

In Search of Equity:

**Instruments of Equity Within
Finnish Cultural Policy and Funding**

Laura Valoma

Master's Thesis

Arts Management

Sibelius Academy

University of the Arts Helsinki

Spring 2024

Title In Search of Equity: Instruments of Equity Within Finnish Cultural Policy and Funding	Number of Pages 76 + references and appendices
Author Laura Valoma	Semester Spring 2024
Department Arts Management	
Abstract <p>Equity has become a prominent topic through societal movements, activism and research contributing to social justice. The rapidly diversifying Finnish society needs to acknowledge its discriminating structures and cultural policy and funding are not an exception. This thesis aims to describe how equity is integrated into Finnish cultural policy and funding of current. The key elements of equity are examined from three perspectives, the policies, the funding, and research on cultural policy.</p> <p>The multifaceted concepts of diversity, identity, discrimination and intersectionality will guide this study grounded on the theoretical frameworks of cultural policy, cultural rights and research on cultural policy. Through its vast and interconnected frameworks this study reveals cultural policy to be essential in realising equity in the field of arts and culture and within state funding. Rooted in intersectional feminist thinking, this study strives to reveal what equity measures Finnish cultural policy and funding encases, how they are implemented and monitored and furthermore what are the themes arising from current discourse on diversity and equity.</p> <p>The results indicate evident intent and will among decision-makers to include equity into policymaking, however a systematic approach has not been implemented as of yet. Many of the equity instruments and objectives appear general without a transparent plan of how by whom or when they are to be executed. Although encouraging changes can be observed, more effective action and structural change are needed. In addition, the results stipulate more research from several perspectives is needed for creating an equitable cultural policy with participatory and intersectional practices.</p>	
Keywords Cultural policy, funding, equity, diversity, cultural rights, discrimination, intersectionality	
This work has been checked in the plagiarism detection program Turnitin April 3, 2024 Violeta Simjanovska	

TABLE OF CONTENT

Acknowledgements and Abbreviations	4
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Problem Formulating	7
1.3 Researcher Aim and Questions	7
1.4 Previous Research	8
1.5 Research Approach	9
1.6 Researcher Position and Ethics	10
1.7 Thesis Structure	11
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	13
2.1 Lost in Translation	13
2.2 Defining Equity and Equality	14
2.3 Describing Identity, Diversity and Discrimination	16
2.4 Intersectionality	21
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	24
3.1 Cultural Rights	24
3.2 Cultural Policy Instruments	27
3.3 Finnish Cultural Policy and Funding	29
3.4 Cultural Policy Research	33
4. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK	36
4.1 Research Methods	36
4.2 Qualitative Research	36
4.2.1 Single Case Study.....	38
4.2.2 Semi-structured Interviews.....	39
4.2.3 Rapid Literature Review.....	40

4.3 Thematic Analysis & Critical Discourse Analysis.....	40
4.3.1 Analysing the Data	41
4.3.2 Critical Reflections and Limitations.....	42
5. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.....	44
5.1 Critical words	44
5.2 Identifying Key Instruments	49
5.2.1 Existing Equity Instruments	50
5.2.2 Implementation of Equity Instruments	51
5.2.3 Evaluating and Monitoring of Equity Instruments	53
5.3 Themes and Challenges Arising from the Data.....	54
5.3.1 Statistics and Diversity	55
5.3.2 National Institutions & Agencies Under MinEdC.....	57
5.3.3 Knowledgebase, Monitoring and Equity Indicators	59
5.3.4 Positive Action Supporting Representation.....	63
5.3.5 Lack of Intersectionality.....	66
6. CONCLUSIONS	69
6.1 Summary of the Results.....	69
6.2 Furthering Equity	71
6.3 Final Conclusions	73
6.4 Generalisability	74
7. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	75
7.1 Further Research on Equity.....	75
7.2 Further Research on Cultural Policy	76
8. REFERENCES	77
APPENDICES.....	89

Acknowledgements and Abbreviations

First and foremost, this research will abide by overall good practices of academic research as well as the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK guidelines.

Microsoft Word was used to write this thesis. Google Scholar and ResearchGate in addition to the library databases of the University of the Arts Helsinki (Arsca) and the University of Helsinki (Helka) were used in the search for relevant articles.

Grammarly Free was used solely for correcting grammatical mistakes such as typos, punctuation, and spelling mistakes. No other AI was used in the process of researching or writing this thesis.

Abbreviations

MinEdC = the Ministry of Education and Culture

Taike = Arts Promotion Centre Finland

Cupore = Center for Cultural Policy Research

DEI = diversity, equity and inclusion

BIPOC = black, indigenous and people of colour

UNESCO = The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

It is a lottery win to be born in Finland, as the saying goes. Finland is described as “*lintukoto*” or “*lyckoland*”, the land of bliss. Finland, defined by Nordic exceptionalism is constructed on notions of equality, social welfare and cohesion with its identity based on the perception of a nation of peace-loving and moral citizens (Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2012, p. 2). For long Finnish arts and culture as well as cultural policies have reflected and strengthened said narrative. Yet, arts and culture do not exist in a vacuum but rather operate on multiple levels of a society fostering various forms of structural injustice and inequalities. The narrative of Nordic exceptionalism is shattering.

Research of the last decade as well as recent societal movements have raised critical questions concerning the realities of the marginalised. A recent study, *Being black in the EU* reveals Finland to be one the most racist countries in the EU towards people of African descent (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2023). Cupore’s recent studies from the field of arts and culture concentrating on the status of artists with foreign backgrounds indicate that more concrete actions for equality are needed. These studies including the latest diversity report *Ulkomaalaistaustaiset taiteilijat Suomessa – Moninaisuusraportti* (2023) and a study of foreign-born arts and culture professionals *Avaus – Ulkomaalaissyntyisten taide- ja kulttuurialan ammattilaisten asema Suomessa* (2020) reveal the discrimination faced by foreign-born artists to be common in addition to a lack of systematic monitoring of the situation. Teosto (a performance rights and royalty collecting non-profit organization representing music creatives) published a recent study focusing on the Finnish music industry that discloses substantial discrimination based on ethnicity, gender, and age (Aura, 2024). Moreover, Finnish films and TV series depict the typical Finn as white, able, and heterosexual (Sundqvist, 2023), hardly reflecting the real demographic diversity of Finland. The challenges are imminent within the rapidly diversifying society.

In 1990 the percentage of persons with foreign backgrounds in Finland was a mere 0,8% and by 2022 it had increased to 9,1% (Tilastokeskus, n.d.). In addition, as the

population of Finland is ageing, immigration will further increase. Finland will inevitably become even more multicultural, multilingual, and diverse. Moreover, calls for equity and inclusion regarding minorities and marginalised groups, such as the disabled, the LGBTQIA+, the Roma, the Sámi and the BIPOC are current and critical. Activists and artists together with civil society have raised important topics of equity, participation, accessibility, and anti-racism in the form of social change movements such as #metoo, Black Lives Matter, Extinction Rebellion, Movements against apartheid, initially concerning South Africa currently Palestine and Movements for indigenous rights. International and national movements and activism are affecting Finland in addition to the ongoing crises around the world. The opposition to these social justice movements; the political populist movement, polarisation and the current right-wing government along with its austerity measures will play important roles in how arts and culture are valued and funded. It is safe to say that Finnish society is going through pivotal changes that will inescapably affect the field of arts and culture.

These pivotal changes and my values paved the way for finding my thesis topic. I strongly believe in human rights, social justice and arts and culture as a value but also as a practice. Throughout my professional life, I have sought ways to link, advocate and contribute to these topics through arts and culture. During my studies, the link between social justice and cultural policy became evident when researching the current cultural and linguistic rights of the Sámi in Finland. The awareness of the double standards between the privileges I for instance hold and the inequalities so many in Finland face crystallised the topic of this thesis, equity. Cultural policy then appears an obvious link in realising equity within arts and culture. Moreover, cultural policies guiding and supporting arts and culture will determine whose art is valued, funded, and promoted. Therein lies the pivotal question intriguing me: is the current cultural policy regime able to address the critical issues of rapid diversification, societal and cultural inequalities and subsequently equity?

1.2 Problem Formulating

The question of equity within policies is multifaceted. For a comprehensive picture of the state of equity in cultural policy and funding, it should be researched through various viewpoints. An extensive study should include statistics on how state subsidies for arts and culture have been applied and subsequently allocated, including information on ethnicity, race, and/or other minority status of the applicants. Yet, identifying minorities is almost impossible as Finland does not gather data on ethnicity, race or other minority status, only language, religion and country of origin thus rendering many minorities invisible.

Another critical aspect to be considered is the viewpoint of the artists of these minority and marginalised groups. Only through their personal experiences of inequalities and discrimination can a cohesive picture of the state of equity in the Finnish cultural policy and funding be formed. This however is difficult for the same reasons as studying the first aspect of allocated funds, there are no statistics. Identifying these artists without data on ethnicity or minority status is difficult demanding ample resources. In addition, it would be beneficial to compare the equity instruments and programs with non-governmental funding such as private foundations as they are perhaps more agile in creating and implementing new initiatives. However, within the scope of a thesis research, it is relevant to concentrate on one aspect.

The final aspect is the key to this research. Cultural policies are significant in realising cultural rights but also governing and safeguarding an environment where diverse cultural expressions and arts and culture of multiple forms thrive. Equity then is implemental in ensuring everyone the required recourses and opportunities. This study will concentrate on examining the policy instruments, initiatives and programmes for equity within Finnish cultural policy and funding, and how they are implemented and evaluated.

1.3 Researcher Aim and Questions

This research strives to formulate a picture of how equity is incorporated into Finnish cultural policy with a wider aim of contributing to social justice issues. The objective is to highlight the importance of structural change in dismantling inequalities and striving towards

equity. For this, it is important to identify the possible equity instruments in place, how they are implemented and consequently monitored and evaluated. To shed light on the state of equity, three important perspectives are included, the policies, state funding and the current research on cultural policy.

The main research questions of this thesis are as follows:

- What are the current equity instruments in Finnish cultural policy and funding?
- How are these instruments realised and implemented?
- What are the means of measuring and evaluating the outcomes of these equity instruments?
- What kind of themes arise from the discourse on equity, diversity, cultural policy and funding?

These questions are to be answered through an investigation of national equity policies laid out and implemented by the MinEdC and those of Taike. In addition, examining how these policies and instruments are evaluated and monitored will create an overview of the state of equity. The research will concentrate on the current cultural policy documents such as MinEdC strategies, cultural policy strategies and reports, and action plans relevant to diversity and equity. In addition, interviews with representatives of MinEdC, Taike and Cupore are conducted. Themes arising from the research data will then position the study among current discourses on equity.

1.4 Previous Research

What is notable within the discourse and research on equity is that they are predominantly concentrated on a certain group or a certain field. Cupore, for instance, has considered equity in numerous study projects, fact sheets and reports such as the yearly arts and culture barometers from 2016-2018, *Elokuva-alalta valmistuneiden työllistyminen* (2019-2020) focused on the film industry, *Avaus – Toimijaksi suomalaisella taide- ja kulttuurikentällä* (2017-2020) and *Ulkomaalaistaustaiset taiteilijat Suomessa – Moninaisuusraportti 2023*, the last two concentrating on the perspective of foreign-born artist

in Finland. Furthermore, research and programmes considering diversity or equity within arts and culture have often concentrated on describing how accessible arts and culture or the education of arts and culture are to different vulnerable groups and minorities, such as the *Arts Equal* research initiative (2015-2021) and the *Culture for All* service. These are important aspects to consider, and all are deeply interconnected with equity, however, what strives this research is the question of equity within policymaking.

Research and literature on cultural policy and diversity are extensive usually covering some aspects of equity (eg. Balta Portoles & Dragičević Šešic, 2017; Belfiore, 2016; Belfiore et al., 2023; Canyürek, 2022; Koivunen & Marsio, 2007; Pekkarinen, 2022; Saukkonen, 2007; Saukkonen, 2010; Saukkonen, 2021, Saukkonen & Pyykkönen, 2008; Vella & Xuereb, 2021). Equity and diversity, particularly in the field of education, have been studied with recommendations for equity instruments in relation to policymaking (eg. Citro et al., 2019; Connolly et al., 2020; Silverman, 2010). Nonetheless, research focused on equity and equity instruments specifically within cultural policy is scarce and often focused on inclusion and accessibility, important aspects of realising equity. The aspects this thesis seeks to cover are diversity and equity within cultural policies and funding. What policies enable, support and safeguard the diverse manifestation of arts and culture? What is the state of equity within Finnish cultural policy and funding?

1.5 Research Approach

This is a qualitative single case study rooted in intersectional feminist thinking. The research data consists of relevant policy documents such as MinEdC strategies, reports and action plans considering equity and/or diversity gathered through rapid literature review as well as three semi-structured interviews. The methods of analysis are critical discourse analysis and thematic analysis.

The interviews with MinEdC representatives Maija Lummepero and Johanna Vuolasto as well as with Cupore representative Miikka Pyykkönen were conducted in December 2023. The representative of Taika, Kaisa Rönkkö was interviewed in January 2024. From the overall research material, interviews and documents, I will then formulate

themes of relevant discourse considering the multiple aspects impacting equity and its realisation within cultural policy and funding. Contrasting the themes with the vast frameworks of this study will then create an overview of the state of equity and will position this study among current discourses on equity and cultural policy.

1.6 Researcher Position and Ethics

To understand my position and the privilege it holds, I must reflect on this research from an intersectional feminist viewpoint. My position as a researcher is that of privilege, white majority, well-educated, middle-class, cisgender to name a few. It is important to acknowledge this and consider how it might affect my assumptions as a researcher, my ability to recognise injustice and the interaction with the participants and perhaps the form or quality of the results. Though researching from this position of privilege, I would like to see myself as an ally to minorities and a mediator of information. This has a profound effect on the research position and ethics. However, the constraints of reflexivity must also be considered. Reflecting on my position only to absolve myself as a privileged researcher, or to gain prestige through raising awareness cannot be the result of reflexivity (Kallio, 2021, p. 54).

