

Checkboxes and radio buttons: metrologies, cultural policy, and the *dispositif* of art management

Asko Kauppinen
Malmö University, Sweden
asko.kauppinen@mah.se

Berndt Clavier
Malmö University, Sweden
berndt.clavier@mah.se

Submission date: 14.03.2017 · Acceptance date: 15.06.2017 · Publication date: 10.12.2017

ABSTRACT

Cultural policies will be analysed as producing what Bruno Latour calls "metrologies"; that is, measuring devices and valuemeters, and by extension, concepts and instruments that contribute to the progressive socialization and naturalization of art effects such as social sustainability, community cohesion, social capital, and innovation. The case analysed will be the art scene of the city of Malmö, its policies and metrological devices, with a focus on one community theatre project as an exemplary case. The metrologies, we claim, are the ways in which the policy apparatus opens up to larger concerns of what Michel Foucault calls dispositifs, linking art policy to other policy changes and societal concerns in general, and making art respond to those concerns in managed ways.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences for their generous support of our research.

Keywords:

Cultural policy

Performance
measurement

Participation

Art funding

Governmentalisation

Introduction

This paper analyses the funding process of a play called *Drömmarnas väg* ("The Road of Dreams") and is part of a larger project, "Art and Governmentalisation: Actor-Networks and Urban Governance in the City of Malmö, Sweden". The paper is meant to be an initial and *reorienting* description of one of the most important policy instruments for governing the arts, namely the funding mechanisms that surround publicly funded art. In our case, the transactions occur between three state funding agencies – the Swedish Arts Council, Region Skåne and Malmö city Department of Culture – and a community theatre group called JaLaDa that staged *Drömmarnas väg*¹. The transactions consist of application forms, performance measurements and reports of various kinds, and are analysed as part of what we call "the art management *dispositif*", which combines, for example, discourses on aesthetic value, regulatory decisions on governing culture, administrative measures of handing out funds, philosophical and moral propositions on equality and diversity, scientific centres of monitoring culture, and the coordinates of knowledge on which they base their work.

By using Foucauldian and Latourian frameworks in our description of the funding mechanisms, we aim to shift the analysis from causal, linear and rational understandings of the policy process to a much more mundane and humble level of recording of transactions brought about by the policy apparatus. The transactions in the funding process are analysed as the capillary ends of cascading metrologies: assemblages of policy instruments, such as cultural policies, funding application forms, evaluation reports for funders, contributing to the progressive socialisation and naturalisation of contemporary policy agendas for art. However, we suggest that this socialisation cannot really be understood with a notion of evidence-based policy, which is often an assumption of the stakeholders in the policy process.

As Sara Selwood notes, in the British context, "evidence-based policy" came to be synonymous with "modernisation" in the day-to-day work of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in the 1990s (Selwood, 2002: 17). The DCMS directed a lot of energy into the development of evidence-based policy, for instance, by initiating QUEST (the Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team) to improve the quality of the data that went into the analysis so that "'greater accuracy to activity, measurement, evaluation and research' (...) could be developed" (Selwood, 2002: 66). Although QUEST existed only between 1998–2003/2004 (Selwood, 2002: 69), "evidence-based policy making" (EBPM) gained an almost sanctified status in policy circles, delivering metaphors such as "cycles", "chains", "stages", "paths", "phases", "streams" and "rounds" to

describe what Paul Cairney argues is the EBPM ideal, an "ordered process of decision-making (...) beginning with an evidence-based debate about policy problems and ending with an evidence-based evaluation of (...) solutions" (2016: 14). This sense of causality is the very heart of the science of evidence-based policy, splitting the policy process into clearly defined segments with causal or logical relationships, such as "agenda setting", "policy formulation", "legitimation", "implementation", "evaluation", "policy maintenance", "succession", or "termination", which together form a harmonious, cyclical image of the policy process (Cairney, 2016: 18). This ideal picture, although recognised as problematic, arguably still haunts the policy process, especially when "specific problems" are targeted, and there is "greater expectation that the evidence-policy link is direct and linear" (Cairney, 2016: 51). In a study on "the use of performance information by ministers, parliamentarians and citizens", Christopher Pollitt argues that we need "to reconsider what it means to use performance information. It could be argued, for instance, that the regular production of these various reports is more important than their regular consumption by end users" (Pollitt, 2006: 38 & 49). Similarly, Peter Dahler-Larsen points out that "for some years the most important observation within the field has been that, considering the large number of evaluations carried out, there are very few cases of intentional, instrumental use of them" (Dahler-Larsen, 2012: 22–23). EBPM is idealised as highly structured, but is in practice a fuzzy process; an integral principle of "good governance", rarely, if ever, materialised in the work of policy.

Rather than seeing the work of policy as the result of causal processes (which have to be inferred based on metaphorical and metonymical extrapolations), we suggest that a greater focus on the mapping of the networks of human and non-human agents will produce *thicker descriptions* of the "social lives" of policies, their methods and assumptions, and that this in turn will lead to a better understanding of the stakes of what we call the arts management *dispositif*.

Swedish cultural policy

In the official report of the Swedish government from 1972, *Ny kulturpolitik*, which is part of the legislative history of the 1974 bill of culture (Sverige, 1974) – Sweden's first bill of culture – all the public actors involved could be neatly fitted into a horizontally laid out diagram, including cultural institutions presided over by other departments than the department of culture². The diagram lists the various governmental agencies involved, dividing them into central and regional gov-

1 Official English names of the organizations are used. Region Skåne, for example, is the official English name of the organization. All translations from the Swedish sources are ours, unless otherwise stated.

2 In Sweden, the arts belong within the purview of cultural policy and are regulated through the bill of culture; no strict separation is made between art and culture.

ernment bodies, where the central ones are divided again into "government bodies", "institutions" (such as "trusts", "corporations" and "academies") and "educational institutions". In the diagram, the number of employees of all but 11 of the agencies are listed and divided into three categories: "category h" (case workers), "category a" (artistic personnel, administrative personnel, and teachers), and "category ö" (others). In the diagram, the total number of people working on art and culture within a specialized administration under ministerial authority is 3,422, plus the employees of the 11 agencies whose workers are not listed (Kulturutredningen, 1972: 32).

