four points higher than the population m/n ratio. This suggests that the VSO earns proportionally more income than the PGSO relative to population. The m/n ratio for public funding is only 16, ten points lower than the population m/n, demonstrating that the PGSO receives far more public funding than the VSO relative to the population. Comparing the public funding m/n to the total budget m/n there is an even bigger discrepancy of 12 points. Relative to the total budget, the PGSO receives much more
public funding than the VSO. The private income m/n ratio shows the most extreme difference between the PGSO and the VSO. The m/n ratio is 65, more than double the population m/n. This demonstrates that the VSO earns significantly more income through private donations than the PGSO even when the size of the market is taken into consideration. Using the m/n ratio to account for the difference in market size, it is clear that the PGSO earns less through earned income and private donations, but receives more in public funding.

When examining the theater m/n ratios a much different set of circumstances are discovered. Although the population m/n is 26, the overall budget m/n for theatre is 13. This means that Theater Northwest’s (TNW) total budget is double that of the Arts Club Theater (ACT) when market size is taken into consideration. All of the m/n ratios for TNW demonstrate that they are a much bigger organization relative to market size than ACT. The m/n ratio for earned income is 19 showing that ACT earns more of its total budget through earned income. The m/n ratio for public funding is only a 4, illustrating that TNW receives six and a half times more public funding than ACT relative to market size. Finally, the private funding m/n ratio is 9, meaning that TNW earns more through private donations than ACT again, relative to market size.

The m/n ratio allows comparisons between metropolitan arts organizations and northern arts organizations while taking market size into consideration. Both the PGSO and TNW earn less income than their metropolitan counterparts through the earned income revenue stream. Both organizations also receive considerably more public funding than their metropolitan counterparts, however, the northern arts organizations differ greatly when it comes to private funding. TNW earns more through private
funding than ACT, but the PGSO earns significantly less through private funding than the VSO. It appears that northern organizations in Canada receive more public funding than their metropolitan counter-parts, but that private funding is affected by factors other than human and physical geography.

The m/n ratio has been used to compare population to total budget, total budget to the three different revenue streams, and the three revenue stream to population. The flexibility of this ratio is why it was chosen as a first method of analysis rather than per capita analysis. In order to make dollar figures clear, below is included a break-down of per capita funding for the Canadian organizations.

Table 6 – Canadian Per Capita Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan 2,173,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Symphony</td>
<td>$4.72</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Club Theater</td>
<td>$3.90</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>$0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern 85,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Symphony</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Northwest</td>
<td>$7.70</td>
<td>$4.19</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by author from tables 4 and 5

Again, it is clear that the northern arts organizations receive far more public funding per capita than their metropolitan counterparts.

**United States**

The model for arts funding in the US as presented above is 50% earned income, 10% public funding, and 40% private funding. Below is a break-down of arts funding in the USA.
### Table 7 - Break-down of Revenue for US Performing Arts Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Earned Revenue</th>
<th>Public Funding</th>
<th>Private Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA Total (all disciplines)</strong>*</td>
<td>$23,872,573,400</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$11,936,286,700</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Total Music*</td>
<td>$1,834,015,860</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,134,496,973</td>
<td>62% (Public + Private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Total Theatre*</td>
<td>$1,390,672,350</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$883,786,724</td>
<td>64% (Public + Private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alaska Total (all disciplines)</strong></td>
<td>$10,153,392</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$7,334,790</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Total Music</td>
<td>$6,236,325</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4,748,528</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Total Theater</td>
<td>$1,591,376</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$981,201</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>$1,077,068</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$558,250</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric Theatre Company</td>
<td>$116,798</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$97,654</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Symphony Association</td>
<td>$364,842</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$180,901</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Shakespear Theatre</td>
<td>$268,294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$256,181</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by author from (GuideStar)

*Source: Adapted by author from the (National Centre for Charitable Statistics)
These numbers show that northern hinterland arts organizations receive very different amounts of funding in different areas compared to their heartland counterparts.

The Fairbanks Symphony Association (FSA) follows the metropolitan model of the Anchorage Symphony Orchestra (ASO) fairly closely, with minor deviations. The biggest difference is that the FSA receives 4% more of their funding through public channels, again suggesting that northern arts organizations receive more public funding than metropolitan areas. However, the Fairbanks Shakespeare Theatre company (FST) receives less public funding than its metropolitan counterpart, the Eccentric Theatre Company (ETC). Perhaps the most important difference between these two organizations is that the FST actually has a larger total budget than the ETC, more than double in fact. FST also earns 95% of its income through earned revenue and only a meager 2% of the budget is raised through private funding. Using the m/n ratios more comparisons are possible.