Intersectionality investigates how intersecting power relations influence social relations across diverse societies as well as individual experiences in everyday life. As an analytical tool, intersectionality views categories of race, class, gender, sexuality, class, nation, ability, ethnicity, and age – among others – as interrelated and mutually shaping one another. Intersectionality is a way of understanding and explaining complexity in the world, in people and in human experiences. (Collins & Bilge, 2020, p. 4)

As Bailey et al. describe it, as an analytical tool intersectionality can help identify the multiple layers of human identity and socially constructed categories (2019, p. 3). Manifestations of diversity and discrimination within Finnish society need to be considered to recognise where there is a lack of equity, or what measures are taken to tackle these issues.

Additionally, examining the power relations and representation impacting policy decision-making is important. Thus, examining the diversity represented among policymakers, those executing the policies and the process of evaluating these measures will hopefully form a realistic and current picture of equity in Finland today.

As the participants are representing public institutions, they are likely to be recognised. The issue of anonymity was discussed in detail with the interviewees, and though there was some hesitation perhaps due to the sensitivity of the subject, all agreed to be referred to by name and position.

1.7 Thesis Structure

This thesis is structured in seven main chapters and several subchapters followed by references and appendices. In the first chapter, I will introduce the background and problem formulation of the study followed by the aim and research questions, previous research, research approach and assess my position as a researcher, present the ethical considerations and finally the thesis structure.

In Chapter 2 I will present the key concepts of equity and equality, identity, diversity and discrimination and intersectionality followed by the theoretical framework in Chapter 3. The theoretical framework consists of Finnish cultural policy complemented by cultural rights, cultural policy instruments and cultural policy research. The concepts in both Chapters 2 and 3 are deeply intertwined and complimentary and will connect this thesis with the current discourse on cultural policy. Throughout the frameworks, I will consider how the concepts and theories pertain to equity.

Chapter 4 is dedicated to the methodological framework of a qualitative single case study in which I will describe and justify the methods used which are semi-structured interviews and rapid literature review. I will then continue to describe the analytical methods of thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis followed by critical reflections and limitations of the study.

Results and analysis of the research material are presented in Chapter 5. I will begin with the results of the critical discourse analysis describing what words and language used within the policy documents reveal about the state of equity. To answer the research questions, I will continue to identify the key policy instruments supporting equity, and the implementation and evaluation as they appear in the data collected. I will then in detail describe and analyse the themes that have emerged from the overall research data, and what implications there are concerning equity within the frameworks of this thesis.

In Chapter 6 I present a summary of the results, reflections on furthering equity, final conclusions and generalisability. Chapter 7 will conclude with recommendations of motifs for future research arising from the results, followed by references and appendices including the interview questions in Finnish and in English.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter introduces the conceptual framework on which this thesis is grounded. The guiding principle is equity, the search for equity, recognition of equity and how it may improve not only the field of arts and culture but the entire society. Thus, the framework relies on the concept of equity complemented and further explained by concepts of equality, identity, diversity, discrimination, and intersectionality. These concepts will position this study amongst the current discourse on equity and guide the interpretations of the findings. I will begin by briefly expanding and illuminating the translations of equity and equality and their legal status in Finland. I will then continue to present the concepts and current discourse involving these concepts as well as how they are manifested in Finnish society of current.

2.1 Lost in Translation

As this thesis is set in the Finnish context but written in English, to clearly understand the different wordings and nuances, the concepts and how they are perceived in this thesis need to be clarified. However, the concepts themselves are difficult to unequivocally define. Distinct terms matter because conceptions are created through vocabulary. The challenge of this thesis therein lies in translation. Between context-specific concepts such as equity and discrimination and two languages, some words simply do not distinctly translate. Thus, it is critical to clarify the translations and their use in this research.

Equality translated into Finnish is “*tasa-arvo*” (literal: equal value) and has since come to mean specifically socio-economic and gender equality (Ekvalita, 2022). Moreover, judicial equality in Finland refers to the equality between genders and is specifically governed by the Act on Equality Between Women and Men (609/1986), thus reaffirming the meaning of the word equality referring to gender equality. Then the dictionary translation for equity into Finnish is also “*tasa-arvo*” (literal: equal value) making the distinction between equality and equity difficult in the Finnish language. Furthermore, the term “*yhdenvertaisuus*” (literal: equivalence) which is often used as a translation for equity, in

Finnish is commonly used synonymously with equality. However, “*yhdenvertaisuus*” (literal: equivalence) encompasses a wider notion than only socio-economic and gender equality signifying equal opportunity in life, education, healthcare, work and more specifically non-discrimination and fair treatment. It has been written into a law, “*Yhdenvertaisuuslaki*” which then again as translated is the Non-discrimination Act (1325/2014). This aspect of fairness and non-discrimination embodies the meaning of equity.

As described, the words and translations introduced here are sometimes used simultaneously, and synonymously and are intertwined in meaning and use. However, shifts in language are rapid and nuances of these words are in constant motion. This, however, is the framework of the terms used and examined within the written data and interviews of this thesis; equality is translated to “*tasa-arvo*” and equity to “*yhdenvertaisuus*” and vice versa.

2.2 Defining Equity and Equality

Equity and equality are attributed to the same qualities of justice in English dictionaries, they are even used to define each other (Minow, 2021, p.171-172). However, there is a fundamental difference between equity and equality (Montañez, 2023, p. 1; Minow, 2021, p. 167). Equality holds the principle of equal opportunity, and equal humanity and encompasses sameness, equal value. It has been a coveted resolution of human struggles to be recognised as equally valuable and the same (Kumar, 2021, p. 26). Equity on the other hand encompasses two aspects missing from equality; fairness and inclusion (Honkasilta et al., 2019, p. 1). The shift from equality made known by the past social justice movements to equity holds an aspiration of recognising and tackling systemic inequalities (Minow, 2021, p. 170-171.) Thus, recognising different needs (inclusion) and treating everyone according to their needs (fairness). Section 9 of the Finnish Non-discrimination Act states: “Proportionate different treatment that aims to promote de facto equality, or to prevent or remove the disadvantages attributable to discrimination, does not constitute discrimination.” (1325/2014). Indeed, equity can be seen as a means to achieving equality in effect (Kumar, 2021, p. 26).

The understanding of these fundamentally different concepts of equity and equality is further described in the following figure circulating the Internet.

Figure 1

The Difference Between Equality, Equity and Systemic Equity



From <https://www.diffen.com/difference/Equality-vs-Equity>.

As pictured in *Figure 1* in the first picture from the left, everyone has an equal place and a possibility to watch the game. Equality here stands for equal opportunity, everyone having the same possibilities in life, everyone is granted the same. However, this equal opportunity is by no means just and subsequently reveals inequalities in the treatment of diverse groups and individuals. Tackling those inequalities calls for equity. Equity then stands for the support systems in providing equal opportunity. As depicted in the middle picture, the differences between these spectators have been considered and addressed fairly creating equity. All of them can now reach over the fence and watch the game, here equity stands for fair treatment. However, the kind of equity described in the middle picture is concerned with the individual. When equity is applied on a systemic level, improving the circumstances for all without singling out the ones in need of specific support, as presented in the last picture, it tackles structural injustice.

Finland is reportedly the world's happiest country for seven consecutive years (Helliwell et al., 2024). In addition, Finland among the other Nordics ranks high in different

welfare indexes such as Gender Equality ranking, Global Gender Gap Index, Press Freedom Index and Corruptions Perceptions Index (Ekvalita, 2022). The concept of equal opportunity is embedded deep in the Finnish national identity (Lehmuskallio, 2022, p.113). Finland among the Nordics basks in the limelight of gender equality as defined by the “Nordic model” and has since become a part of national self-esteem (Nygren et al., 2018). Much like Nordic exceptionalism, this notion of a Nordic social-democratic welfare society has become synonymous with equality itself, particularly gender equality, levelling the socioeconomic statuses and equal opportunity in education, work, and healthcare. Furthermore, equality as in granting everyone the same is easily obtained in a seemingly homogenous society.

However, Finland is and has always been diverse (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 178; Lehmuskallio, 2022, p. 106). As Finnish society has evolved beyond the calls for equal opportunity through the understanding that the same circumstances and assets are hampered by a myriad of social and economic inequalities and diversity throughout the society, equity has become a relevant topic. A shift in language can be observed in the public discourse of civil society and activists as well as within the strategies and reports of MinEdC. ”Arts and cultural organisations must be able to identify discriminatory structures and recruitment practices and recognise their varying degrees of existence in their own activities. Expertise related to cultural diversity, equity and equality should be developed in these organisations.” (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021). Indeed, a shift in language is not an adequate measure for equity but it needs to translate into action (Minow, 2021, p. 171).

To summarise, equality assumes everyone will benefit from the same circumstances and assets, in other words, the principle of equality in Finland. However, equity acknowledges that everyone has different demands and resources and by way of active measures improves the unequal conditions. Moreover, systemic equity instead of concentrating on individual needs then improves the circumstances for all by removing barriers in creating direct systems of support such as quotas or positive action. Furthermore, equity recognises not only barriers and inequalities but also privileges and advantages connecting it profoundly with diversity, discrimination, and intersectionality.

2.3 Describing Identity, Diversity and Discrimination

No group ever defines itself as One without immediately setting up the Other opposite itself... For the native of a country inhabitants of other countries are viewed as “foreigners”; Jews are the “others” for anti-Semites, blacks for racist Americans, indigenous people for colonists, proletarians for the propertied classes. (de Beauvoir, 2011, p. 26)

To illustrate the multifaceted concepts of identity, diversity and discrimination briefly but profoundly, I will describe them through the concept of other/othering, prominent in literature concerned with inequalities from feminist writers such as de Beauvoir, Morrison and Lorde. The origin of discrimination is the origin of othering, for discrimination requires the other, the diverse in opposite of the one. Thus, diversity and discrimination can be traced back to the formation of identity.

The modern understanding of identity, as Fukuyama explains it, can be derived into three different concepts: recognition, an inner self more valuable than society, and dignity (2018, p. 37). Humans are defined by identity, who they are, and where they belong, identity is the beholder of human dignity. The inner self is the most valuable and if the world fails to recognise its worth, if the norms do not fit, identity becomes at odds with society (Fukuyama, 2018, p.10). All humans crave recognition of their value, inherent dignity and identity. Though identity is complex and comprises many different layers of belonging, identity will inevitably create the others diverse from the majority. The others of today are the marginalised, the discriminated, and the ignored, the ones not fitting the norm. Further, as identity has evolved to encompass multiple layers, one can, simultaneously belong and be the other. Most crave recognition for all those different intersections of their identities.

Identity, ideology, and norms creating identity politics are intertwined and inseparable. The accomplishments of an ideology can be measured by how well it has influenced the norms, the same has happened with identity (Malesevic, 2006, p. 4). Malesevic continues to explain that while an ideology or identity becomes the norm, and is accepted through repetition by the majority, it becomes natural and a matter of fact (2006, p. 4). Identity politics operate on the same level, it seeks to intensify the feeling of belonging and justification of an ideology/identity by enforcing the norm and opposing the diverse, the

other. This development can be observed in any formation of a national identity, also in Finland. In Finland, this process of nation-building was intensely intertwined with the establishment of cultural institutions (Kangas, 2001; Saukkonen, 2021, p. 177; Sokka et al. 2022, p. 49). This process included the majority but most importantly excluded diversity.

Research suggests members of the majority (white, cis-men) view diversity differently than members of the minority (Unzueta & Binning, 2009, p. 3). For the majority, diversity in its simplest can mean the representation of women and/or BIPOC (Unzueta & Binning, 2009, p. 3). Diversity, however, is a multi-layered concept difficult to describe, thus cultural diversity along with multiculturalism has been adopted to reflect diversity as widely as possible (Silverman, 2010, p. 293). In opposite to monoculture, diversity holds a wide array of identifying categories including but not limited to ethnicity, race, gender, ability, class, religion, nationality, and immigrant status (Silverman, 2010, p. 297; Loh et al., 2022, p. 7). These categories can overlap as well as be invisible or visible (Silverman, 2010, p. 297-298). Diversity can also be viewed as spatial as Gupta & Ferguson describe the identities of immigrants, refugees and exiles as interconnected to local cultures and furthermore linking diversity to colonial encounters of old and new cultures (2008, p. 7-8). Thus, cultural diversity is transgenerational, a bridge between the past and present adding a temporal dimension. Combining identity, temporality and spatiality, UNESCO's definition of cultural diversity reaches over time and space encompassing a plethora of identities and communities. (UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity 2001). However, neurodiversity and diverse bodyminds appear absent even in the widest definitions of diversity. Hence, as diversity is such a multifaceted and dynamic concept in addition to the majority's tendency to simplify, categories of diversity often lead to stereotypes. These stereotypes are then fuelled by existing norms, power structures or supremacy leading to discrimination.

Discrimination happens due to belonging to a social group defined as diverse rather than for individual traits or qualities (Striebing et al., 2023, p. 5). Furthermore, to justify the power structure, the norm, the diverse group must be attributed with negative characteristics to set it apart from or to oppose the norm.