When the government rewrote the cultural policy in 1996 (Sverige, 1996), the new official report made no effort to map all the individual participants involved, nor to delineate their expertise. The bill was based on two extensive reports which together spanned 2,198 pages. One of the reports has a discussion and an appendix which might be understood as attempts to map the efforts to effectuate the goals of the national cultural policy. It contains a section entitled "Follow up and evaluation" where the governmental institutions within the purview of the department of culture are listed in a diagram, dividing them horizontally into "Sector agencies", "Central authorities and institutions", and "Regional institutions", and dividing these vertically into "Academies", "Mass media", "Artists", "Film", "Heritage", and "Theatre, dance, art, museums, exhibitions, literature, peoples' libraries and peoples' education" (Kulturutredningen, 1995: 658-659). In total, the list consists of 91 authorities and institutions of varying sizes. This diagram is based on what the report refers to as a "narrow" definition of state-sponsored cultural activities, which includes all the allocations overseen by the ministry of culture (Kulturutredningen, 1995: 17 & 775).

The appendix of the same report aims to be more evaluative and springs from what the report identifies as a "broad" definition of state-sponsored cultural activities, which also include activities that have cultural or artistic content but are under the purview of other ministries. The appendix lists 13 such activities spread over five ministries and the Royal Court of Sweden (Kulturutredningen, 1995: 550-551). In the appendix, references are made to a "genealogy of allocations" ordered by the government in its Committee Directives (Riksdagsförvaltningen, 1993 & 1994). Although the directives contain no references to a "genealogy", they speak of the need to evaluate the "government supported cultural activities from scratch, including the motives for government responsibility [in the arts and culture sector]" (Riksdagsförvaltningen, 1994: 146). The report responds to this need by producing "a family tree of the development of the now existing allocations" irrespective of their ministerial affiliations (Kulturutredningen, 1995: 770). To reduce the complexity of the overall budget for the arts and culture, the genealogy categorizes the appropriations into four groups: "decentralization", "gov-

ernment responsibility", "cultural areas", and "purpose" (Kulturutredningen, 1995: 772). These groups roughly correspond to some of the demands proposed in the Committee Directives, notably the focus on "decentralization" and "government responsibility". Both these groups are constructed with the aim of measuring the degree of decentralization, the first one in geographical terms, the second in terms of how allocations are shared among national and regional authorities. The "cultural areas" and "purpose" categories are there to map the spread of sponsored activities across the 13 arts and cultural areas identified in the report, and to pigeonhole allocations into five main "purpose" categories with 17 subcategories. The resulting catalogue of tables gives an overview of the allocations based on the categories explained above, but there is no discussion of these results.

When it was time for the second overhaul of cultural policy in 2009 (Sverige, 2009), the official report of the government gives up on listing the government agencies involved in the management of art and culture. These have, according to the report, become too many, too diverse and too specialized in relation to different areas of art and culture, for any overview to be possible (Kulturutredningen, 2009a: 238). Instead, the report presents a "cultural policy matrix" by means of which the different budgetary allocations could be classified in accordance with what kind of allocation they were listed as in the budget bill and government appropriation directions (Kulturutredningen, 2009a: 248). The point of this move, the report argues, is that a focus on the type of allocation could complement the prevalent area-logic of the allocations (the what-is-financed) by also including what the report refers to as "the how" of cultural policy. This is understood as "the forms that policy takes in action", which is further defined as the "pathways" and "tools" through which cultural policy is applied within the different art and culture areas (Kulturutredningen, 2009a: 239). These "forms" are seven in number, divided into 15 subcategories (figure 1). The allocations have 11 "purposes" and are recognizable as a condensed list of the arts and culture areas in previous governmental reports and bills.

With the cultural policy matrix, there is a shift in the way that the government accounts for how cultural policy works, emphasizing the "how-it-is-financed" rather than the specific areas of the arts and culture that had provided the orientation previously. We believe that this signals a novel way for policy to address art and culture in Sweden. Prior to the official reports of 2009, the evaluative focus was on the compartmentalized areas of art and culture, which had been fairly set since the government bill of 1974. When the 1995 report divides these into 13 arts and culture areas, with 5 main "purposes" and 17 "sub-purposes", it basically follows the division set by the stipulations of the 1974 bill. In the 2009 report, these are condensed into the 11 "purposes" of the matrix. In a sense, this is both a compression of how cultural policy addresses the dif-

Forms of activity:	Purpose:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Government agencies & institutions. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Government agencies with med administrative mission. b. Government agencies with institutional mission. c. Central institutions. d. The three R.s e. Regional and municipal institutions f. Semi-institutions and academies 2. Sectoral subsidies 3. Artist support 4. Project and directed allocations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research b. International and Nordic cultural exchange 5. Allocations for associations and organizations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Running allocations for associations b. Popular movement associated cultural activities c. Support to popular movement education 6. Special recipients <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Children and youth b. Disabled persons c. National minorities d. Multiculturalism 7. License-fee resources for public service 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Radio, TV 2. Newspapers 3. Film 4. Periodicals literature and libraries 5. Theatre, dance and music 6. Culture, general 7. Image and form 8. Crafts and design 9. Museum and exhibition 10. Cultural heritage 11. Archives

FIGURE 1. THE CULTURAL POLICY MATRIX

Source: Kulturutredningen (2009a).

ferent art and culture areas, unifying them into fewer distinct posts, and an increase in the attention on what the 2009 report calls the “how” of cultural policy, the “forms” of governmental activity.