Table 8 – US Metropolitan/ Northern Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>270,951</td>
<td>$1,077,068</td>
<td>$558,250</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
<td>$480,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>$116,798</td>
<td>$97,654</td>
<td>$5,774</td>
<td>$13,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>30,970</td>
<td>$364,842</td>
<td>$180,901</td>
<td>$28,457</td>
<td>$155,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Symphony Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>$268,294</td>
<td>$256,181</td>
<td>$8,042</td>
<td>$4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/N Ratios</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by author from Table 7 and (City population)

The overall budget of the FSA is proportionally larger than the ASO when market size has been taken into consideration, as reflected in a low m/n ratio of three. In fact the
FSA is larger in every revenue stream, but especially so in public funding. Although the
ASO serves a market 9 times the size of Fairbanks the FSA receives only $10,000 less
than the ASO. Again, the conclusion is that northern arts organizations receive more
public funding than their metropolitan counterparts.

The Fairbanks Shakespeare Theater company is an anomaly in this study. They
are the only northern arts organization with a budget that is larger than their metropolitan
counterpart. This irregularity is reflected throughout the numbers with the exception
of private funding. The m/n ratio demonstrates the when accounting for market size FST
receives more private funding than ETC, but relative to the size of the overall budget FST
receives five times less in private funding than ETC.

Perhaps the most interesting point concerning the US data is the amount that
Alaska receives relative to the rest of the US. Referring back to Table 6, the country
model is 50% earned revenue when Alaska’s overall earned revenue accounts for 72% of
the total budget. Similarly, public funding across the US is 10% while Alaska shows half
of that with only 5% of total funding coming from public sources. Finally, private
funding in Alaska is much lower than in the rest of the US with numbers of 22%
compared with 40%, respectively. In an effort to understand this difference, another
southern metropolitan area was added to the American data. Los Angeles is the major
metropolitan area in California and below is a chart comparing data from Anchorage with
Los Angeles.
Table 9 – US Southern Metropolitan/ Northern Metropolitan Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Metropolitan</td>
<td>3,819,951</td>
<td>$84,697,284</td>
<td>$42,140,785</td>
<td>$616,381</td>
<td>$41,940,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Philharmonic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Theatre Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,579,000</td>
<td>$25,907,000</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>$7,257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>270,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,077,068</td>
<td>$558,250</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
<td>$480,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric Theatre Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>$116,798</td>
<td>$97,654</td>
<td>$5,774</td>
<td>$13,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/NM Ratio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by author from Tables 7 and 8

This table shows that there is indeed a southern bias in the US in terms of arts funding although it is much bigger in theatre then in music. The sm/nm ratio for population is 14 where as the overall budget sm/nm ratios for music and theatre are 79 and 287, respectively. This demonstrates that the overall budget for the southern metropolitan regions is as much as 20 times greater even when the population differences are taken into consideration. The only number that is close to equal is the public funding for music in the northern metropolitan region. The sm/nm ratio for public music funding is 16 which is only slightly greater then the population ratio of 14. Perhaps it is not only the region that this slightly disadvantaged, but rather the discipline. These ratios demonstrate that a southern bias in the US exists, but not necessarily between metropolitan and northern arts organizations, but rather between the southern states and Alaska.
Below is a per capita analysis for all of the organizations involved in the US data.

Table 10 – US Southern Metropolitan/ Northern Metropolitan Per Capita Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>3,819,951</td>
<td>$22.17</td>
<td>$11.03</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td>$10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>270,951</td>
<td>$8.79</td>
<td>$6.78</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.98</td>
<td>$2.06</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$0.36</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>30,970</td>
<td>$11.78</td>
<td>$5.84</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
<td>$5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.66</td>
<td>$8.27</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by author from Tables 7, 8, and 9

Again, it is clear from the per capita analysis that the northern arts organizations receive more public funding per capita than their metropolitan counterparts both within and outside of Alaska.