Racism, the belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance. Sexism, the belief in the inherent superiority of one sex over the other and thereby the right to dominance. Ageism. Heterosexism. Elitism. Classism. (Lorde, 2019, p. 108)

Just as identities and diversity are layered, some parts are visible and some ambiguous, so are the forms of discrimination. Discrimination operates on multiple levels, individual, societal, visible and undetected. In addition to recognisable forms, advancing the already privileged groups will add to discrimination though the initial intent has been positive (Striebing et al., 2023, p. 5-6). Striebing et al. continue to describe the subtle and complex forms of discrimination including implicit bias, microaggressions and systemic structures of oppression (2023, p. 5). However, research suggests a difficulty in perceiving injustices such as racism as structural (Unzueta & Binning, 2009, p. 5). Still, an important shift in the discourse and understanding of discrimination can be observed. Instead of perceiving discrimination rooted in personal attitudes, the perspective is slowly shifting towards comprehending the problem as societal. Furthermore, the more subtle and structural forms of discrimination bear the same negative results as interpersonal racism if not even more (Striebing et al., 2023, p. 5-6). Racism, ableism, misogyny, homophobia etc. are the products of an unjust society based on white supremacy with structures of systemic discrimination. Shifting the focus from the blatantly discriminating individual will then reveal systemic discrimination and social injustice.

While identity especially in the Western world is more and more constructed on individuality and achievement, and the services, spaces, and facilities are made to cater mostly to the majority, diversity is both distinct and obscure. There are distinct mandatory actions for equity and inclusion such as accessible toilets, disabled parking, and wheelchair access, to name a few. Yet, these actions seem to have an othering effect as they are directing attention to the differences. This is imperative also from the viewpoint of equity as actions directed at a single minority group can reinforce the negative stereotypical conception of that group (Grove, 2017, p. 176). Studies indicate an artist from a minority group should not be referred to as a minority artist as it will marginalise and limit the field of operations

(Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 27). This confirms how equity measures and instruments should be institutional and targeted towards the structures rather than individuals or minority groups.

Discrimination does not happen in a vacuum but is rather in constant dialogue with society and its current discourses. In Finland, the current political climate with nationalist and populist forces in charge has created a conversational culture normalising racism making it even harder to acknowledge and dismantle the discriminative power structures. These asymmetrical power structures reinforce limited participation. Arts and culture are dynamic and connected to power structures. *Avaus*, a study on the status of foreign-born arts and culture professionals in Finland stipulates that the structures in the Finnish arts and culture field are not equitable, and experiencing discrimination is common (Lahtinen et al., 2020, p. 115-116). Finland is still quite far from having diversity incorporated at all levels within cultural life. Research reveals how the field of arts and culture includes some only to exclude others (Pekkarinen, 2022, p. 94). The cultural hegemony of the white majority points out how discrimination among arts and culture is intersectional (Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 164). In fact, the arts and culture barometer indicates that foreign-born artists have more problems with work opportunities and funding, in addition, the answers to the open-ended questions disclose experiences of exclusion and discrimination based on language, ethnicity, gender or a combination of these (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 83). In addition, *Being Black in the EU* - survey reports widespread racism, discrimination, harassment and violence against people of African descent, the study reveals Finland to be one of the most racist countries in the EU (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2023).

All of this is taking place in the happiest country with ample legislation meant to ensure equality and equity. In addition to national legislation against discrimination, Finland has ratified universal conventions and declarations such as the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965, ratified by Finland in 1970), the UNESCO Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice (1978) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966, ratified in 1976), Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005, ratified 2006), (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021). This illuminates how complex bias, and inequalities are

embedded in the structures and how the laws made to govern equality and equity in fact render the system blind to its own elusive bias.

“Demands for equality need to be as complicated as the inequalities they attempt to address.” (Eddo-Lodge, 2020, p.183). As the aforementioned studies indicate, research is often focused on a single minority group excluding all others, or a certain aspect of diversity, quite often cultural diversity. In Finland, cultural diversity then appears to exclude the national minorities such as the Sámi, the Roma, and the Karelians not to mention the diversity of gender and sexuality, neurodiversity, diversity of the bodymind, ability and diversity that is concealed behind normativity. However, they are all present in the field of arts and culture and subsequently a part of cultural policy. Moreover, groups and minorities are not monolithic but rather intersectional. Hence, to avoid generalisation, it is vital within the scope of research practices to attempt to enclose multiple aspects of diversity in an intersectional approach.

2.4 Intersectionality

“Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic.” (Lorde, 2019, p. 104).

Understanding intersectionality as a concept, an ideal is deeply rooted in the comprehension of identity, diversity, discrimination and consequently equity. Intersectionality is also a key element in the methodology of this thesis to be discussed in Chapter 4. Thus, it is important to view intersectionality not only as a concept describing injustices but also as a tool for discovering and analysing culture and society.

Intersectionality is rooted in feminist thinking and was first coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989. Initially, it strived to describe the interlockings of discrimination which black African American women face in their daily lives and to reveal the bias in the discourse of racism and sexism focusing on the privileged within different minorities (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 140). Thus, the discrimination of a black woman cannot be explained merely by racism or misogyny but is more complex and dependent on the power structures and norms defining multiple categorisations such as race, class, gender, sexuality etc. Since then, it has been

adopted by feminists describing exactly both, the myriad of interlocking disadvantages of a person or a group as well as the privileges. At an institutional and policy level, the structures of power and privilege are inescapable. In Finland, diversity among policy- and decision-makers is rare. Research posing questions about the very equity of cultural policies aimed at diverse minorities needs to take an intersectional stance.

Intersectionality has been adopted widely throughout the scholarly disciplines, civil society, and activists, and perhaps due to the wide range of practitioners, intersectionality is fluid and difficult to unambiguously define (Collins & Bilge, 2020; Vella & Xuereb 2021, p. 31). However, as Collins continues, definitions are rather a beginning than a conclusion (2015, p. 3). Nonetheless, intersectionality can be defined as a field of study of power relations, an analytical tool as well as critical praxis (Collins, 2015, p. 1). As such, it both reflects and affects the very power relations it examines (Collins, 2015, p. 3). It most profoundly highlights the voices of the marginalised and epistemic structures of white supremacy and reveals the erasure of minorities (Thomas, 2020, p. 32, Vella & Xuereb 2021, p. 37). Surely, intersectionality has inspired many institutions to incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion in their practice. However, the results of DEI programmes and incorporating diversity into cultural policy have been modest as the targets have been specific rather than comprehensive and resources scarce (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 190).

Indeed, comprehensive solutions cannot be achieved with fragmented knowledge and intersectionality is neither immune to critique nor an easy fix. At worst, it has been described as nothing but a buzzword creating a divide within feminists, or as an identification tool strengthening general stereotypes (Bailey et al., 2019, p. 3). At best though, intersectionality enables to view the fragmented and divided knowledge as a whole and construct a more comprehensive understanding of both, the construction of identity and society. However, it has been criticised for turning into a praxis of routinely executed steps without deeper thought, a façade of intersectionality (Aldrin Salskov, 2020, p. 254). It should be applied to practitioners, scholars and decision-makers alike in addition to the structures of injustice. Intersectionality cannot be merely a self-reflection exonerating the privileged white researcher and policymaker. Indeed, intersectionality has been criticised for centring whiteness (Aldrin Salskov, 2020, p. 254-256).

In addition, the multiple uses of intersectionality and its fluidity between different disciplines have been reprehended for confusing the original task of addressing social injustices (Aldrin Salskov, 2020, p. 252; Collins, 2015, p. 6). However, as Collins continues, the use of intersectionality widely in different disciplines allows for creativity (2015, p. 6). Perhaps this creativity will then spark new forms of cultural policy, such as what Belfiore et al. describe as an intersectional cultural policy (2023, p. 166). This analytical tool though calls for further developing intersectionality in dissecting the inequalities in the cultural sector as well as cultural policies (Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 166). Belfiore et al. conclude by calling for academic research globally in the quest for social justice (2023, p. 166). As Crenshaw lists, there are three important forms of intersectionality, structural, political, and representational (2013). Thus, it is imperative to include intersectional analysis when considering policies, the politics and power structures behind the policymaking but also representation within the policymakers. Indeed, an intersectional cultural policy could be the future of cultural policy.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I will outline and describe the theoretical framework of this thesis which is anchored in Finnish cultural policy accompanied by cultural rights, cultural policy instruments and cultural policy research. I view cultural rights and cultural policy research to be integral extensions of policymaking and as such are included in the theoretical framework. Much like the conceptual framework presented in the previous chapter, the concepts within the theoretical framework are both intertwined and complimentary. I will begin with cultural rights as they embody both the human identity discussed in the previous chapter and international conventions guiding cultural policy. I will continue with introducing cultural policy instruments and Finnish cultural policy and funding and move to describe their significance and/or influence on the current state of equity in Finland. Lastly, I will introduce cultural policy research and demonstrate how an equitable cultural policy should be based on cultural rights and informed by cultural policy research.

3.1 Cultural Rights

I have identified two important perspectives on cultural rights which directly pertain to the motif of this thesis: the human rights perspective and cultural rights' implications to cultural policy.

The discourse on cultural rights first emerged alongside demands over indigenous and minority rights (Saukkonen, 2007, p. 22). Indeed, one key element of cultural rights is the right to self-determination, first recognised along with cultural rights in the 1966 United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Robbins & Stamatopoulou, 2004, p. 423). They were devised to ensure the right to self-determination, freedom from discrimination, and participation in cultural life in addition to the economic and social aspects. Cultural rights as human rights are deeply entwined with equity, identity, and culture (Caust, 2019, p. 17), and as such, with international conventions. Cultural rights are stated in various international principles and agreements, and as such are fragmented

between multiple policy domains (Vickery, 2019, p. 2). Cultural rights are a part of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005, 2006) (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021, p. 33). Ensuring cultural rights can also be identified in the conventions of the Council of Europe. These conventions directly tied to diversity and human rights are as follows: the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950), the European Social Charter (1961), the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992), the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995) (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021, p. 34). However, these ceremonial and perhaps rigid conventions lack the realisation of cultural rights as human rights (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 25) and are missing a comprehensive definition of cultural rights.

In search of an international consensus on cultural rights Farida Shaheed, the United Nations first appointed special rapporteur in the field of cultural rights concluded that cultural rights are human rights (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2010). Scholars at large agree with Shaheed (Renteln, 2006; Koivunen & Marsio, 2007; Caust, 2019; Vickery, 2019), though it has been argued that cultural rights seem to have been the undeveloped, even neglected category of human rights (Symonides, 1998, p. 559; Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 24; Balta Portolés & Dragičević Šešić, 2017, p. 160). However, cultural rights could provide a needed option in advocating and implementing particularly group rights such as the self-determination of indigenous peoples (Robbins & Stamatopoulou 2004, p. 426). Thus, implementing cultural rights within policies could have long-lasting effects on human rights and subsequently equity.

Indeed, in recent decades cultural rights have become quite visible in cultural policy domains though their implementation has remained obscure (Balta Portolés & Dragičević Šešić, 2017, p. 163; Vickery, 2019, p. 2). Perhaps this is due to the difficulties of defining universal cultural rights (Balta Portolés & Dragičević Šešić 2017, p. 160). Furthermore, culture itself is not fixed but fluid and subject to constant change (Robbins & Stamatopoulou, 2004, p. 419; Nyangweso, 2016, p. 51). Thus, cultural rights are not without challenges as they are difficult to define and apply across diverse cultural communities and identities making a fixed set of laws governing cultural rights an oxymoron. As described, there is no

one explicit definition or set of laws globally claiming cultural rights for all countries to abide by but rather countries have their perceptions and varying focuses concerning cultural rights (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 20). Ensuring cultural rights often comes at the expense of minorities when the majority demands conforming to existing national norms (Caust, 2019, p. 19). As Koivunen & Marsio affirm, a rigid and formal definition of cultural rights will inescapably exclude minority cultures (2007, p. 26). Thus, cultural rights have received criticism over its fixed Western perspective towards culture (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 25; Robbins & Stamatopoulou, 2004, p. 419). Cultural rights in the Western context are human rights but in other global conditions may conflict with human rights, especially in cases where cultural rights are at odds with the rights of vulnerable groups such as women in the Global South (Renteln, 2006, p. 325; Nyangweso, 2016). Koivunen & Marsio continue to explain the issue to be in the difficulty of standardising cultural rights to fit the diversity of minorities (2007, p. 25). Shaheed also recognises this to be a pivotal challenge of cultural rights, the ensuring of multiple and diverse voices in representing different communities, identities, and cultural expressions (2014).

The central targets of cultural rights within Finnish cultural policy have been the protection of minority cultures and minority cultural identities as well as equal opportunity to participate in cultural life and activities (Saukkonen, 2010, p. 56). Rather than as an instrument, cultural rights have been incorporated into the ethics of Finnish cultural policy and together with accessibility they formed the so-called “fair culture” (Saukkonen, 2007, p. 22). Legislation ensuring the cultural and language rights of national minorities improved in the 1990s (Saukkonen, 2007, p. 22). However, the cultural rights of other than national minorities are still lacking (Saukkonen, 2007, p. 22). In addition, the national minority rights are still not fully realised or recognised, such as the self-determination of the Sámi. This indicates that the implementation of the above-mentioned targets has been insufficient and would require positive action (Saukkonen, 2010, p. 56).

Finland is rapidly diversifying. In 1990 the percentage of persons with foreign background was 0,8% of the population, and in 2022 it was 9,1%, in the capital region of Uusimaa the percentage is even higher, 16,9% (Tilastokeskus, n.d.). The share of foreign language speakers is 8,9% and in the capital region 16,6% (Tilastokeskus, n.d.). Thus,

negotiating the cultural rights of everyone is even more important. Cultural rights enclose simultaneously group rights and individual rights. The dilemma therein lies with universal cultural rights, and how to integrate theory with practice (Renteln, 2006, p. 326). To tackle the dilemmas of universal cultural rights, conflicting cultural and human rights, majority, and minority rights, Nyangweso suggests “a cross cultural approach based on intersectionality” (2016, p. 49-50). This could allow cultural rights to incorporate realities beyond social boundaries or norms, and as such recognise the constant cultural change, it could negotiate cultural diversity and cultural rights (Nyangweso, 2016, p. 50). Furthermore, the instrumentalisation of a cross-cultural approach to cultural rights could have long-lasting effects on cultural policy and equity. However, what would these policies entail, the question remains.