This change is in line with a broader set of accounting and control principles that have affected the ways in which Swedish government practices are managed. The 2009 report speaks of “a clear trend in government administration” to establish independent policy evaluation authorities and lists several recently created organizations (Kulturutredningen, 2009b: 135). What they all have in common is that they produce statistics, evaluate reforms, conduct research and develop new knowledge, provide support to local, regional and state government agencies – they are basically authorities which provide knowledge and information for decision-makers³. This type of governance has a long history in the economics, education, and health sectors, but comes thus relatively late in culture. This grey, dry and mundane manipulation of administrative categories may lack artistic lustre, but it is a game-changer for the arts, and changes the game down to the details.

Dispositif and cultural policy

As stipulated in the 2009 bill on culture *Tid för kultur*, a separate agency for the analysis of cultural policy was established in 2011 (Sverige, 2009). The Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis (*Myndigheten för kulturanalys*) is tasked “to evaluate, analyse and present the effects of proposals and measures taken in the cultural field. This is to be done based on the cultural policy objectives” (Myndigheten för Kulturanalys, 2016). The agency is responsible for official statistics of culture, monitoring the cultural sphere, analysing trends, understanding and explaining how events in the “horizon of culture” may affect cultural policy, evaluating state reforms and measures, and producing broad syntheses and situation assessments in relation to cultural policy objectives (Myndigheten för Kulturanalys, 2016). At the inception, the agency took over the official statistics production and cultural habits and trends analysis from the Swedish Arts Council (*Statens kulturråd*), which could now focus more on funding activities in accordance with the national cultural policy objectives; the new agency became an independent auditor of the penetration and impact of those policies.

The move towards a more intensified and centralized monitoring of art and culture is by no means simply a Swedish development, nor a very recent one. According to Eleonora Belfiore, “[t]wo of the defining issues of contemporary cultural policy debates” are “cultural value and the challenge of its measurements” (2015: ix). Lachlan MacDowall captures the tension of the debate critically: “On the one hand, initiatives to make culture count can have an active and positive drive to include a cultural perspective, and to have it be made visible and taken into account in broader decision-making. On the other hand, too often, culture is *made* to count, in the sense that it is forced unwillingly and unhelpfully into systems of measurement, from where it can be pressed into the service of divergent agendas” (2015: 5). But what is really going on with this move of counting culture and making culture count? We suggest that behind the urge to make culture count and counting culture is not some nefarious political agenda, but an intensification of a mode of governance which is predicated on what Michel Foucault calls “veridiction” (Foucault, 2008)⁴ along with the “crisis of causality” which the focus on veridiction brings about (Valentine, 2007: 101). One crucial motivation for the changes in Swedish cultural policies, for example, is the desire to better identify and account for the effects of policy. Jeremy Valentine argues that because of this urgent problem of causality, the “objective

³ The report lists quite a few: Institute for Evaluation of Labour Market and Education Policy (IFAU), Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV), Swedish National Council of Crime Prevention (BRÅ), Swedish Agency for Health Technology Assessment and Assessment of Social Services (SBU), Swedish Institute for Transport and Communications Analysis (SIKA), Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies (SIEPS), Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (*Tillväxtverket*), and Growth Analysis (TUA).

⁴ “In this sense, inasmuch as it enables production, need, supply, demand, value, and price, etcetera, to be linked together through exchange, the market constitutes a site of veridiction, I mean a site of verification-falsification for governmental practice” (Foucault, 2008: 32).

“WE SUGGEST THAT BEHIND THE URGE TO MAKE CULTURE COUNT AND COUNTING CULTURE IS NOT SOME NEFARIOUS POLITICAL AGENDA, BUT AN INTENSIFICATION OF A MODE OF GOVERNANCE WHICH IS PREDICATED ON WHAT MICHEL FOUCAULT CALLS ‘VERIDICTION’”

and independently verifiable observations” about art and its effects “have become politicized, embedded in political and aesthetic projects as solutions to the problems that such programs exist to solve, and in so doing are the means with which these projects can become solidified and maintained” (Valentine, 2007: 98). The launch of the Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis is a direct response to this perceived “crisis”, tasked to produce objective and verifiable observations about the state of culture, purportedly lifting at least the facts of culture outside the murky goals of politics. However, we see this as a new and powerful dimension of calculative governmentality and a new organising *dispositif* for the arts.

We suggest that a productive way of dealing with this perceived crisis is to understand it in terms of the Foucauldian concept of the *dispositif*. Although there is considerable theoretical debate over the translation of the concept of *dispositif*, for us the translation issues are of less significance compared to the concept’s methodological utility (for a discussion of the issues of translation, see Bussolini, 2010). Foucault’s own understanding of the term is primarily developed in his technical analyses of the productivity and positivity of power and how these “positivities” in turn relate to the main theme of the analysis of liberal and neo-liberal governmentality, namely the practices of veridiction. *Dispositif* is, in this context, a term with at least four methodological functions (Foucault, 1980):

- *A combinatory function*: the *dispositif* brings together “a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions”, and so on (Foucault, 1980: 194). As such, the *dispositif* functions as a kind of set theory, allowing disparate and dissimilar elements to be brought together without formally sharing any identity. In terms of cultural policy, the *dispositif* brings together discourses of aesthetic value, institutions such as arts councils, regulatory decisions such as the “arm’s length principle”, laws on transactions between individuals, associations and the state, administrative measures such as government appropriation directions, scientific statements about the impact of the arts and their spillover effects, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions of the value of the arts, their benefits in terms of individual development, identity and social cohesion.

Formally, these elements do not share an identity but the notion of *dispositif* allows us to think them together.