Norway

Funding for the performing arts in Norway follows a much different model than the two North American examples. As established earlier, arts organizations in Norway receive more than 80% of their funding from public sources including federal, local, and municipal agencies. Below is a break-down of revenue for arts organizations in Norway.
Table 11 - Break-down of Revenue for Norwegian Performing Arts Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All figures in the 000's of Kroner</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Earned Revenue</th>
<th>Public Funding</th>
<th>Private Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Total (all disciplines)</td>
<td>$1,520,630</td>
<td>$254,989</td>
<td>$1,244,190</td>
<td>$21,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Total Music</td>
<td>$347,867</td>
<td>$35,889</td>
<td>$302,631</td>
<td>$9,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Total Theatre</td>
<td>$1,172,763</td>
<td>$219,100</td>
<td>$941,559</td>
<td>$12,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Metropolitan                      |               |                |                |                |
| Oslo Filharmoniske Orkester       | $103,945      | $18,357        | $80,088        | $5,500         |
| Nationaltheatret                  | $164,724      | $47,806        | $116,918       | -              |

| Northern                          |               |                |                |                |
| Tromsø Symfoniorkester            | $13,061       | $627           | $12,334        | $100           |
| Halogaland Teater                 | $28,617       | $3,029         | $25,588        | -              |

Source: Adapted by the author from (Kulturstatistikk 2003)
These figures demonstrate that northern arts organizations in Norway actually receive more public funding in percentage terms than their metropolitan counterparts. In fact they also receive more than the national average by a considerable amount. The northern organizations receive a smaller percentage of funding through both the earned income revenue stream and private funding. By using the m/n ratios it is possible to analyze these numbers with respect to market size.

Table 12 – Norwegian Metropolitan/ Northern Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan POP.</th>
<th>Oslo Filharmoniske Orkester</th>
<th>Nationaltheatret</th>
<th>Tromso Symfoniorkester</th>
<th>Haugaland Teater</th>
<th>Symphony M/N Ration</th>
<th>Theatre M/N Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>521,886</td>
<td>$103,945</td>
<td>$164,724</td>
<td>$13,061</td>
<td>$28,617</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,357</td>
<td>$47,806</td>
<td>$627</td>
<td>$3,029</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$80,088</td>
<td>$116,918</td>
<td>$12,334</td>
<td>$25,588</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created by author from Table 11 and (City population)

The overall budgets in Norway are much more comparable to each other with respect to market size. In fact the symphony is exactly the same size when population is taken into consideration and the northern theatre is actual larger.

The big differences in revenue can be seen in the earned income. The Oslo Filharmoniske Orkester (OFO) earns more then 3.5 times more revenue through earned income when compared to the Tromso Symfoniorkester (TSO). The public funding is close to similar, but it is clear that the TSO receives more public funding relative to the market size than the OFO. The largest discrepancy is in the private funding revenue
stream. The OFO earns almost 7 times more through private donations than the TSO even when the population difference is taken into consideration.

The Halogaland Teater (HLT) is closest to the Nationaltheatret (NT) in overall budget and public funding, but it is clear that HLT is a slightly larger organization with more public funding than the metropolitan NT when taking population into account. There is a large discrepancy in earned income with NT earning double what HLT does relative to market size. Neither theatres receive private donations and therefore are equal to each other in that respect.

Overall the Norway models demonstrate the closest fit between the northern arts organizations and the metropolitan ones. However, as with both other examples the northern organizations in fact receive more public funding both as a percentage of total budget, and relative to population, than their metropolitan counterparts.