Despite its challenges, as Balta Portolés & Dragičević Šešić state that cultural policy should be based on the understanding of cultural rights (2017, p. 160; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017, p. 13). Koivunen & Marsio suggest that rather than a legal responsibility, cultural rights should originate from an informed cultural policy (2007, p. 20). However, as implementing cultural rights has so far been ambiguous, it is fair to argue they should initially be implemented into cultural policy legislation and decision-making at all levels (Balta Portolés & Dragičević Šešić 2017, p. 159-160). Thus, cultural rights at best could in fact be implemented through a well-informed cultural policy.

3.2 Cultural Policy Instruments

“Cultural policy reflects the values, principles and procedures that inform choices concerning publicly subsidised cultural activity subject to communal decision-making and control. (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 10)

Cultural policy instruments in essence are mechanisms for a governmental or public authority to exercise its power in supporting or preventing certain behaviour (Hylland, 2020, p. 145). Theories and literature on policy instruments are ample from which I have identified and combined four main instruments varying in mechanisms and goals: economic or distributive/redistributive, regulatory, informational, and constitutive or value-based

(Bemelmans-Videc et al., 1998; Hylland, 2020). I will continue to briefly portray these instruments as well as their application within Finnish cultural policy.

The distribution of funds is regarded as essential to the realisation of public cultural policy (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p. 249). These economic instruments can be separated into positive or distributive and negative or redistributive policy instruments (Bemelmans-Videc et al., 1998, p. 77, Hylland, 2020, p. 145). In practice, the distributive instruments aim at allocating public funds via subsidies and grants, integral to the actualisation of Finnish cultural policy (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p. 249). The so-called “negative economic policy instruments” or redistributive instruments then seek to reallocate wealth through mechanisms such as tax reliefs (Bemelmans-Videc et al., 1998, p. 77; Hylland, 2020, p. 145). Finland has yet to develop serious tax reliefs for arts and culture if not for the reduction of value-added tax. Subsequently, the value-added tax was raised from 10% to 14% by the current government consequently affecting books, sports services and cultural events (Jakonen & Renko, 2023). Furthermore, governmental funding of arts and culture in Finland is not refrained to one policy domain but spread widely between different ministries (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p. 304). Public funding as a main policy instrument without a cohesive criterion able to address the geographically and ethnically diverse cultural field poses a challenge.

Regulatory policy instruments then define the norms and actions, in practice these instruments are laws and regulations (Bemelmans-Videc, et al., 1998, p. 59; Hylland, 2020, p. 145). There are several laws and acts governing Finnish cultural policy, many of them regulating the distribution of funds, national institutions, and promotion of various art forms and heritage. In addition to the conventions listed in the previous chapter, Finnish cultural policy lies heavily on the Non-Discrimination Act. The Non-Discrimination Act can be seen as a regulatory instrument, however, in practice, monitoring its implementation is difficult. Within the criteria of governmental subsidies, the applicants are expected to follow the guidelines of the Non-Discrimination Act (Lummepuro, 2023). The monitoring of this is difficult and relies heavily on the sincerity and transparency of the applicants’ reports (Rönkkö, 2024).

Information as a policy instrument refers to the governmental influence and transfer of knowledge in attaining certain wanted results (Bemelmans-Videc et al., 1998, p. 103).

Effectively information as a policy instrument can denote recommendations and campaigns regarding a certain issue, training and counselling, as well as informational material (Bemelmans-Videc et al., 1998, p. 103). Strategies and programmes addressing diversity and equity have become a part of Finnish cultural policy over the last decade. However, the challenge of information as an instrument is its tendency to stay emblematic rather than translate into action (Bemelmans-Videc, et al., 1998, p. 114). This form of tokenism will constitute policies addressing an issue, such as diversity, but the effects will fall short. This has also been the challenge of Finnish diversity policies (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 190).

In addition to these instruments, value-based or constitutional instruments are the guidelines for policymakers (Hylland, 2020, p. 145). Values are often articulated through policy documents, such as strategies and legislation but also in different agreements and international declarations and conventions. As with most policy instruments, the effects of these instruments are complicated (Bemelmans-Videc, et al., 1998, p. 115). They articulate values and ethics but as informational instruments, they are often more symbolic than actual.

Considering the policy instruments, Finnish cultural policy and funding seem to linger somewhere between the democratisation of culture and cultural democracy. On the one hand, the cultural institutions regarded as high culture are heavily subsidised and then again MinEdC strategies and values promote participation, creativity, plurality, and inclusion.

3.3 Finnish Cultural Policy and Funding

“Policies reflect societal realities as well as political ideas and ideologies” (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 177).

The origins of Finnish cultural policy lie in the formulation of a nation-state and were meant to establish and enhance the national spirit (Kangas, 2001; Saukkonen, 2021, p. 177; Sokka et al. 2022, p. 49). Thus, many of the national institutions born from this cultural imperialism, still subsidised today by the government, were established to strengthen national cohesion and as such contributed to social inequalities. Nordic exceptionalism with its egalitarian ideals runs deep in the nation’s identity. Finland has a complicated past and

present with colonialism, first as a subordinate to Sweden and Russia and later as the imperialist continuing the colonisation of the Sámi Homeland still not able to come to terms with its colonial history (Keskinen, 2019, p. 164), evident in its anti-racist and anti-imperialist activities without being able to acknowledge its colonial and racist ventures (Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2012, p. 2). Within the policies originating from colonialism lie many intricate assumptions, norms, as well as political and economic interests (Frenander, 2008). These historical values and norms are embedded in cultural policies (Canyürek, 2022, p. 42), thus preserving the inherently unequal power structures. Finland has never been completely homogenous with multiple ethnicities, languages, religions, cultures and regional identities (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 178; Lehmuskallio, 2022, p. 106; Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2012, p. 3). The ripples of these nationalistic policies have an effect still as the most invasive instruments for building this homogenous national identity, assimilation and colonisation, resulted in generations losing their language, culture and subsequently their cultural identity (Joona, 2018, p.111; Aikio-Puoskari, 2018, p. 3). Through increasing immigration, Finland has had to acknowledge the nation's growing diversity, and the cultural policies have since taken a turn to promote diversity (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 177). However, Saukkonen continues to describe how nationalist and populist forces around Europe have created a counterforce resisting the measures for promoting diversity and equity (2021, p. 177).

Structural changes in Finnish cultural policy have been slow (Renko & Jakonen, 2024), though affected by the processes of independence, the building of a nation-state followed by societal diversification, emphasis on well-being, international mobility and changing demographics, and lastly the challenges of neo-nationalism as well as economic and global crises (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 177). Finnish cultural policy of current can be described as a fairly steady Nordic model of social welfare orientation in which public funding is a key element (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p. 294).

Finnish cultural policy relies upon legislation though there is no one cohesive set of laws defining it. It is based upon numerous laws and conventions describing and defining for instance the national institutions, the public funding, cultural rights, equality, and equity. Considering equity and diversity, Finnish cultural policymakers abide by the Constitution and Non-discrimination Act (Vuolasto, 2023). In practice, MinEdC prepares action plans and

guidelines for implementing equality and equity which then are monitored, renewed, and updated regularly (Lummepuro, 2023). MinEdC states on its website the aim of cultural policy is to promote creativity, plurality, and inclusion. Equity can be seen as a cross-cutting theme in the Finnish cultural policies of today with a principle of identifying and bettering inequalities (Pyykkönen, 2023).

However, the positive attitudes towards diversity, equity and inclusion have been met with criticism from the nationalist movements emphasising cultural and national unity, which together with the decreasing public funding has led to few new initiatives promoting and increasing equity (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021, p. 36). Yet it is noteworthy that initiatives are often targeted at a certain minority group rather than address structural equity. The past strategies of MinEdC have indicated strong positive predilections towards minorities and equity instruments (see strategies from 2003-2017), however, the latest strategy (2023) has a strong emphasis on the economy demonstrating the current government's priorities.

The current government's austerity politics will affect heavily on arts and culture. The budget cut directed at MinEdC subsidies by 2027 amounts to 125 million euros (Jakonen & Renko, 2023), which for example in Taike's 2024 budget will signify a 5% decrease, the largest in Taike's history (Taike, 2023). The Central Arts Council of Taike raised their concern over the budget cuts stating the cuts will significantly hinder both the prerequisite of operations as well as the supply of arts and culture (Taike, 2024). In addition, as the Central Arts Council points out, the 10 million is peanuts in the entire state budget, however crucial to arts and culture and the vitality of the field (Taike, 2024). Major cutbacks are also directed at social benefits which will reflect highly on arts and culture workers who are predominantly freelancers. Furthermore, it is feared that the cuts on social security in addition to the harmful immigration policies will impair cultural diversity and exchange (Jakonen & Renko, 2023).

As cultural policy can be described also as identity policy, the policies made reflect the current attitudes towards minorities as they are used to either strengthen or weaken certain groups (Koivunen & Maristo, 2007, p. 11). This is often realised through funding. Funding as an instrumental part of Finnish cultural policy is however no longer refrained only to MinEdC but spread widely between different policy domains (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p.

303). Accordingly, arts and culture are funded through numerous other ministries with a total budget of 1,33 billion euros (Jakonen et al., 2021). For instance, the Finnish Broadcasting Company (YLE) is funded by the Ministry of Transport and Communications, creative industries are funded through the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment and municipal cultural services through the Ministry of Finance (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p. 304). Thus, it is important to note that not only the equity policies of MinEdC are applied, but other ministries have their criteria for allocating funds and are equally influenced by the political climate. Although the different policy domains affecting and funding arts and culture deserve more attention in research, as Jakonen & Sokka conclude, the focus of research on arts and culture funding and policies should be on the quality and success rather than the amounts (2022, p. 311).

However, when arts and culture funding is discussed publicly, it is usually referred to as the funds allocated only through MinEdC. Thus, this is the policy domain and funding perspective of this thesis. An integral part of Finnish cultural policy and funding is the arm's length principle. This principle is realised through Taike which distributes MinEdC allocated funds for arts and culture through its national and regional arts councils. As the main distributor of grants and subsidies for freelance artists, Taike is an integral part of Finnish cultural policy. Taike has also been at the forefront of creating and executing equity measures with a long-term objective of integrating equity into daily practices rather than realising them only through short-term programmes and initiatives (Rönkkö, 2024).

In light of the current political climate and austerity measures, the challenges the Finnish cultural policy faces are diversity and funding. Furthermore, diversity and funding are inherently intertwined as Finnish cultural policy is often realised through public funding and as such can have a significant impact on equity. Cultural policy is an important instrument in supporting diversity as it has the power to legitimise and normalise diverse cultural expressions and on the other hand it can restrict and even prohibit diversity (Saukkonen & Pyykkönen, 2008, p. 50). With the right-wing and populist political forces in charge, their impact on cultural policies and funding seems gloomy. In times of scarcity, it is more difficult to justify resources allocated towards minorities and equity measures (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 177). Even though the neo-nationalist influence on cultural policy has

yet been modest, so have the short-lived diversity initiatives (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 190). This suggests that Finnish cultural policy requires a progressive turn with integrated instruments and implementation of equity to accommodate the rapidly diversifying society and the fields of arts and culture.

3.4 Cultural Policy Research

Cultural policy research is a fairly young field of study (Frenander, 2008). Initially, cultural policy research emerged from the requirements of governmental bodies for policy research and evaluation after the Second World War (Frenander, 2008; Mangset, 2020, p. 9). Along with the commodification of culture, the pressure to produce quantitative research to justify culture as economically profitable has been strong (Frenander, 2008). However, as an interdisciplinary field of study, cultural policy research of today contributes to both academia and practice and seeks to answer questions concerning also institutional, social, political, and cultural needs (Scullion & García, 2005, p. 114). The two sides have even been depicted as “the torn halves of cultural policy research” (Bennett, 2004). Belfiore then describes the problematic tensions between these two aspects as dichotomous as it has been argued that critical and true academic research cannot be harnessed for advocacy (2016, p. 206). However, this dichotomy of proper academic research versus impacting policies can also be challenged by a viewpoint combining these two, arguing relevant critical research can have the aim of influencing policies (Belfiore, 2016, p. 205). Indeed, this is a relevant approach as current cultural policy research aims at creating a knowledge base for policymakers and providing evidence of the importance of current topics such as equity and diversity and are furthermore contributing to the current discourse on social justice issues.

Finnish researchers among the other Nordics have contributed greatly to the formation of an international research community (Mangset, 2020, p. 11). Mangset further elaborates on how research on cultural policy is conducted in addition to international networks, in universities and by independent researchers (2020, p. 9). The significance of knowledge-based leadership, in other words, informed decision-making relying on data gathered in the field is growing (Haanpää et al., 2020, p. 12). Vuolasto (2023) from MinEdC states that research in itself however is not a sufficient measure for equity. Pyykkönen (2023)

elaborates that research needs to be implemented into the cultural policies and strategies and furthermore, into the monitoring. Together these aspects indicate a strong implication for the relevance and credibility of cultural policy research within Finnish policymaking.

Although the significance of research conducted in universities has increased dramatically (Mangset, 2020, p.11), in Finland, cultural policy research is still most notably conducted in the Center for Cultural Policy Research Cupore. Cupore is maintained by an independent foundation with close ties to MinEdC, one of the initiators of establishing the research centre. Currently, research topics at Cupore are both created independently and commissioned by MinEdC. In 2012 Cupore published a mapping of relevant research topics in Finland with input from all major higher education institutions, and cultural institutions regarding policy research as well as funders of such research (Jokela, 2012).