- *A networking function*: the *dispositif* allows our analysis to focus on the links between elements, both discursive and non-discursive, and to register how these links shift and modify the functions of the elements over time and in a variety of contexts, producing “a sort of interplay of shifts of position and modifications of function” (Foucault, 1980: 195). A Foucauldian example of this shifting function is when the *Sâlpêtrière* clinic could combine observation, examinations, interrogations, experiments, public presentations, theatre, dialogues, palpations, laying on of hands, and postures, which ultimately combined in constructing “around and apropos of sex an immense apparatus [*dispositif*] for producing truth” (Foucault, 1990: 56). In our case, there is no one institution like *Sâlpêtrière*, which links elements in a similarly concentrated fashion. Arguably, cultural policy networks function in similar albeit more dispersed fashion. They typically produce links between large statistical frameworks, such as Eurostat, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), Statistics Sweden (SCB) and their local and regional equivalents. They organize meetings between administrators and cultural actors, fund artistic activities, engage in public debates, formalize application forms and procedures, all of which contribute to producing truths and realities about art.

- *A strategic function*: the *dispositif* “has as its major function at a given historical moment that of responding to an urgent need” (Foucault, 1980: 195). In this, the *dispositif* is “strategic”, deployed where there is controversy and is in this sense the foundation of the “problematizing activity” which Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller claim to lie at the heart of modern government (Rose & Miller, 2008: 61). Arguably, cultural policy is born out of a set of specific urgencies after World War II. Swedish cultural policy, for instance, comes about to enlist the cultural sector as a contributor to the development of the Welfare State, first in terms of addressing the lack of democratic access to excellent art, and more recently in terms of contributing to the development of economic and social wellbeing.

- A *genetic function*: the *dispositif* is the handmaiden of a particular form of modern "genesis" which has "two important moments", one which engenders "the prevalent influence of a strategic objective" (for instance, the strategic objective to produce a sustained and coherent policy for enlisting the arts into the welfare project), and a second moment where the *dispositif* is created "and enabled to continue in existence insofar as it is the site of a double process" (Foucault, 1980: 195). The double process is neatly elucidated by Rose and Miller when they argue that the "problematizing activity" of modern government is simultaneous with the solutions and measures with which the identified problems are rectified: "The solidity and separateness of 'problems' and 'solutions' are thus attenuated. Or, to put it differently, the activity of problematizing is intrinsically linked to devising ways to seek to remedy it. So, if a particular diagnosis or tool appears to fit a particular 'problem', this is because they have been made so that they fit each other" (Rose & Miller, 2008: 15). In the context of cultural policy, this explains how both the urgent needs (the strategic functions, the problematizing activities of cultural policy) and the solutions proposed by cultural policy are modified over time (Menger, 2014).

The *dispositif* is thus a methodological device with which we can bring together the genesis of cultural policy, its combination of problems and solutions, the links that are established in the process of its development, and the disparate elements that constitute it. The shift in Swedish cultural policy to what we here call veridiction is an example of the development of a *dispositif*. As we have seen, the *dispositif* of arts management is heavily imbued with monitoring processes of various kinds, and presided over by a governmental scientific authority, the Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis.

Cultural policy and metrology

Following the terminology of Actor-Network Theory, the Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis is a "centre of calculation" (Latour, 1987). For Bruno Latour, a centre of calculation is a place where information is gathered, where "specimens, maps, diagrams, logs, questionnaires and paper forms of all sorts are accumulated and are used by scientists and engineers to escalate the proof race; every domain enters the 'sure path of a science' when its spokespersons have so many allies on their side" (Latour, 1987: 232). Latour introduces the idea of a centre of calculation to explain how observations and experiments in science turn into facts: what scientists actually do with experiments, what graphs they produce with what machines, what printouts are passed on where, what instance collects and collates the printouts, what is said about

those printouts in what contexts and so on. For Latour, centres of calculation produce the proofs and observable facts of a verified science. Rather than ideas, John Law argues, it is these printouts and other "inscription devices" that travel (Law, 2004: 33).

In their post-Foucauldian work on governmentalisation, Rose and Miller transpose Latour's idea of centres of calculation into the field of governmentality (Rose & Miller, 2010; Rose, 1999). Following Foucault, they see knowledge and expertise as central to the activities of modern technologies of government, and identify centres of calculation as crucial components of those technologies, doing the work of "cognition, calculation, experimentation and evaluation" (Rose & Miller, 2010: 273). According to Rose and Miller, then, "government is intrinsically linked to the activities of expertise, whose role is not one of weaving an all-pervasive web of 'social control', but of enacting assorted attempts at the calculated administration of diverse aspects of conduct through countless, often competing, local tactics of education, persuasion, inducement, management, incitement, motivation and encouragement" (Rose & Miller, 2010: 273). The key expression for Rose and Miller is not "social control", or even "calculated administration", but rather "assorted attempts" at calculated administration: there is no single unifying logic or strategy to this administration, but it is always justified by a reference to a limited set of controversies and to a body of knowledge gathered at the centres of calculation to address those controversies.

How does a centre of calculation do its work? A centre of calculation first makes value judgments by using what Bruno Latour and Vincent Antonin Lépinay call "valuemeters": "devices which make value judgments visible and readable" in the avalanche of data that is collected at the centre (Latour & Lépinay, 2009: 16). This can be something as simple as an Excel file containing, for example, the number of tickets sold to a performance, the number of men, women and children attending the performance, and the ratings they give to the performance. When many valuemeters are connected, comparisons between items become increasingly precise: the number of tickets sold can be divided by the number of men, women and children, the ratings can be related to the number of tickets sold, and so on. Eventually, new objects worthy of serious scientific attention come into being; for example, a new object called "audience" that can now be analysed through many interlinked valuemeters such as class, gender, age, ethnicity and disability. The collections of interlinked valuemeters form "metrological chains" when they are transposed from one context to another (Latour & Lépinay, 2009: 19). An example of such a metrological chain in the cultural policy field is the recent race to develop standards and instruments of cultural value indicators on global and local scales (Madden, 2005).