When a per capita analysis is done using the Norwegian data, results similar to the other two countries are seen. Below is a table with two per capita analyses; one in Norwegian Krons, and one with the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar taken into account.
The per capita analysis does not provide any new information; however, when exchange rates are taken into account it is clear that Norwegian arts organizations receive significantly more public funding than other organizations included in this study. Below is a table comparing all the arts organizations involved in the study compared on a per capita basis in Canadian dollars.
Table 14 – Per Capita Comparison in Canadian Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Capita Figures $CDN</th>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan</strong></td>
<td>2,173,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Symphony</td>
<td>$4.72</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Club Theater</td>
<td>$3.90</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
<td>$0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td>85,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Symphony</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Northwest</td>
<td>$7.70</td>
<td>$4.19</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Per Capita Figures $CDN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita in Canadian Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP.</td>
<td>2,173,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Metropolitan</strong></td>
<td>3,819,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Philharmonic</td>
<td>$28.80</td>
<td>$14.33</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$14.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Theatre Group</td>
<td>$11.42</td>
<td>$8.81</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan</strong></td>
<td>270,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>$5.16</td>
<td>$2.68</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric Theatre Company</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$0.47</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td>30,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Symphony Association</td>
<td>$15.30</td>
<td>$7.59</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
<td>$6.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Shakespeare Theatre</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>$10.74</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norwegian Per Capita Figures $CDN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita in Canadian Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP.</td>
<td>521,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo Filharmoniske Orkester</td>
<td>$38.52</td>
<td>$6.80</td>
<td>$29.68</td>
<td>$2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationaltheatret</td>
<td>$61.05</td>
<td>$17.72</td>
<td>$43.33</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td>61,897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromso Symfoniorkester</td>
<td>$40.81</td>
<td>$1.96</td>
<td>$38.54</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halogaland Teater</td>
<td>$89.43</td>
<td>$9.47</td>
<td>$79.96</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by author using Tables 4, 7, 11, population from (City population) and exchange rates from (FXHistory)
The numbers reflect the fact that the Norwegian model supports the performing arts at a much higher level than either of the other two models. Perhaps the most significant number is the total budget per capita figures. Although all of the Norwegian organizations have a considerably higher per capita funding figure, the northern arts organizations have total per capita budgets that dwarf all of the other figures in the Table. One can only conjecture as to why the arts organizations in Tromso receive so much more public support per capita. Perhaps it is because there is an expectation that the quality of artistic performance should not depend on the location that the production takes place, and as such the Norwegian government ensures a minimum amount of funding to provide enough support to create performances that rival metropolitan organizations, both in scope and artistic achievement.
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Implications

There are a number of limitations to the analysis presented above and a number of factors that were beyond the scope of this study and therefore were not taken into account, such as the disciplines examined and qualitative artistic aspects. Within the Canadian data, there is a large discrepancy between the two northern organizations in terms of both overall budget, and private donations. There are many possible factors that may explain these discrepancies including regional preference, reputation, and differences in management abilities. These factors are beyond the scope of this study and remain questions for further research.

Within the American data, there is one anomalous organization; the Eccentric Theatre Company in Anchorage. The overall budget was surprisingly small when compared to both the northern theater in Fairbanks, and when compared to a southern metropolitan theater in California. There is no data to suggest why this theatre company is so much smaller than expected, other than the same reasons suggested above to explain the discrepancy in the Canadian data. Again this irregularity may warrant further research into factors that determine the size and success of arts organizations, but that is beyond the scope of this study. Other theatre companies in Alaska were excluded from the study because, although they had larger budgets, they were either located in non-metropolitan areas such as Juneau and Homer, or their main organizational goal was education as opposed to performance.

Finally, this study only examines two disciplines within the performing arts. It is possible that biases in funding may exist in other artistic disciplines such as dance, opera,
graphic art, and arts education. However availability of data, and time restraints prevented further consideration of these disciplines.

It is important to note that arts organizations, whether in the north or in metropolitan regions, are judged primarily on their expertise in performance and their reputation through the artistic community. This study does not take into account the fact that the size of overall budgets contribute directly to the artistic quality that is achievable. Clearly, northern arts organizations receive far less funding in actual dollars because they serve a much smaller market. However, is it realistic to expect that northern arts organizations create productions that rival their metropolitan counterparts in terms of size, scope, and artistic quality? Of course the answer is no. Although this study has found that northern arts organizations receive more public funding per capita than their metropolitan counterparts, it has not taken on the task of analyzing the qualitative aspect of artistic achievement.

Although a southern bias exists in terms of distribution of wealth and resources, public funding allocated to the arts on a per capita basis, do not show a bias. By examining northern performing arts organizations in three different funding models, and comparing them to metropolitan counterparts the study demonstrated that, in fact, northern performing arts organizations receive a greater amount of public funding than metropolitan performing arts organizations in per capita terms and as a percentage of the total budget. Although there were variations within each revenue stream and within each national funding model, a southern bias does not exist when simply comparing funding breakdowns or per capita dollar amounts between metropolitan and northern organizations. The American model did suggest that Alaska as a whole received less
public funding then the other southern states. This may lead to further study to examine if there is a state wide southern bias against Alaska. Even if this is so, within Alaska itself no southern metropolitan bias was found.