One considerable study suggested by MinEdC is the recently published diversity report *Ulkomaalaistaustaiset taiteilijat Suomessa – Moninaisuusraportti 2023*. The findings of this report indicate more research is needed. It concludes that diversity is not a crosscutting theme in the knowledge base of cultural policy and the information gathered generally in the field does not include origins or ethnicity indicating challenges in keeping systematic statistics of diversity (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 83). The suggested further research relates to intersectionality as a needed perspective, the study of racism within Finnish working conditions in arts and culture and access to decision- and policymaking from diverse backgrounds (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 86-87).

Another recent study contributing to equity and diversity; *Avaus – Ulkomaalaisyntyisten taide- ja kulttuurialan ammatilaisten asema Suomessa* (2020) reveals experiencing discrimination to be common in Finland (Lahtinen et al., 2020, p. 115-116). In its conclusions, the research states that relying solely on good intentions on the issues of diversity and equity is not enough (Lahtinen et al., 2020, p. 119). In addition, the requirements of equity within the criteria of funding are not sufficient but call for monitoring of its realisation (Lahtinen et al., 2020, p. 120).

Other studies and projects include *Yhdenvertainen kulttuuri!* (2017), an investigation on governmental funding promoting the accessibility of cultural activities among disabled communities, along with the *Arts Equal* research initiative (2015-2021) which investigated

the equality of art services, education and hobbies with suggestions on how to promote equality and inclusion throughout the field. In addition, Cupore has provided short fact sheets with relevant basic information on topics such as participation, equality, diversity, inclusion and accessibility. As shown, Cupore has somewhat prominently taken upon to investigate cultural policy in correlation to diversity and as such has contributed to equity.

However, the research, much like the policies promoting diversity and equity, is mostly focused on a certain minority group, a certain aspect or concerned with only cultural diversity and would in my opinion benefit from a clearly intersectional perspective. The structures of cultural policy are based on Western capitalism and cultural imperialism and as such are still contributing to discrimination and inequalities (Frenander, 2008). Shifting towards decolonial and intersectional research perspectives is needed. The diverse and dynamic field of arts and culture calls for multidisciplinary and current cultural policy research to support cultural policymaking (Ruusuvirta, 2020). Ruusuvirta continues in their editorial to describe cultural policy research as raising awareness of societal phenomena, challenging and questioning the existing answers and highlighting grievances (2020). As Renko & Jakonen reflect; could the current time of crises move the foundations of Finnish cultural policy as the discourse on cultural policy has widened to concern public policy (2024)? Social justice issues inhabit all domains of society. In times of political turmoil and polarisation research on cultural policy is all the more crucial and could be a foundation for a dynamic cultural policy.

4. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

4.1 Research Methods

The topic of this thesis holds some societal significance as it addresses current and ongoing disparities within cultural policymaking and policy execution. Methods that recognise the societal aspects as well as the aim of contributing to society are vital. The study aims to identify the measures of equity, examine whether they are explicit or implicit, how they are implemented and how the possible impacts of these measures are evaluated. Thus, the methods are chosen fully cognisant of the societal aspects.

This thesis is qualitative research and a case study of cultural policy rooted in intersectional feminist thinking. The methods of collecting data are semi-structured interviews and rapid literature review. The semi-structured interviews and data collected are then examined through thematic analysis in order to find recurring themes which then are analysed through critical discourse analysis. In the next chapters, I will present the methods in more detail, justify my choice of methods, and the analysis process as well as reflect critically on the different aspects of the research process.

4.2 Qualitative Research

“One of the strengths of qualitative research is its ability to explain processes and patterns of human behaviour that can be difficult to quantify.” (Tenny et al., 2017). Tenny, et al. continue to describe the aim of qualitative research to be finding answers to open-ended questions such as “why” and “how” instead of measurable quantitative questions of “how many” or “how much” (2017).

Qualitative research is particularly useful to learn inductively about a social phenomenon from the perspective of individuals and small groups. Qualitative research allows us to unpack the meanings people ascribe to activities,

situations, events, people, or artifacts, build a depth of understanding about some dimension of social life, or to study the meanings embedded in texts. This approach values people's subjective experiences and meaning-making processes. Small, information-rich samples are generally favored. (Leavy, 2017, p. 159)

This thesis aims to identify certain themes in cultural policymaking and execution. Identifying patterns and themes is typical for qualitative research. As policymaking processes are highly affected by society and the people planning and executing them, qualitative research is justifiable as it is concerned with describing and explaining societal phenomena as well as human behaviour. In addition, qualitative research allows a wider range of methodologies as well as revising them following the study development (Leavy, 2017, p. 124).

Qualitative research rooted in intersectional feminist theory is relevant when considering societal issues involving disparities and discrimination. At the heart of intersectionality is to understand power structures through the variables of privilege and disparity. Intersectional feminism also takes a stance on epistemic injustice in striving to enable and support knowledge production outside the realm of white Western male academia. Within the scope of this research, I attempt to do the same in choosing my academic sources.

In this research, it is equally important to identify the equity instruments that exist within cultural policy as it is to identify who the instruments are aimed to benefit. Through an intersectional feminist lens, it is possible to recognise the power structures and better analyse and interpret the existing equity instruments and their impact.

It takes into consideration the situated gazes of particular people in relation to their own social locations and social well-being. Focusing on these situated gazes enables us to incorporate minority and non-conformist perspectives of social actors rather than assume that all people in particular social category even in the same geographical and social locations would necessarily share

the same meaning of social relations of power and/or of their 'culture and tradition' in their own society or community in general and their own positionings in particular. (Yuval-Davis, 2017, p. 8)

The aim is to situate this research and its findings through qualitative methods with an intersectional feminist viewpoint amongst the current discourse on equity and to examine the equity policies concerning the minorities and marginalised.

4.2.1 Single Case Study

The focus of this qualitative case study is to identify the cultural policies created to support equity and examine how they are implemented and evaluated through three different perspectives, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Arts Promotion Centre Finland and the Center for Cultural Policy Research Cupore.

Case studies are a qualitative strategy in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. The case(s) are bounded by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time. (Creswell, 2009, p. 207)

Creswell continues to describe how in a qualitative case study the questions in hand are described through themes emerging in the process of research (Creswell, 2009, p. 126). A strong single case should also provide a plentiful of data to study (Leavy, 2017, p. 149). Thus, the aim is to discover and analyse recurring themes from the data collected from said three institutions. The data is collected through semi-structured interviews and rapid literature review, described in detail in the following chapters.

4.2.2 Semi-structured Interviews

Qualitative research concentrates on open-ended questions and thus semi-structured interviews as the primary research method is justifiable. This method entails a set of open-ended questions conducted conversationally. Rather than with surveys or closed-ended questions, semi-structured interviews allow a dialogue around the topic and even unforeseen directions with follow-up questions (Adams, 2015, p. 493). In this case, an open dialogue is a valid tool for examining, as the subject matter concentrates on how certain concepts and policies are understood or interpreted.

The interviews were conducted in December 2023 and January 2024. The questions were sent to each interviewee in advance and follow-up questions were sent via e-mail. Deciding on the interviewees was a combination of availability and in-depth knowledge of cultural policymaking and matters of equity considering the three chosen institutions. Finding representatives from all three was critical for a comprehensive understanding of equity instruments, their implementation and evaluation in Finnish cultural policy and funding.

The interviewees are as follows:

- 1) Ministry of Education and Culture; Counsellors Johanna Vuolasto and Maija Lummepero.
- 2) Centre for Cultural Policy Research Cupore; Professor Miikka Pyykkönen, the chairman of the board of Cupore at the time of the interview.
- 3) Arts Promotion Centre Finland; Director Kaisa Rönkkö.

Interviews 1) and 2) were conducted in person and interview 3) via Teams. All were recorded using the researcher's computer and phone as a backup device. The questions were mainly tailored to each institution to reveal both the institutional and personnel's take on equity instruments. Similar questions regarding the diversity of each institution's staff, recruitment processes and understanding of diversity and equity were posed to each representative. Though questions were sent in advance, the interviews were casual and conversational.

4.2.3 Rapid literature review

The central source of material for this thesis is the interviews described in the previous chapter. In addition to the interviews and as the basis for the interview questions, current and relevant written data was collected. Instead of a systematic traditional literature review, the data was collected through rapid review. Rapid literature review is a relatively new alternative method with a specific definition as recent as 2021 (Smela et al., 2023, p. 6). Smela et al. continue to describe the method as suitable for identifying and summarising research data emerging from the health care settings (2023, p. 2-6). With a limited timeframe and scope, a rapid literature review is an efficient tool to synthesise especially policy-related material focusing on specific questions and themes affirming existing recommendations (Smela et al., 2023, p. 6). Therefore, instead of going through a massive amount of policy, funding, and research material on cultural policy throughout the years, the relevant current material was identified, narrowed down and then reviewed. The material collected is the most recent strategies and action plans from MinEdC, the information available on ongoing programmes of Taïke and recent research from Cupore, all considering or focusing on themes of equity, diversity and/or discrimination.

4.3 Thematic Analysis & Critical Discourse Analysis

The conceptual framework of this thesis, as described in Chapter 2 encases concepts that are constantly evolving. In Finland, for instance, the meaning of equality has already shifted from considering equality of all to equality between genders (Ekvalita, 2022). In another example, Dragičević Šešić illuminates this shift in meanings describing the word “cultural pluralism” first evolving to “multiculturalism” to finally currently used “cultural diversity” (2022, p. 49-50). All three describe initially the same thing; however, cultural diversity has become more used as it aims to describe all social elements of identity such as race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, religion, and country of origin, in other words, more comprehensively the uniqueness of an individual or a group. Dragičević Šešić argues these words sometimes shift in meaning without deeper understanding or reflection as to why

(2022, p. 49). This may be true with many buzzwords. However it is fair to argue in the context of these particular words, the shift has happened due to societal awareness of diversity and inclusion. The words that are used shape the way different concepts are understood, language affects perceptions. As these concepts and language are such significant parts of this thesis, the analysis must address them.

Thematic analysis as a qualitative research method is flexible as it can be used to find patterns and themes from a wide variety of data (Clarke & Braun, 2017, p. 2). In this research, it was applied to both, the written material, and the interviews to identify common structures and themes. In addition, the written material was closely examined through critical discourse analysis to reveal the evolving language and possible attitudes behind it. “Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a highly context-sensitive, democratic approach which takes an ethical stance on social issues with the aim of improving society” (Huckin, 1997, p. 87). Adding an intersectional viewpoint to critical discourse analysis will allow a wider perspective on understanding and explaining the interlockings of inequality and subsequently equity.

4.3.1 Analysing the Data

The recorded interviews were conducted and transcribed in Finnish. The transcription type used was intelligent verbatim transcription, in which unnecessary repetition, insignificant non-verbal cues and filler words such as “um”, “like” and “you know” are removed. This type of transcription aims to offer an accurate yet readable account of the interview that is easy to analyse (McMullin, 2023, p. 144-145). McMullin continues with the importance of acknowledging and including important nonverbal cues such as laughing or sarcasm and not ignoring the perceptions or possible biases of the transcriber (2023, p. 145). As the researcher is the transcriber, it is generally agreed that the transcript is a reliable record of events as well as an appropriate method considering the research approach (McMullin, 2023, p. 145). Considering reliability and transparency, the transcriptions were sent to each interviewee for revision. However, no modifications were recommended. Upon analysis, I translated relevant quotes from the interviews and again the representatives were given the possibility to revise or correct said quotes before publishing the thesis.

To answer the research question, key elements of equity instruments, methods of implementation and evaluation found in the material are presented as results. Through the steps of thematic analysis, the written data and interviews were first familiarised, then colour-coded and finally generated into common themes. In this case, the thematic analysis was a deductive approach as the frameworks and societal discourse have offered some preconceived themes concerning the state of equity within Finnish cultural policy and funding. The analysis is more interested in the subtext and social context. Especially considering the policy papers, this latent approach will reveal what is underlying in the changes of words throughout the years. Critical discourse analysis is at its best a critical study of language. Thus, the strategies of MinEdC, cultural policy strategies and action plans were analysed through words describing equity, diversity, and inequalities. In addition, words describing the instrumentalisation of policies were examined. Lastly, themes arising from both, interviews and written material were then systematically described and analysed.

4.3.2 Critical Reflections and Limitations

I acknowledge this thesis will offer an overview of the state of equity from the viewpoint of the policies. A more detailed and comprehensive study would include three more aspects of equity, the experiences of the minorities, statistics on how funding is allocated, and in contrast, how are equity instruments implemented outside the public and governmental domain of culture and funding. However, due to the timeframe and scope of thesis research, I found it important to limit my study to one aspect, governmental policies, distinct instruments, and evaluation. Furthermore, the instruments identified are limited to what the research material, namely documents and interviews disclose and as such might not reflect the entirety of equity instruments.

During the interviews, there was no consideration of the power structures between the researcher and the interviewees. Thus, it is important to acknowledge that as an outsider to all the institutions in question, my analysis can be affected by preconceptions of the structures and bureaucracy involved in policymaking and execution. However, as I am not biased by being closely acquainted with these institutions, my analysis will hopefully offer a fresh take on the state and measures of equity and can perhaps offer viable ideas for further

research. As the interviewees are from prominent positions within their organisations, they are perhaps biased by their positions and privileges in seeing the myriad of social disparities in the cultural field. In the hopes of honest dialogue, the questions posed were amicable and, in my opinion, future research would benefit from a more critical set of questions.