Metrology concerns itself with the scientific organization, standards, and instruments of measure-

ment that range from the most scientifically important ones on which many other standards depend (for instance the atomic beam standard of measuring time) to the mundane acts of checking the temperature outside. As Latour puts it, "[m]etrology is only the official and primary component of an ever-increasing number of measuring activities we all have to undertake in daily life. Every time we look at our wristwatch or weigh a sausage at the butchers [sic] shop; every time applied laboratories measure lead pollution, water purity, or control the quality of industrial good" we make use of metrologies (Latour, 1986: 28). In a more fundamental sense, metrology is "the name of this gigantic enterprise to make of the outside a world inside which facts and machines can survive" (Latour, 1987: 251); that is, to expand the science outward so that the world becomes knowable by measurable experiments, develop and expand both theoretical and practical models of measurement so that we know what we are measuring and we know what the margins of error are in the devices doing the measurements. Or, as Latour puts it: "What we call 'thinking with accuracy' in a situation of controversy is always bringing to the surface one of these forms. Without them we simply *don't know*" (Latour, 1987: 252). This interplay of controversy and accuracy of measurement is a site of intensified veridiction. This explains the constant call in the Swedish official government reports (which in Sweden are part of the legislative history of its bills) for more accurate data for policy evaluation. These forms of knowing through collecting valuemeters in centres of calculation, gathering them into metrological chains to make value judgments about, for instance, art policies, have become an essential, unavoidable (and eventually uncontroversial) part of art and culture management. Of course, policies get done without sufficient accurate data, or by ignoring data (policies are also political), but nevertheless more data is collected, more analyses of data are reported, and these cannot simply be ignored, either.

The Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis is thus tasked to bring the world of art and culture into metrological account: to develop those valuemeters and metrological chains needed to make policy value judgments, create new entities of scientific policy attention, and make the policy effects knowable and analysable by measurement. Part of the metrological work of the agency is to develop quantitative measurements of art and culture: gather data, develop new data for art and culture. The other part of the work of this agency is to develop qualitative data. This is where the work with developing indicators is at its most intense, not only in Sweden but globally, because there is no agreement on the best set of qualitative indicators. In fact, the grey literature of art and culture management and governance is awash with competing producers and developers of indicators of quality: AEGIS, Arts Council England, the Cultural Development Network, Interarts, the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), UNE-

SCO, and so on. In the Swedish context, we can clearly see how the focus of cultural policy has shifted from governing the arts and culture to governing the governance of the arts and culture. This can be illustrated by respective emphases of the three government bills on the arts and culture in Sweden (the bills from 1974, 1996 and 2009). It is a history of increasing emphasis on veridiction, with its emphasis on problematisations and controversies. The solution so far has been the production of ever more advanced and cascading metrologies.

The theoretical methodology we have presented above makes quite a few demands on cultural policy research: we suggest that cultural policy research should pay closer attention to linking conceptual networks to skeins of practices and "technological" devices such as centres of calculation as central to policy. The scope of this paper is not enough to offer a detailed account of the avenues opened by the suggested framework, nor is the empirical scope of the case we offer below. The case clearly covers only a detailed space in the framework we presented, but nevertheless highlights the importance of metrologies for cultural policy research.

How does a cascading metrology appear at the capillary end of governance? How does it materialise as part of the *dispositif* of arts management? As an example, we present a case involving a community theatre group seeking funds for a play. The example is random and one among many we could have chosen. The idea is to let the example illustrate the process of veridiction, its metrologies and the intensification of veridiction involved in the context of arts management in Sweden.

***Drömmarnas väg* and cascading metrologies**

In the autumn of 2014, JaLaDa – a Malmö-based community theatre group with a focus on multilingual theatre for children and young people – applied for funding to put on a play called *Drömmarnas väg*. The play was about refugee children on their way to seek safety in Sweden. JaLaDa applied (and received) funding from several government agencies, among them a national funding agency (Swedish Arts Council), a regional funding agency (Region Skåne), and a municipal funding agency (Malmö city's Department of Culture, Cultural Grants section). A year and a half later they reported back to the funders on how the project had run and how the funds had been spent. All the applications were submitted in the autumn 2014 and all the evaluation reports were submitted in the spring 2016. All the three applications under analysis were filled in online, and the forms contain a variety of html-form elements such as checkboxes, radio buttons, and text boxes with maximum character limits.

By looking at the applications and evaluation reports we can glean some of the ways in which national cultural policy goals are transformed and cascade in Swedish public funding as metrologies, and how the forms themselves add slight but not insignificant variations, emphases and interpretations to the goals. Applications and reports are policy instruments in the traditional policy research sense that they are pragmatic tools with which other policy instruments (such as funds) are delivered. They are also policy tools in the more sociological sense in that they produce a particular relationship between "the governing and the governed" and constitute "a condensed form of knowledge about social control and ways of exercising it" (Lascoumes & Le Galès, 2007: 3). Perhaps even more crucially, they are policy instruments that structure a possible "field of action" for individuals (Foucault, 1997: xxii; Rose & Miller, 2008: 147), that is, ways of identifying individuals who are eligible to do art, ways of imagining what counts as art, possible ways of doing art, necessary ways of accounting (for) art, and so on. They also constitute an idea of "good governance", and can be read as a condensed theory of the right form and the right amount of arts management. The applications and evaluation reports are the capillary ends of policy instruments, asking for certain very definite figures to be stated, prompting reflections to be entertained by art actors, circulating concepts, identifying objects, defining practices, dividing roles and responsibilities.

First a word of caution: the national, regional and municipal funding agencies mentioned above are of course not the only funding agencies in Sweden. There is a plethora of state and non-state agencies and foundations and private sector actors. JaLaDa also secured funding from these other sources for *Drömmarnas väg* (Gertrude and Ivar Philipson Foundation and The Swedish Savings Bank Foundation). *Drömmarnas väg* is thus a typical Swedish art project: it applies for funding from several different kinds of funders, receives money from some of them but not all of them, and usually the biggest amount of funding is from state agencies. JaLaDa clearly has considerable administrative resources to write applications, and write them successfully. In some other ways, *Drömmarnas väg* is not a typical project: its theme of unaccompanied refugee children coincided with the Syrian refugee crisis of 2015, the project caught an unusual wave of interest and grew to be the largest project of JaLaDa's to date, employing as many as 30 people. In what follows we will describe 1) the application forms as policy instruments for each of the funding agencies; 2) the presentation of the project in the application forms; 3) the evaluation report forms as policy instruments, and 4) the presentation of the project in the evaluation reports.