Policy implications resulting from this study are that a minimum overall budget should be established and maintained by public funding sources for performing arts organizations in northern regions. This however, would be a major shift in the origin, evolution, and maintenance of northern arts organizations. This minimum would need to be established and monitored through government agencies and in effect lead to a funding model that closely resembles the Norwegian Arts Funding model that is presented above. This would create a basis of funding for all arts organizations so that a comparable level of artistic achievement was possible, regardless of the market size. The performing arts are an integral part of every society and regardless of funding models will continue to exist due to the hard work of dedicated artists, volunteers, and patrons.
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### Appendix One

#### British Columbia Arts Discipline Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Full-Year Budget</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Music Vancouver</td>
<td>$ 489,025</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 147,247</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$ 233,125</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$ 108,653</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops Symphony</td>
<td>$ 471,739</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 183,859</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$ 170,712</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$ 117,168</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Symphony</td>
<td>$ 366,331</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 138,135</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$ 178,642</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$ 49,554</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver New Music</td>
<td>$ 488,875</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 27,030</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$ 336,147</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$ 125,698</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Symphony</td>
<td>$ 10,263,198</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 4,149,656</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$ 2,906,420</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>$ 3,207,122</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC Total</td>
<td>$ 12,079,168</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 4,645,927</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$ 3,825,046</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$ 3,608,195</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Club Theatre</td>
<td>$ 8,470,248</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 6,649,462</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>$ 710,428</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$ 1,110,358</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard on the Beach</td>
<td>$ 2,636,608</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 2,167,532</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$ 414,076</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Theatre</td>
<td>$ 1,818,761</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 858,394</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$ 850,078</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$ 110,289</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Thumb Theatre</td>
<td>$ 806,649</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 364,974</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$ 346,500</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$ 95,175</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleidoscope Theatre</td>
<td>$ 461,909</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 256,865</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$ 37,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$ 168,044</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre North West</td>
<td>$ 654,741</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 356,383</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>$ 176,585</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$ 121,773</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Playhouse</td>
<td>$ 5,213,523</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 2,129,067</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$ 1,038,925</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$ 2,045,531</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Theatre</td>
<td>$ 1,247,393</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 724,509</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$ 388,015</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$ 134,869</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Total</td>
<td>$ 21,309,832</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 13,507,186</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$ 3,602,531</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$ 4,200,115</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by author from (Business for the Arts)
## Appendix Two

### Alaskan Arts Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Chamber Singers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Concert chorus</td>
<td>$ 204,078</td>
<td>$ 152,772</td>
<td>$ 11,114</td>
<td>$ 40,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Children's Choir</td>
<td>$ 240,507</td>
<td>$ 155,009</td>
<td>$ 2,940</td>
<td>$ 82,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choral Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 444,585</td>
<td>$ 307,781</td>
<td>$ 14,054</td>
<td>$ 122,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Dance Theatre</td>
<td>$ 512,892</td>
<td>$ 455,151</td>
<td>$ 30,750</td>
<td>$ 26,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau Dance Unlimited</td>
<td>$ 136,393</td>
<td>$ 111,884</td>
<td>$ 21,535</td>
<td>$ 2,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchikan Theatre Ballet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Star Dance Foundation</td>
<td>$ 198,978</td>
<td>$ 171,605</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 27,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 848,263</td>
<td>$ 738,640</td>
<td>$ 52,285</td>
<td>$ 57,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Concert Association</td>
<td>$ 4,341,008</td>
<td>$ 3,746,623</td>
<td>$ 98,925</td>
<td>$ 495,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>$ 1,077,068</td>
<td>$ 558,250</td>
<td>$ 38,500</td>
<td>$ 480,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Concert Association</td>
<td>$ 297,424</td>
<td>$ 183,717</td>
<td>$ 31,077</td>
<td>$ 82,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Symphony</td>
<td>$ 364,842</td>
<td>$ 180,901</td>
<td>$ 28,457</td>
<td>$ 155,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau Symphony</td>
<td>$ 155,983</td>
<td>$ 79,037</td>
<td>$ 9,410</td>
<td>$ 67,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Music Machine</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 6,236,325</td>
<td>$ 4,748,528</td>
<td>$ 206,369</td>
<td>$ 1,281,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opera</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Opera Company</td>
<td>$ 907,771</td>
<td>$ 470,460</td>
<td>$ 89,758</td>
<td>$ 347,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Light Opera</td>
<td>$ 125,072</td>
<td>$ 88,180</td>
<td>$ 5,592</td>
<td>$ 31,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau Lyric Opera Assn</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opera Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,032,843</td>
<td>$ 558,640</td>
<td>$ 95,350</td>
<td>$ 378,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theatre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Theater of Youth</td>
<td>$ 318,683</td>
<td>$ 268,052</td>
<td>$ 6,920</td>
<td>$ 43,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric Theater Co.</td>
<td>$ 116,798</td>
<td>$ 97,654</td>
<td>$ 5,774</td>
<td>$ 13,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Shakespeare Theatre</td>
<td>$ 268,294</td>
<td>$ 256,181</td>
<td>$ 8,042</td>
<td>$ 4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance Theatre</td>
<td>$ 740,370</td>
<td>$ 253,861</td>
<td>$ 149,500</td>
<td>$ 337,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier One Theatre inc</td>
<td>$ 147,231</td>
<td>$ 105,453</td>
<td>$ 9,490</td>
<td>$ 32,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toast Theatre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theatre Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,591,376</td>
<td>$ 981,201</td>
<td>$ 179,726</td>
<td>$ 430,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 10,153,392</td>
<td>$ 7,334,790</td>
<td>$ 547,784</td>
<td>$ 2,270,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by the Author (GuideStar)
## Appendix Three