My perspective in recognising the discriminatory structures and the state of equity is perhaps hindered by my privileges. As a member of the white majority, I can never have a personal understanding of the disparities of a marginalised person. That being the case, constantly checking my privileges as well as familiarising myself with the current discourse on diversity and the interlockings of discrimination is imperative. The reliability of this study relies on its academic frameworks and the researcher's ability to recognise and address the preconceptions and possible shortcomings.

My values, worldview, and privileges as well as my biases and attitudes will inevitably influence how I interpret the material. Furthermore, Leavy states objectivity might be impossible and even unwanted when aiming to advance societal and policy-related issues which are already value-based. (2017, p. 38-39). Thus, instead of aiming for neutrality, I will practice strong objectivity in acknowledging my biases. Thus, my values and thinking rooted in intersectional feminist thinking will influence the interpretations of the results.

In addition, it is vital to acknowledge the limitations of this study due to the language and concepts that are dynamic and open to interpretations as well as possible limitations when it comes to translations between Finnish and English. This has been addressed by posing the same questions on equity and diversity to all interviewees. However, that does not eliminate the possible misunderstandings due to different perceptions of the concepts. Careful reflection and analysis of transcribed material and follow-up questions are designed to reveal possible misconceptions. In addition, the methods described are chosen to best reflect the possible shortcomings and successes concerning equity but also to be able to critically assess the future developments needed.

5. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I will present the key findings of my research. First, I will focus on presenting the linguistics within the written data examined through critical discourse analysis and interpret what the usage and frequency of specific words might reveal about measures of equity in Finnish cultural policy and funding. I will then continue to present the policy instruments in support of equity discovered from the research data, their implementation and evaluation. Lastly, I will present the results of the thematic analysis, the themes arising from the discussions and written data and their relevance to equity.

5.1 Critical Words

As a first step in my analysis, I familiarised myself with the most recent ministry and cultural policy strategies, reports, and action plans published by the Ministry of Education and Culture. The reports and action plans were selected on the basis that they should be related to diversity and/or equity or equality. Guidelines concerning immigration were first integrated into cultural policy in 2003 (Saukkonen, 2021, p. 184), which then defined my timeframe to 2003-2023 as within those years issues of diversity and equality were considered in these documents. I delved into the material in search of what I call critical words. These words and the frequency they appear represent how issues relating to equity and diversity are recognised and addressed. In addition, I looked for words related to policy, implementation, and evaluation to see how these processes of policy instrumentalisation are described. The wording of these publications also reveals the way language describing these issues has evolved within two decades.

In the light of critical discourse analysis, it is also vital to acknowledge the purpose of these documents. The documentation consists of Strategies of the Ministry (2003, 2010, 2023), Cultural Policy Strategies (2009, 2017) as well as reports and action plans such as *Art and Culture for Well-being – Action Plan* (2010), *Meaningful in Finland Action Plan* (2016), *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland – Final Report* (2021), and *Art, Culture and Diverse*

Finland – Action Plan (2023). These documents differ greatly in their purpose. Strategies of the Ministry give an overview of the values, future visions, and objectives of the entire ministry. Cultural policy strategies then outline more specifically what are the targets and objectives of said policies while executing the Ministry’s strategic objectives. Reports and action plans then again go further by identifying key issues and suggesting practical proposals to implement certain policies.

Thus, these documents are not directly proportional or comparable as such. However, they do offer an overview of how language describing diversity, inequality, and equity as well as the language of policy instrumentalisation has evolved. A paradigm shift can be observed in the vocabulary. As an overview, these changes do suggest a general increase of interest in addressing these topical issues of diversity and equity. In addition, the variety of words used to describe diversity, inequality, and equity shifts. Furthermore, not only do the words that are used matter, but it is significant to examine what words are absent. The language and frequency of words differ between documents reflecting perhaps the societal and governmental trends of that period. Insofar as to say the shift encloses the entire society, policymakers or political sphere is difficult to say.

The Strategies of MinEdC are the most general. They are concerned with conveying the values and future visions of the Ministry. Beginning with the strategy from 2003 hailing for “Future is in civilisation” (Ministry of Education, 2003), it emphasises Nordic welfare, equal access to education and culture. It highlights the ongoing demographic changes due to an ageing population and increases in immigration. This strategy of the three examined is most concerned with diversity and equality with the most frequently used critical words: diversity, plurality, equality, equal opportunity, inclusive society, accessibility, and participation.

The next strategy from 2010 reaffirms the Ministry’s objective to safeguard the welfare state. However, a decrease in the usage of critical words can be observed as diversity, equality and equity are not mentioned at all. The strategic programmes suggest a focus on competitiveness and regional improvements but also inclusion and participation.

The latest strategy of the Ministry from 2023 is blatantly void of critical words, equity for instance is not mentioned at all, and equality / equal opportunity altogether five times

within this 10-page document. The focus of this strategy appears to be on the economic value of arts and culture with an emphasis on creative industries. This can reflect the current trend of devising very concise and approachable strategy papers. However, it can also reflect the current government's interest in arts and culture mainly as an economic resource but also reveals a neglect of matters concerning diversity and subsequently equity.

Throughout the Ministry's strategies, words describing minorities are missing. Words for diversity are also scarce and very generic such as plurality, multiculturalism, and diversity. Though the strategies are meant as overviews and convey values in a concise package, to exclude minorities and inequalities is a value choice. A strategy not considering the societal inequalities, in fact, refuses to recognise those inequalities. The lack of defining existing minorities then outlines the audience these strategies are meant for, the majority.

Observing the shift in words describing implementation and evaluation is also vital. The strategy from 2003 has the most versatile vocabulary in describing how policies and programmes are implemented and monitored. The frequency and variety of these words lessen as the strategies are renewed. As the Ministry's strategies are the most general, they perhaps best reflect said government's attitudes and values regarding culture, diversity and equity. However, as Koivunen & Marsio point out, cultural indicators, the implementation of monitoring arts and culture, are needed for strategic planning (2007, p. 107) indicating that their absence is even more significant.

An important observation from all three strategies is the lack of mentioning cultural or human rights as opposed to the cultural policy strategies where cultural rights are numerous mentioned as the basis for cultural policy. Indeed, the values and interests of the policymakers and implementation can best be examined from the cultural policy strategies and particularly from the action plans.

The targets of the two cultural policy strategies examined are similar in their focus on inclusion and participation, culture as a creative sector contributing to the economy and culture's significance and continuity in society. The policy strategies are better at considering diversity however, it is often generalising and centred on cultural diversity leaving the recognition of specific minorities to sporadic mentions of indigenous, linguistic, or disabled communities. "Cultural policy is a means to successful assimilation" (Ministry of Education

and Culture, 2009, p. 16) reveals the priorities to be rather conformity than equity and plurality. Nevertheless, the evolving language is evident as the use of multicultural shifts to cultural diversity. Though improving how diversity is considered through inclusion and participation, again the lack of describing societal inequalities is evident. The words inequality and unequal appear in all six times between the two strategies whereas for example discrimination, injustice, racism, and disparity are missing completely. The strategy from 2017 contains a SWOT analysis (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017, p. 29) with no recognition of disparities within the field of arts and culture except for regional and consumptional inequalities.

In the policy strategies, the language to describe the implementation and evaluation is richer than in the Ministry's strategies. The realisation of policies is described with words including policy instruments, action plans, governmental programmes, development measures, targets, and objectives. Implementing or implementation is frequently used as well. Though the language appears proactive for example: "Multiculturalism is taken into account in all activity relating to cultural policy." (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2009, p. 31), and "Ensuring full access to and equality in artistic and cultural activities and in services associated with them." (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017, p. 37) the actual activities are not disclosed. Strengthening the knowledge base is addressed as part of cultural continuity and policy steering. Monitoring and evaluating are mentioned a few times, however as a part of developing such actions rather than describing how and in what timeframe they are realised. This is the tendency throughout the two cultural policy strategies, targets and objectives are laid out without a transparent action plan as to how, when and by whom they would be accomplished.

As expected, the action plans are better equipped with describing the implementation and critical words, such as equality, equity, (cultural) diversity, accessibility, inclusion, racism, and even intersectional discrimination. The cultural policy strategies addressed the issue of cultural diversity, minorities, equality, and equity in some manner, much the same as the oldest of the action plans, *Culture for Well-being – Action Plan* (2010). However, the action plans directed at addressing racism and hate speech (Meaningful in Finland Action Plan, 2016) and rapidly diversifying Finland (Art, Culture and Diverse Finland, 2021 &

2023) are more adequate at examining and describing the inequalities and subsequently measures needed for equity.

Culture for Well-being – Action Plan (2010) relates to the trend of defending arts and culture through aspects of well-being. The action plan is focused on inclusion on a societal and individual level, however not very concerned with diversity, minorities or inequalities. However, out of the three action plans, it is most versatile in describing policy implementation and monitoring through words such as action programme, proposal, objective, and measure, as well as monitoring and evaluating. This might reflect the tendency of said era and policymaking aiming to make clear measurable action plans to advocate the importance and funding of arts and culture in general.

Meaningful in Finland Action Plan (2016) was a response to growing hate speech and tackling racism. The action plan consists of 10 actions. Some are general such as action 1: “Administrative mechanisms. We focus on tackling hate speech and racism and strengthening multiculturalism, inclusion and equality in the Ministry of Education and Culture, its agencies, bodies and other organisations.” (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016, p. 4) lacking in distinct ways these administrative mechanisms would be implemented. Some on the other hand are exact funding decisions to support projects and programmes such as action 7: “No more hate speech. A special government grant application process for municipal youth services serves to curb hate speech and strengthen equality.” (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016, p. 6). Funding is allocated through other actions as well. However, the implementation and evaluation of the outcomes of these programmes are not disclosed which suggests they are left to be carried out by the applicants granted the funds.

Art, Culture and Diverse Finland Action Plan (2023) is based on a report of the same name from 2021. The report was made in response to the needs of a rapidly diversifying society with an emphasis on cultural organisations’ capability to recognise and tackle structural discrimination and revise recruitment practices to consider diversity, equity, and equality. In addition, its key themes related to incorporating cultural diversity into policy decision-making and research on the development of indicators of diversity. The action plan then was drafted based on the proposals of the report.

The action plan is saturated with critical words concerning diversity, inequalities, and solutions to addressing them. The tone of voice is conciliatory but demanding in the urgency of supporting equity in the field of arts and culture. Diversity however in this context is general, mostly cultural diversity. Minorities are described as visible, other, and cultural or underrepresented groups again lacking the recognition of specific minorities. Discrimination is described as intersectional which indicates an encouraging shift in the understanding of structural injustices.

The action plan consists of important background information on immigration and diversity in Finland in general. The measures suggested are a wide variety of principles and practical solutions, not only from or for MinEdC but throughout the agencies under its administration and the national institutions. However vital and ground-breaking, the action plan falls short of transparent indicators and plans for monitoring and evaluating. Monitoring is granted a mere two sentences at the end of the action plan, a tendency repeated throughout MinEdC documents.

However, it is important to note that not only the usage of distinct words reveals tendencies and intentions. Thus, it is important to review the whole picture emerging from the data. The choice of words might namely reflect the values of single writers. Ministry papers are revised by numerous people; thus, they might reflect more general tendencies among the decision-makers. Objectives and initiatives for realising equity can be observed, although their implementation is not cohesively explicit in addition to insufficient disclosure of monitoring. Looking at the body of work including the accomplishments and challenges, the strategies and action plans revised in MinEdC throughout the years reflect a change in words and perhaps also an encouraging change in attitudes. Changes in words though might not be enough, as Minow reflects on realising equity: “Yet defining that vision in ways that can be put into operation requires more than simply a shift in words and more than a gesture to unclear alternatives.” (2021, p. 171). Thus, I will next consider the policy instruments in place to support equity.

5.2 Identifying Key Instruments

How cultural policy is translated into instruments is a complicated question (Simjanovska, 2022, p. 118). Identifying the key instruments targeted particularly towards realising equity proved to be even more complex, as they are scattered within many instruments rather than a defined and cohesive set of actions. In light of the critical discourse analysis of the documents presented in the previous chapter, an overview of the state of equity can be formulated. To support that overview, and answer the thesis questions, I will present the instruments supporting equity, the implementation of those instruments and the processes of evaluation and monitoring the outcomes of those instruments as they emerged from the research data. However, it is important to acknowledge that these are the instruments discussed during the interviews or found in the written material and may not represent the entirety of equity instruments.

5.2.1 Existing Equity Instruments

As discussed in chapters 3.2 and 3.3, the key instrument of Finnish cultural policy is funding. Within the category of funding, aspects including the target agreements with national institutions and performance agreements with agencies as well as the statutory state aid and discretionary subsidies from MinEdC and Taike need to be considered.

Funding decisions per se can already qualify as instruments of equity if they either aim at supporting the applicants' equity or are directed at equity work executed by the applicant. Funding directed to support equity can be identified in state funding aimed at minority groups, and funding aimed at overall work in support of equity. The funding provided for municipalities can qualify as equity instruments when they are similarly directed at certain minority groups or for overall equity work within an organisation or community. These instruments fall under the category of economic policy instruments.

More economic policy instruments in support of equity can be identified in the funding and commissioning of research on topics related to diversity and equity as they directly contribute to the knowledge base of policymaking. Consolidating the knowledge base is also an informational instrument.

Somewhere between economic and regulatory instruments fall the target agreements with the national institutions and the performance agreements with the agencies under the MinEdC administration. The institutions rely on state funding and as the target agreements suggest are directly guided by MinEdC though autonomous in practice. As part of the funding, the agreements represent economic instruments and on the other hand, they are providing guidelines for obtaining said funding. The Non-Discrimination Act is used both as guidance and regulation as a criterion for funding.

Distinctly informational instruments are such as the Dialogue Cards and the programme National Dialogues. Staff training within the ministry and as part of the target and performance agreements also constitutes an informational policy instrument. In addition, the cultural policy strategies and action plans as informational instruments outline MinEdC's guidelines for supporting equity.