The Swedish Arts Council application form

The first information that the Swedish Arts Council application form asks for concerns the identification of the actor applying for funding. This is a legal framework; the applicant must provide details, documentation and proof of certain administrative criteria that allows the state to have dealings with the applicant. The applicant must be registered as a corporation of some kind (many are registered as "economic associations"), but the critical point is that they must have an organization number, address, and give the name of someone who can represent the corporation. One might say that already at this point considerable administrative requirements must be met for someone to be eligible for a publicly funded art project.

A second framework is the framework of artistic activity. Here, the applicant is required to tick boxes indicating the area of the arts their activity belongs to (dance, theatre, etc.) and to select the type of activity they engage in: 1) "productions and presentations of original art work", 2) "presentation/collaboration art work", and 3) "promotional art work" (*främjande arbete*). Although the expression "promotional work" does not specify what is promoted, it nevertheless carries in Swedish a strong connotation of promoting core values and of doing this in a pedagogical way. All relevant boxes can be ticked. The applicant can then describe the artistic idea of the project and the concrete things the project intends to do. Interestingly, here, the art work is divided into three different conceptualizations of art: "original art production", "collaborative art production", and "promotional art production". This division neatly illustrates the recent changes in the artistic field: collaborative and pedagogical dimensions (explicitly stated value dimensions) can no longer be considered as simply extraneous to art; rather, they have become obligatory elements of contemporary artistic production (Ruffel, 2014).

A third framework is therefore not surprisingly a collaboration framework. Here the people working in the project are named and their CVs should be attached to the application (such lists are rarely complete, since the project is not yet under way, and not all people can be listed). However, the application form expects collaborators to be organizations, not individuals. Therefore, collaborators should be listed as "collaborator institutions", and following this logic, the division of labour should also be expressed in terms of institutions.

A fourth framework is the audience framework: this is where the applicant is prompted to give the longest account. Measured in pure space for writing, this is the most important framework. Here the applicant is asked to describe the intended audience, how the project plans to work with "audience development" (*publikutveckling*, e.g. widening the public, attracting new groups as audiences) and how the project considers the perspectives of equality, diversity and cultural difference, and how it works to increase

access for disabled people. The applicant is further asked to tick boxes about the age and geographical distribution of the intended audience.

Lastly, the application form asks the applicant to submit more details about several aspects of the art project: the gender of the artists and their professional roles (director, actor, etc.), and the planned event locations.

Region Skåne application form

The regional art application form contains much the same frameworks as the national funding agency application. The initial legal framework is almost the same, as is the artistic activity framework. One difference compared to the national funding agency application form is that the regional form asks for an explicit account of how the project will create surplus value (*mervärde*) for the region and how it contributes to the region's development. Here we see the effects of the emphasis on "policy attachment" (Gray, 2002) made in the 2009 bill on culture. The regional emphasis on spillover effects also corroborates Pierre-Michel Menger's historical account of the development of cultural policy in Europe, where the gradual decentralization of public support for the arts has led to an increasing policy attachment, especially towards social and economic concerns (2014). This explicit development is further corroborated by interviews we made with Region Skåne administrators (interview, 23 February 2016; interview, 9 March 2016; interview, 16 March 2016).

In the audience framework, the concern for the age of the audience is present, but the region also adds the dimensions of gender and ethnicity, which are not present in the national agency application form. The national agency is interested in the audience age (but not gender) and performer gender (but not age). Within the audience framework, the region focuses on the results and evaluation of the proposed project much more than the national agency. It asks how the audience is involved in the planning, implementation and follow-up of the project, but in particular it is interested in knowing the impact of the project in terms of certain valuemeters: equality, cultural diversity, and access for disabled people, but also how the project is marketed and how the results and experiences of the project are disseminated. While the national funding agency form asks the project applicants to posit possible ways in which the art project works with equality, diversity, cultural difference and disability, the regional form asks for specific "impacts" in relation to these same distinctions. It is arguably also more decisive in its requirement for the art project to be "participatory", making it hard to see how art projects that are not participatory would be eligible for funding.

Overall, Region Skåne's application form encourages the applicant to think of their project as open

at both ends: there is a greater requirement to situate the project in a chronology of before-during-after: a planning-implementation-evaluation model governs the logic of the application form. This also shifts the focus from art as an art work or activity (usually defined in terms of artistic innovation and excellence) to a more "planned" form of art. What is planned is evaluated, and what is evaluated is not the art itself, but the effects of art, and not just any effects, but effects that prioritize the surplus values of social cohesion and economic development.

Malmö city Department of Culture application form

The application form of the third funder, the city of Malmö, follows the same logic. The legal framework is the same as the Swedish Arts Council and Region Skåne. The artistic activity framework asks the applicant first to describe the organization submitting the application, then to state the project content and aim, what the projects wants to achieve, but also give locations and times of performances. The collaboration framework asks for names, roles, and division of labour. The audience framework consists of expected number of performances and expected number of people in the audience divided into age categories, and specified as audiences inside Malmö and outside Malmö. In general, the Malmö application form is the shortest and the most loosely framed. There is an emphasis on the city of Malmö, in particular when it comes to stating the composition of the audience. Somewhat surprisingly, prompts for equality, diversity, and cultural difference are entirely lacking from the application form.

To summarize: the Swedish Arts Council form subtly changes the understanding of the art activity to include dimensions of collaboration and pedagogy. The Region Skåne application clearly pushes the understanding of art as having spillover outcomes. While both the Swedish Arts Council and Region Skåne use the application instrument to advance particular ideas of art, it is more difficult to see any such agenda in the Malmö city application form. At the same time, the similarity of these forms is remarkable, and are a testimony of at least two significant trends. The first one is the networked (and to an extent, scaled) character of these agencies: clearly the valuemeters asked for in these forms are not locally produced, but are connected to larger (international) discussions of cultural value, at the same time as they display awareness of different localizations of those values. Secondly, these forms reveal the hierarchy of quantitative and qualitative valuemeters; they collect data that reflect current values and emphases of arts management, which are strongly oriented towards quantifying social diversity and economic growth.