### Norwegian Theater Data

### Table 7.5. Theater and opera, driftsinnkreter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Total 1,000 kr</th>
<th>Other income 1,000 kr</th>
<th>Total operating income 1,000 kr</th>
<th>Government subsidies</th>
<th>Municipality subsidies</th>
<th>Other subsidies</th>
<th>Internal driftsinnkreter</th>
<th>Other internal driftsinnkreter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agder Theater</td>
<td>22,762</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>18,370</td>
<td>10,795</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>5,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Box Theater</td>
<td>12,616</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragernes Theater</td>
<td>9,094</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Nationale Scene</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6,842</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Norske Teater</td>
<td>21,954</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>19,903</td>
<td>13,522</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Norske Teater</td>
<td>123,021</td>
<td>20,201</td>
<td>15,166</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>102,820</td>
<td>101,909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heugesund Teater</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedmark Teater</td>
<td>13,062</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>11,238</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>3,264</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordland Teater</td>
<td>9,927</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>8,243</td>
<td>7,172</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyllestad Teater</td>
<td>28,616</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>25,588</td>
<td>17,728</td>
<td>5,697</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notodden Teater</td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>39,231</td>
<td>8,575</td>
<td>11,918</td>
<td>11,368</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordland Teater</td>
<td>19,281</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>17,981</td>
<td>12,526</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo Nye Teater</td>
<td>93,980</td>
<td>30,561</td>
<td>29,776</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>63,319</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billedteater</td>
<td>96,983</td>
<td>18,196</td>
<td>18,296</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,599</td>
<td>78,599</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rønneelen Teater</td>
<td>62,193</td>
<td>15,381</td>
<td>12,616</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>46,812</td>
<td>32,069</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>9,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogn og Fjordane Teater</td>
<td>15,658</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>14,903</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaterbygg</td>
<td>22,970</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>20,529</td>
<td>13,514</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teater Vårt</td>
<td>20,888</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td>11,908</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>2,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>75,482</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>11,913</td>
<td>3,527</td>
<td>60,642</td>
<td>42,866</td>
<td>9,078</td>
<td>9,078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Kulturstatistikk 2003)
# Appendix Four

## Norwegian Symphony Orchestra Data


The symphony orchestras. Concerts and audience. 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orkester</th>
<th>Konserter (Concerts)</th>
<th>Tilhøyrarar (Audience)</th>
<th>Tilhøyrarar per konsert (Audience per concert)</th>
<th>Talet på musikkarar i heil stilling (Number of full-time employed musicians)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oslo Filharmonien</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen Filharmoniske Orkester</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trondheim Symfoniorkester</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavanger Symfoniorkester</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristiansand Symfoniorkester</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromsø Symfoniorkester</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I alt Total | 523 | 529 | 568 | 321 | 386 | 361 | 647 | 333 | 103 | 401 |

1 Medrekna turnékonserter i utlandet. Including tour concerts abroad.

Kilde: Norske teater- og orkesterforening. Source: Association of Norwegian Theatres and Orchestra.

Source: (Kulturstatistikk 2003)
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Map of British Columbia

Source: (Yahoo Travel)
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Map of Alaska

Source: (Yahoo Travel)
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Map of Norway

Source: (Yahoo Travel)