Value-based instruments as discussed are ratifying national and international conventions and declarations concerning but not limited to diversity, equity and equality.

5.2.2 Implementation of Equity Instruments

The implementation entails conveying policy instruments into concrete action and practice. These actions can be direct or indirect, explicit or implicit.

The implementation of funding can be observed in different programmes and initiatives and defined as explicit when directed specifically towards realising equity. Funding directed at a certain minority group is actualised for example in the yearly state grants for the Sámi Parliament in support of maintaining and developing Sámi languages, art, and culture. Funding implemented towards overall work in support of equity can be identified in programmes such as Taike's subsidies for promoting cultural diversity and combating racism and subsidies for promoting inclusion and cultural wellbeing. For example, in 2023 Taike's subsidies for promoting cultural diversity and combating racism were applied by over 200 applicants and only 48 were awarded with this subsidy (Rönkkö, 2024). This indicates that more funding directed at such programmes is required. Funding implementation at the municipal level can amount to for example programmes directed at

immigrant artists or organisations offering DEI training. However, programmes are revised and renewed periodically suggesting a lack of continuity in realising equity through funding programmes.

Another direct implementation is the target agreements between MinEdC and national institutions and the performance agreements between MinEdC and agencies under their administration. However, the objectives in support of equity such as strengthening citizens' equity, equality and participation (Tulostavoiteasiakirja, 2023) are quite general and implementation is unspecified. On the other hand, all the institutions and agencies under the MinEdC administration were represented in the *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland Action Plan (2023)*, with more or less specific actions in support of diversity and equity. These measures include for instance "Taike has launched a "BIPOC" steering group" (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 30) giving a clear example of an action supporting diversity and equity. A more indirect example is "The Finnish Heritage Agency promotes discussion on cultural diversity and serves as a platform for diverse communities and population groups as well as for encounters between different cultures." (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 32) without disclosing how discussion or encounters are realised. Thus, even though the target and performance agreements appear explicit in implementation as they combine the guidance and funding aspects from MinEdC, the clear actions and their implementation are varied.

The implementation of informational instruments is overall more indirect. For instance, the Dialogue cards developed by MinEdC and Taike are directed at anyone willing to facilitate discussion among communities and organisations on topics of sustainability, diversity, discrimination and equity. Similarly, the National Dialogues initiated by MinEdC are directed at enabling and facilitating discussions between different population groups about differing topics such as immigrants, racism and loneliness. These are practical examples but as the execution of these facilitated discussions is left open, meaning anyone can produce and take part, the implementation appears indirect. Staff training on diversity and equity is a direct implementation of informational instruments, however, due to their voluntary nature the realisation might fall short.

The Non-Discrimination Act as legislation is regulatory in essence. All instances are expected to comply. More specifically, the applicants for state subsidies and grants must comply with the Non-Discrimination Act, as stated already in the application guidelines.

Value-based policy instruments, such as cultural rights and the UNESCO declarations are a powerful testimony of values and a baseline for cultural policy. However, conventions and declarations have been criticised for their ceremonial and ethical nature rather than seen as direct policy instruments (Saukkonen, 2007, p. 22). In addition, cultural rights among other universal declarations are difficult to apply in all situations considering all minorities (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 25). Cultural policy strategies outline cultural rights as the basis for cultural policy. Thus, value-based instruments are significant in creating an ethical base but cannot be defined as direct policy instruments.

5.2.3 Evaluating and Monitoring of Equity Instruments

The outcomes of cultural policy can be measured in the outcomes of the cultural actors (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017, p. 35). However, there appear to be no clear equity indicators in place that were discussed or found in the material. Measuring and monitoring within the written material are very implicit, absent of direct actions, timeframes or instances to execute the monitoring. Moreover, evaluation was mostly discussed in the context of research and strengthening of the knowledge base.

Funding-wise, MinEdC and Taike have records of allocated grants and subsidies. Yet, monitoring the equity of funding decisions is insufficient as no statistics on minority status of any kind are asked or collected. However, grants and subsidies directed at specific minority groups or through programmes directed at supporting diversity and equity offer some data. A criterion with specific aspects of equity and diversity would be able to produce more precise data for measuring the equitable distribution of funding. A funding criterion is in development in both Taike and MinEdC, however, whether it would include distinct aspects of diversity and equity were not disclosed.

The target and performance agreements are evaluated together between the institutions/agencies and MinEdC and as such work as feedback mechanisms. The

monitoring of such targets is difficult, as the objectives within the agreements are already vague or indirect.

Strengthening the knowledge base, mainly research and development of indicators and monitoring is evaluated. The results of indicator or meter development are easy to evaluate, yet monitoring the implementation of information into policymaking is more complicated. The amount of research commissioned on equity and diversity indicates the importance of said topics.

Along with other informational instruments, monitoring and evaluating how information is translated into action is difficult and requires resources. Quantitative data on attendance is collected from staff training sessions, the National Dialogues, and the number of Dialogue cards ordered. Additionally, qualitative data is obtained specifically from the National Dialogues in the form of a summarising report published online.

Non-Discrimination Act as a regulatory tool is also difficult to monitor. It appears to be in the hands of the funding applicants to both disclose during application and to report afterwards. The evaluation of said reports is left to the discretion of the funding reviewers.

Monitoring of value-based instruments is perhaps unreasonable. The number of declarations can stipulate the significance of the topic they represent. Furthermore, the conventions and declarations not ratified then again indicate value choices within the decision-makers.

To summarise, clear policy instruments in support of equity evident in the research material of this thesis consist mostly of economic, and informational instruments such as state funding, target and performance agreements and guidelines and the regulations guided by the Non-Discrimination Act as well as value-based instruments. The implementation of those instruments varies greatly, some are distinct actions, and some are theoretical or principle in nature. Moreover, measuring and monitoring is difficult for the most part and perhaps left vague for that reason. No clear equity indicators appear to be in place.

5.3 Themes and Challenges Arising from the Data

The previous chapters outline the state of equity and equity instruments within Finnish cultural policy and funding. For a deeper understanding beyond concrete instruments and in line with the frameworks of this thesis, I have identified and assembled a set of themes and challenges that address or touch upon matters concerning equity. The themes have emerged from current societal discourse, the written data examined and were for the most part also discussed in the interviews. Some themes are prominent and obvious, and some are absent from the data thus making them visible.

5.3.1 Statistics and Diversity

Demographic changes are a recurring theme in the data gathered. Insofar as diversifying poses societal challenges, specific difficulties can be identified in the statistics of diversity, or the lack of such statistics (Lahtinen et al., 2020, p. 116). Scholars have identified blind spots in the study designs focusing on immigration, such as “*ethnic gaze*”, a point of view which creates an impression of outlined and culturally convergent minority groups (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 17-18). However, communities and identities are rather dynamic than clearcut and thus would benefit from intersectional research practices. Another blind spot is the non-existent statistics on diversity, more specifically on ethnicity and race (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 18). Though acknowledged internationally, and discussed also in the interviews of this research, the subject is contested.

Finland has always been diverse as established in previous chapters. Furthermore, Finland keeps rapidly diversifying through much-needed immigration as the population ages. From 1990 until 2022 the share of persons over 65 and over has increased by almost 10 points, from 13,5% to 23,3% (Tilastokeskus, n.d.) Furthermore, in 2022 the percentage of persons with foreign backgrounds in the population was 9,1% (Tilastokeskus, n.d.). In the capital region, the change is even more considerable, with a total of 16,9% of persons with foreign backgrounds, in Helsinki 18,6%, and the highest in Vantaa with 25,3%. (Tilastokeskus, n.d.).

When considering the realisation of cultural rights and equity of this rapidly changing population, understanding the variety of cultures, identities and cultural expressions within

Finnish society is vital. Furthermore, when considering funding, the key instrument of Finnish cultural policy, the realisation of equity comes into question when as Vuolasto & Lummepero (2023) and Rönkkö (2024) confirm, the applicants are not asked to disclose any information about their minority status. The crucial question then is, how can policies ensure equity and cultural rights of those they do not recognise to even exist?

Vuolasto (2023) describes the question of minority statistics as weak signals, not yet determined whether they pose a problem or not. Indeed, the question of these statistics is conflicted (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 19), perhaps due to historical baggage and fear of misuse. Lummepero (2023) on the other hand recognises the issue and recounts The Ministry of Justice having a round table discussion on the possibilities of collecting ethnic statistics and continues to reflect how for instance in the United Kingdom these statistics have been gathered. Indeed, this matter has been acknowledged internationally and in 2021 the European Commission published a *Guidance Note on the collection and use of equality data based on ethnic or racial origin*. Its purpose as declared was a response to the “need for data for informed policy choices” (European Commission, 2021).

In the matter of informed decision-making, statistics on minority status have been recognised also within cultural policy research. Pyykkönen (2023) recollects the need for such information and how quantitative research appears unable to reach these minorities. Pyykkönen continues to recount how the unavailability of statistics has been partly bypassed by gathering information from the field with qualitative interviews. However, as Pyykkönen conveys, this is a question of resources and lies heavily on the interests of individual researchers. In line with Pyykkönen, MinEdC acknowledges the shortcomings in the availability of minority statistics and states that research on these topics of diversity will be increased within the limits of available data by adding dialogue as a method of research (Lummepero, 2023, p. 52). In the case of equitable funding, however, it is fair to argue that gathering clear statistics rather than interviews would be important.

The evaluation of grants and subsidies relies heavily on the professionalism and know-how of the councils (Rönkkö, 2024), and perhaps equity is assumed. However, it might be argued this is an insufficient instrument for the realisation of equity. A clear criterion with data-based knowledge of the diversity of the applicants would guarantee a more equitable

process. A new criterion for reviewing funding applications is in the makings for both MinEdC and Taike (Lummepuro, 2023; Rönkkö 2024).

In line with the considerations of Karttunen et al. looking at diversity intersectionally would help in dismantling those congruent groupings of minorities (2023, p. 18). Funding wise it would mean disclosing the applicants' minority status, including but not limited to race, ethnicity, disability, language, gender, religion and so on and for the minority status to be considered equity-wise through positive action in the evaluation process. However, statistics about ethnicity fall under sensitive information and their collection is prohibited per se by legislation (Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 19).

However, the European Commission's guidance notes Finland for its system for monitoring discrimination since 2008 (2021, p. 18). These statistics are available online. Though the statistics offer an important overview of discrimination based on minority status, as such they do not give an accurate account of minorities in Finland. As statistics on ethnicity, race or other minority status are not gathered, as of now, the information available from the Population Information System is language, religion and nationality rendering many minorities invisible. The European Commission's guidance however would allow and suggest for more information to be collected and given voluntarily (2021, p. 36). However, the guidance does not overwrite Finnish legislation but does offer solid information and options if the government and other funding instances should be interested.

5.3.2 National Institutions & Agencies Under MinEdC

Finnish culture and subsequently cultural policy took shape through establishing national institutions and as such are considerably represented within the material of this research. These institutions such as the National Ballet and Opera, the National Gallery and the National Theatre hold a strong place in manifesting Finnish culture and cultural policy and values behind these policies. In addition, five agencies under the administrative branch of MinEdC (Taike, Finnish Heritage Agency, National Audiovisual Institute, Accessibility Library Celia and the Governing Body of Suomenlinna) are significant players in realising the policies of MinEdC. All of these are directly funded by the ministry, as well as guided

through target agreements (national institutions) and performance agreements (agencies). Furthermore, Cupore and the National Cultural Foundation are under the ministry's guidance contributing to research and societal discourse.

Art, Culture and Diverse Finland Action Plan (2023), the most recent action plan focuses on diversity and equity. The target negotiations with the institutions and agencies for 2024-2027 have prioritised cultural diversity and equality listing practical measures for each (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 26). As the main funder and guide of these institutions, MinEdC has set certain targets to be reached within these priorities. Many of the practices of the institutions and agencies listed in the action plan are based on the Non-Discrimination Act. Practical measures include diversity, equity and anti-racism training for the personnel, and many have or plan to introduce anonymous recruitment practices (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 16-47). Diversity and equity are also considered in the programming and audience outreach of these institutions with specific goals of reaching immigrants, young people and the elderly, also free admission days are important from an accessibility point of view. (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 16-47). A specific equality and non-discrimination tool has been developed for the Finnish film industry (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 25).

A common factor throughout the measures of the institutions and agencies is an ambition to incorporate diversity and equity into their operations. Some objectives for achieving this are very explicit and practical, however, others are vague and described as increasing or strengthening competence on diversity, taking diversity or special groups into account, promoting cultural diversity or developing accessibility. These objectives are not however elaborated any further as to how they would be realised in action. Explicit actions require resources which is perhaps why it is easier to set more indistinct targets.

Taike as one of these agencies strives to go further than obtaining merely the targets set by the performance agreements (Rönkkö 2024). Rönkkö elaborates that rather than only concentrating on programmes and initiatives targeted at certain minority groups, equity needs to be integrated into daily practices. Pyykkönen (2023) elaborates that targeted funds do offer possibilities to unknown artists but tend to stigmatise them. Research concurs that programmes targeted at distinct groups add to marginalisation (Grove, 2017, p. 176; Karttunen et al., 2023 p. 27) affirming the need for structural change. Rönkkö discloses one

of Taika's targets for 2027: the structures of decision-making in governmental funding would reflect the population structure of Finland, offering an example of systemic change.

Furthermore, considering future austerity measures and decreasing arts and culture funding, Rönkkö (2024) raises their concern over the funding of art forms and arts and cultural actors most vulnerable and not institutional. Performing arts, more precisely national institutions are heavily funded by the government (Jakonen & Sokka, 2022, p. 302) and as such form a major part of the cultural landscape. However, when considering diversity and equity, it is fair to argue that practices strengthening the equitable funding of these non-institutional arts and artists are needed.