Contents of the applications

The applications of *Drömmarnas väg* are clearly aligned with the perceived areas of focus of each application form. In the Swedish Arts Council application, the emphasis is on the artistic specificities of the project. In the Region Skåne application, the emphasis is on the spillover effects of the project. The Malmö city application flags the connections to the local neighbourhoods and schools. Much of the content in the applications seem to be copy-pasted from one application to the other. The focus on audience development, equality, diversity, cultural difference and access for disabled people is present in all applications as required by the application forms.

Interestingly, *Drömmarnas väg* own separate project description, which had to be submitted as an attachment to the applications, is also modelled on the application form (all the frameworks we delineate above are present in their project description in the same order). The Region Skåne form stands out as most closely matching *Drömmarnas väg* own description. It seems that Region Skåne's emphasis on the project as open-ended provides the most powerful formula with which to describe the project. It certainly has the effect of obtaining the most science-like formulations: terms and expressions such as "pre-study", "collecting empirical material", "interviews", "workshops", and "focus groups" populate the project description. This is not an accidental effect, we argue, but the product of a particular instance of metrologies realised at this particular juncture of the policy network. And of course, it is no surprise that the demand for knowledge through centres of calculation, metrological chains, and valuemeters are best satisfied through ideas and practices of art that can call on veridiction.

This is perhaps the most significant effect of the cascading metrologies of Swedish cultural policy: art is increasingly asked to account for itself as research, because research, much more than art, is able to count on veridiction. To put it more poignantly, art is becoming research not because research would produce better art, but because art as research can better supply the data the metrologies are asking for.

Evaluation reports

In general, the evaluation report forms are very closely aligned with the application forms: applicants are asked to report back on the issues which they were asked to write about in the application (re-describe the project, explain how it was implemented, report on changes, report on the audience development, and what they learned in the process). The evaluation report to the Swedish Arts Council focuses on the details of the output: the number of performances made, the size of the audiences at each performance, the age and gender composition of the audience.

The evaluation report to Region Skåne emphasises not only the output, but also the outcome (referred to as "results"). The most distinctive feature of the evaluation report is, again, the above mentioned *researchification*. This *researchification* is also visible in the evaluation reports to the Swedish Arts Council and Malmö city, even though their evaluation forms do not explicitly elicit such responses. In the Malmö city evaluation report, it becomes clear that the project depends on local administrative connections. The sway of the metrologies is looser at the capillary end of the policy network.

We have spent considerable time delineating the contents of the application policy instrument for one art project. Presumably, a lot of energy has gone into the design of the forms, their alignment to policy goals, and their function as instruments to measure effects of various kinds. On the other side of the policy instrument, energy has been spent in filling in the forms and aligning the content to perceived demands. Surprisingly, we learned in the interviews with the administrators that the results of these efforts go into a national database (*Kulturdatabasen*) where they are stored without much analysis. In the interviews, several administrators expressed a certain degree of frustration over the fact that there were no proper routines for consistently taking into account the evaluation reports. In fact, they admitted, the contents of the evaluation reports did not really matter; what mattered was that they were submitted. This contradiction is a salient feature of the art milieu in Malmö. Based on our case, the cultural policy emphasis on cascading metrologies have effects which have less to do with what is measured than the act of measuring itself. This is in line with the research of Dahler-Larsen, Pollitt and Cairney referred to above, which argues that evaluations and audits rarely influence the actual decisions or practice of policy.

"THIS IS PERHAPS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT EFFECT OF THE CASCADING METROLOGIES OF SWEDISH CULTURAL POLICY: ART IS INCREASINGLY ASKED TO ACCOUNT FOR ITSELF AS RESEARCH, BECAUSE RESEARCH, MUCH MORE THAN ART, IS ABLE TO COUNT ON VERIDICTIOIN"

Conclusion

In this paper, we have described cultural policy in action. We have analysed the mundane technical features of a milieu in which contemporary artists in Malmö and Sweden find themselves. We have also demonstrated how this milieu is produced through metrologies of global reach and on scales quite different from the unassuming play about unaccompanied refugee children fleeing war and finding safety in Sweden.

The change from "what" is funded towards "how" it is funded is, we think, a less well researched and understood part of neoliberal governmentalisation: too often, the focus is on some dimension of deregulation or privatization. What we are really observing here is not a deregulation, but another mode of institutional self-regulation: externalising a part of that regulation and bringing it into the folds of digitised, calculative accountability. On one hand, this move opens a governmental system to a greater transparency of actors and processes of decision. On the other hand, it produces new experts of governance, new systems of veridiction, new objects of veridiction and knowledge, and new objects of governance. However, as Frank Pasquale recently has pointed out, "transparency may simply provoke complexity that is as effective at defeating understanding as real or legal secrecy" (Pasquale, 2015: 8). For example, in the case that we have looked at, the institutional self-regulation of cultural policy produces new institutional entities (the Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis), new experts (cultural metrologists; theatre group funding managers), new forms of art (*researchified*, collaborative, audience developing, inserted into the social field as calculators of ethnicities, disabilities, spillover effects), and ultimately, a new kind of managerial objectivity which replaces aesthetic judgement as an arbiter for funding. Funding, thus, selects the kinds of artistic practices that have a chance at producing what Latour calls "the durability of social assemblage" (1991: 129). The socio-technical-aesthetic assemblages producing the contemporary art milieu in Malmö are, it turns out, complex "black boxes" of historically layered *dispositifs*, where veridiction and the cascading metrologies produced by centres of calculation are among the important actors. On the capillary ends of governmentalisation, these human and non-human agents are visible only as the banal and mundane checkboxes, radio buttons, and text boxes of application forms.

The fact that things are measured seems to be what matters, not the facts that are established through measuring. The progressive socialisation and naturalisation of spillover effects such as social sustainability, community cohesion, social capital, and innovation may therefore be less a question of measurable content than of the process of measuring itself. However, they are forming a new milieu for the arts, where art is governed through metrologies, via ex-

perts of systems of governance rather than experts of the arts themselves, where the arts are embedded in the milieu as calculable effect generators. This is a new global governmental constraint to art. The challenge for cultural policy research and art research is to locate in this new governmental constraint not just another nefarious program damaging the arts (the ghost of neoliberal expansion to build a past of liberal freedoms lost), but to describe the new situation for the arts, the new conditions under which art develops, and of course, the new types of art that the changed conditions already produce.

REFERENCES

- BELFIORE, E. (2015) Foreword. In MacDowall, L.; Badham, M.; Blomkamp, E.; Dunphy, K. (eds.). *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement* (pp. ix-xi) Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BUSSOLINI, J. (2010) What Is a Dispositive? *Foucault Studies*, 10, 85-107.
- CAIRNEY, P. (2016) *The Politics of Evidence-Based Policy Making*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- DAHLER-LARSEN, P. (2012) *The Evaluation Society*. Stanford: Stanford Business Books.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1990) *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1, An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1997) *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. The Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984, 1. New York: The New Press.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- GRAY, C. (2002) *Local Government and the Arts*. *Local Government Studies*, 28 (1), 77-90.
- KULTURUTREDNINGEN (1972) *Ny Kulturpolitik: En Rapport Från Kulturutredningen*. Stockholm: Fritze.
- KULTURUTREDNINGEN (1995) *Tjugo Års Kulturpolitik 1974-1994: En Rapport Från Kulturutredningen*. Stockholm: Fritze.
- KULTURUTREDNINGEN (2009a) *Betänkande Av Kulturutredningen. Grundanalys*. Stockholm: Fritze. Available at: [http://www.regeringen.se/rattsdokument/statens-of-](http://www.regeringen.se/rattsdokument/statens-of)

- fentliga-utredningar/2009/02/sou-200916 (accessed 17 August 2016).
- KULTURUTREDNINGEN (2009b) *Betänkande Av Kulturutredningen. Kulturpolitikens Arkitektur*. Stockholm: Fritze. Available at: <http://www.regeringen.se/rattsdokument/statens-offentliga-utredningar/2009/02/sou-200916> (accessed 17 August 2016).
- LASCOUMES, P.; LE GALÈS, P. (2007) Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments - From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 20 (1), 1-21.
- LATOURE, B. (1986) Visualisation and Cognition: Drawing Things Together. *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present*, 6, 1-40.
- LATOURE, B. (1987) *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- LATOURE, B. (1991) Technology Is Society Made Durable. In Law, J. (ed.). *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination* (pp. 103-33) London: Routledge.
- LATOURE, B.; LÉPINAY, V. A. (2009) *The Science of Passionate Interests: An Introduction to Gabriel Tarde's Economic Anthropology*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- LAW, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- MACDOWALL, L. (2015) Introduction: Making Culture Count. In MacDowall, L.; Badham, M.; Blomkamp, E.; Dunphy, K. (eds.). *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement* (pp. 1-5). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MADDEN, C. (2005) Indicators for Arts and Cultural Policy: A Global Perspective. *Cultural Trends*, 14 (3), 217-247.
- MENGER, P.-M. (2014) European Cultural Policies and the "Creative Industries" Turn. In Thomas, K.; Chan, J. (eds.). *Handbook of Research on Creativity* (pp. 479-492) Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- MYNDIGHETEN FÖR KULTURANALYS (2016) What We Do - Kulturanalys. Available at: <http://www.kulturanalys.se/en/activities/> (accessed 14 September 2016).
- PASQUALE, F. (2015) *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- POLLITT, C. (2006) Performance Information for Democracy: The Missing Link? *Evaluation*, 12 (1), 38-55.
- RIKSDAGSFÖRVALTNINGEN (1993) *Kommittédirektiv 1993:24 - Kulturpolitikens Inriktning*. Stockholm. Available at: https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/kommittedirektiv/kulturpolitikens-inriktning_GHB124 (accessed 5 September 2016).
- RIKSDAGSFÖRVALTNINGEN (1994) *Tilläggsdirektiv till Kommittén Om Kulturpolitikens Inriktning (Ku 1993:03) Kommittédirektiv 1994:146*. Stockholm. Available at: https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/kommittedirektiv/tillaggsdirektiv-till-kommitten-om_GIB1146 (accessed 5 September 2016).
- ROSE, N. (1999) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books.
- ROSE, N.; MILLER, P. (2008) *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*. Cambridge: Polity.
- ROSE, N.; MILLER, P. (2010) Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61 (1), 271-303.
- RUFFEL, L. (2014) The Public Spaces of Contemporary Literature. *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences*, 22 (2), 101-122.
- SELWOOD, S. (2002) The politics of data collection: Gathering, analysing and using data about the subsidised cultural sector in England. *Cultural Trends*, 12 (47), 13-84.
- SVERIGE - REGERINGEN (1974) *Den Statliga Kulturpolitiken: Kungl. Maj:ts Proposition 1974:28*.
- SVERIGE - REGERINGEN (1996) *Regeringens Proposition 1996/97:3: Kulturpolitik*.
- SVERIGE - REGERINGEN (2009) *Tid För Kultur*. Available at: <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/13/21/04/a7e858d4.pdf> (accessed 5 August 2016).
- VALENTINE, J. (2007) Political Art, Cultural Policy, and Artistic Agency. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, 51 (1), 96-111.

To cite this article:

KAUPPINEN, A.; CLAVIER, B. (2017). Checkboxes and radio buttons: metrologies, cultural policy, and the dispositif of art management. *ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 7 (1), pp. 59-70.