The targets and objectives described in the *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland Action Plan* (2023) display a strong will, intent and even explicit measures to promote equity and diversity. These institutions and agencies are implemental in setting an example of integrating equity and diversity measures into practice. However, there is the challenge of these practices turning into mere tokenism, particularly if not monitored and measured adequately.

5.3.3 Knowledgebase, Monitoring and Equity Indicators

“Do not assume equity, measure equity” (Rodriguez, 2020).

A report on the statistical and knowledge base of the arts and cultural field was published in 2020 including suggestions for development. The report emphasises the importance of leadership based on knowledge preceding transparent and measurable decision-making (Haanpää et al., 2020, p. 12). Furthermore, the report recognises the statistical and data-related challenges of the fragmented and diverse field of arts and culture (Haanpää et al., 2020, p. 88). In pursuit of gathering this fragmented data, MinEdC has published an online service, taidejakulttuuri.fi, compiling the statistics of arts and culture from various sources making the information of for example grants and subsidies more accessible. Moreover, the service provides statistical information on participation and accessibility in different fields of arts and culture as well as financial and employment rates.

However, the service does not provide specified data on diversity or equity and notably is only in Finnish with sites in English and Swedish under construction.

In addition, the impactfulness of arts and culture in general can be monitored through TEAvisari, a tool for municipalities in monitoring well-being, and culture as one of the seven indicators. Vuolasto (2023) elaborates that TEAvisari offers bi-annual information about cultural well-being including one indicator of cultural diversity in addition to the MinEdC self-evaluation. Lummepero (2023) adds the TEAvisari indicator in question measures the participation of immigrants. Vuolasto continues to elaborate that the first results of that particular indicator were poor. A poor result suggests low participation of immigrants in cultural activities. Vuolasto is anticipating better results in two years as a consequence of the guidance offered by TEAvisari. Lummepero adds the importance of new municipal programmes advancing cultural diversity and hopes to see their positive results in TEAvisari indicators. However, statistics on the impact of cultural activities should not be confused with the impact of cultural policy (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2017, p. 35).

The discussion on monitoring and evaluating equity amounted to the target agreements between MinEdC and the national institutions and performance agreements with agencies under their administration as also stated in the latest action plan:

Indicators, studies and analyses will be used to monitor the implementation of the action plan as part of steering and management processes in the administrative branch. In addition to this monitoring, the programme will be updated on the basis of the needs arising from the Ministry's and the Government's strategy work as well as dialogue and development efforts with the cultural sector. (Lummepero, 2023, p. 56)

Lummepero (2023) agrees the description is concise, however, feels it contains all necessary information and refers to the target guidance of the national institutions and performance guidance of the agencies. The challenge here is the lack of clear implementation. Who is in charge of the studies and analyses, and what material are they to use? Does this imply the

monitoring and evaluation are left to the institutions and agencies and for MinEdC to merely approve? This was not made clear during the interviews. Internal outcome targets of MinEdC include a target of increasing participation in culture and the narrowing of the participatory differences between different population groups (Vuolasto 2023). How the participation of different population groups is measured was again not articulated.

As funding wise, statistics on how money is allocated could offer some insight into monitoring equity. Statistics on funding from MinEdC and Taike can be obtained, however, not easily (Haanpää et al, 2020, p. 117). Assessing how funding is divided between different population groups would then offer further information. However, a complete picture cannot be formed as ethnicity or other minority status is not asked in the applications.

The need for a criterion in assessing funding applications and their outcomes was made clear during the interviews. Both MinEdC and Taike indicate that developing such a criterion is one of their future targets (Lummepuro, 2023; Rönkkö 2024). Rönkkö further elaborates that the existence of a criterion would be implemental in assessing the funding applications and their outcomes as for now the reviewers are to rely on the information provided by the applicants, suggesting some applicants might be more precise in their monitoring than others.

To that note, Belfiore et al. suggest that funding policies based on equity might require the applications rewarded with funding to demonstrate how their overall operations from programming to staff to board members reflect demographic diversity (2023, p. 164). Transparent criteria would be a needed instrument for assessing the applications and their merit in realising equity. From a knowledge-based point of view, Pyykkönen (2023) stresses the importance of developing mechanisms in support and production of such knowledge and its evaluation. Indeed, criteria taking into account not only practical measures supporting equity but also the evaluation of those measures is crucial.

Another indicator of equity to emerge from the discussions was staff training. An increase in such training is an international phenomenon recognised by scholars (Belfiore et al, 2023, p. 161). Lummepuro (2023) states that DEI training is important. Lumepuro continues that MinEdC offers staff training on topics including diversity, gender equality and

equity, human rights and hate speech, however, these trainings are voluntary. In Taiké, training the entire staff on cultural diversity is one of their outcome targets (Rönkkö, 2023). Rönkkö continues to verify that to their knowledge all staff members have participated though attendance is not mandatory. In Cupore the focus has been on monitoring the overall well-being of the staff including themes of equity (Pyykkönen, 2023). Though important indicators of diversity and equity becoming an important part of the discourse within these organisations, the outcomes of staff training are difficult to monitor and evaluate outside the scope of the number of attendees. To measure how many have been affected by the information or how many have been able to introduce the information into practice is even more arduous and requires resources. This would require the development of specific equity indicators.

Equity instruments studied in the field of education stipulate such indicators can be developed. Successful indicators might include measuring the disparities between different groups and indicators monitoring participation (Citro et al., 2019, p. 4). On the other hand, indicators for leadership and readiness within organisations are important (Connolly et al., 2020, p. 5-6). Knowledge-based research is an important part of monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of such indicators and together with funding criteria they could form a comprehensive picture of the state of equity. Moreover, the indicators must be dynamic and constantly augmented to respond to the evolving needs of society (Citro et al., 2019, p. 120; Connolly et al., 2020, p. 22) in addition to identifying the root causes of inequalities (Connolly et al., 2020, p. 22). Furthermore, as indicators delve deeper than statistics they can reveal more (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 107).

The main grievances then appear to be the vague implementation and implicit instruments for monitoring and evaluating equity actions and action plans as well as the lack of common indicators and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating both the field of arts and culture in general and equity measures within the field, in line with other studies and scholars (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 107; Karttunen et al., 2023, p. 83) In addition, the availability of statistics from the field is fragmented (Haanpää et al., 2020, p. 67). However, indicators are more than statistics and can be quantitative as well as qualitative in nature (Koivunen & Marsio, 2007, p. 107). Koivunen & Marsio continue to emphasise the

importance of indicators as a link between policy and policy implementation (2007, p. 107). Thus, for equity targets to be successful, the initial action needs to be measurable. Implicit or vague targets such as those described in the previous chapters are difficult if not impossible to measure. Thus, the development of equity indicators is called for.

5.3.4 Positive Action Supporting Representation

The themes arising perhaps more prominently from the societal discourse than from the research material are positive action and representation. Discrimination in the search for employment and recruitment is a significant problem in Finland (Kanninen et al., 2020, p. 123). Researchers have awakened to questions such as who works in culture and what characteristics describe the decision-makers (Belfiore et al, 2023, p. 161-162). In other words, how are minorities represented in arts and culture and what are the actions supporting their access to these positions? Furthermore, as cultural rights indicate states' responsibility in supporting minority cultures, their preservation and realisation, incorporating positive action into cultural policy would be a clear implementation of cultural rights. As representation and positive action are intertwined and relevant to the conceptual framework of this thesis, they were briefly touched upon in the interviews through questions about recruitment practices, diversity among staff members and assessing funding applications.

The diversity represented within the three organisations interviewed is minimal. Pyykkönen (2023) describes the staff of Cupore as relatively monocultural signifying the reason for this to be the language of operations, which is mostly Finnish. However, there is some cultural diversity in the organisation, if measured by the native language and country of origin of the staff members. Though the language barrier is an important aspect to consider, even that often hides more complicated issues of racialisation (Lahtinen et al., 2020, p. 116). Moreover, Pyykkönen continues to reflect that the demand for research on diversity will continue to grow and as such begs for assessing the diversity among the staff in the future.

Rönkkö (2024) recounts the language requirements for a holder of an office. The governmental and institutional positions in Finland require fluency in either Finnish or Swedish and in some cases both. However, Rönkkö elaborates that for positions of fixed-

term, Taike can determine that Finnish is not required giving an example of recruiting a coordinator of international affairs. Taike's staff much like the other instances is mainly white Finns, however, as Rönkkö states, there is more diversity within Taike's arts councils and working groups such as the Development Programme for Cultural Diversity and Mobility. Taike has also initiated anonymous recruiting in 2022 as part of its recruitment practices (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 30). However, anonymous recruitment is somewhat contested as not the best way to obtain representation for underrepresented groups (Kanninen et al., 2022, p. 97-98). Anonymity is difficult if not impossible to extend to the process of interviews, furthermore, anonymity rules out positive action which according to research may be more beneficial for underrepresented groups (Kanninen et al., 2022, p. 97-98).

The staff of MinEdC is depicted as homogenous if not for singular interns (Vuolasto, 2023). Lummepuro (2023) notes the importance of accessibility of the calls for open positions elaborating it needs to be clearly stated in the description of the position that applications from diverse backgrounds are encouraged. Research on the impact of such encouragement is still scarce (Kanninen et al., 2022, p. 104). The importance of reaching a diverse group of applicants may be more important than the encouragement sentences. Insofar as language, the same requirements apply to all governmental positions, including MinEdC and Taike. Lummepuro continues that the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare has good instructions on recruiting diverse staff. In addition, Lummepuro points out the significance of representation within certain projects, as an example they recall that for the visuals of the Dialogue Cards they called for applications from specifically BIPOC artists.

All interviewees acknowledge the need for diverse representation among their staff. However, concrete instruments for obtaining this representation fall short, including positive action even though the Non-Discrimination Act legitimises positive action (literally: positive discrimination) and has justifications for different treatment. Positive action acknowledges equity as it prefers fairness rather than sameness and strives for structural change (Ghani & Read, 2024, p. 90).

When asked about applying positive action within arts and culture funding, MinEdC interviewees Vuolasto and Lummepuro (2023) forwarded an answer from a MinEdC lawyer stating that applying positive action to the rigid and slowly moving

system of central government funding is difficult significantly because positive action must be planned, proportionate and temporary. They continue to note that on singular funding calls, positive action would be easier to apply however, the criterion needs to be clearly stated already in the call for applications. It could be argued that this sort of action falls under the category of funding directed at certain minorities rather than overall positive action. In Taika, as is the arm's length principle, assessing the applications is executed by arts councils of peers. Positive action is not applied and matters of equity and diversity are trusted to the reviewers' professionalism. Rönkkö (2024) adds that the equity and diversity training offered by Taika is planned to be extended to the arts councils' peer reviewers.

Hence, one defining challenge of realising equity is the diversification of the entire field, particularly the decision-makers (Simjanovska, 2022, p. 121). Furthermore, the narratives of the Western canon of arts, culture and power hierarchies are profound and reluctant to change (Lehmuskallio, 2022, p. 114), and in Finland, the notion of Nordic exceptionalism runs deep. If the leaders and decision-makers of arts and culture lack diversity, the decisions and policies cannot reflect diverse experiences or views (Belfiore et al, 2023, p. 161-162; Simjanovska, 2022, p. 122). Changes in policy call for the participation of the state, private sector, and civil society (Vella & Xuereb, 2021, p. 39). This progress towards diversity in all sectors does not happen overnight or by itself. Equity is possible but requires the acknowledgement of systemic discrimination (Rodriguez, 2020) and the examination of power structures. A change towards a diversified and inclusive field of arts and culture requires intentional action from all involved (Pekkarinen, 2022, p. 95). Thus, representation at all levels is crucial from governmental to private sector, educational to research organisations as well as to funders and policymakers. Applying positive action in terms of recruitment, funding and quotas can be an efficient tool in achieving equity. However, these tools should be applied only until equity becomes the norm rendering the tool redundant (Rastenberger, 2022, p. 83). However, positive action as of now is rendered useless by strict qualifications of educational and professional background in accordance with Western standards, language requirements and anonymous recruitment.

5.3.5 Lack of Intersectionality

Intersectionality or better the lack thereof is a recurring theme in the research data. As a part of the conceptual and methodological frameworks of this thesis, intersectionality and its prevalence in the research data calls for consideration. Cultural inequalities are intersectional (Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 164). Furthermore, international researchers have begun to consider intersectionality in correlation with cultural policy and cultural rights (Nyangweso, 2016, p. 49-50; Vella & Xuereb, 2021, p. 37-14; Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 165-166). Though a prominent topic among feminist research practices, perhaps intersectionality is still as little known as it is little used at the level of policy- and decision-making.

As stated in the chapter illuminating the use of critical words within strategy and policy documents, intersectionality occurs in the written material once: “Apart from direct discriminatory treatment, attention must also be paid to structural and intersectional discrimination and racism” (Lummepuro, 2023, p. 15). During the interviews, intersectionality emerged mostly from a research point of view as a need for intersectional research. Pyykkönen (2023) recounts that Cupore has not engaged in intersectional research as such but recognises its significance in identifying differing factors in line with Karttunen et al. viewing intersectionality as an important future aspect in describing the multiple factors contributing to the status of foreign-born artists in Finland (2023, p. 86). Pyykkönen continues to elaborate on how diversity barometers conducted at Cupore and their indicators may be suited for a cross-analysis somewhat similar to intersectional practices.

Within the other two interviews, though posed as a question: is intersectionality taken into account when considering, for example, equity programmes, the answers concentrate on describing initiatives such as the Dialogue Cards and the National Dialogues. This reveals that intersectionality as a concept is perhaps not much used by policy- and decision-makers.

Both, the Dialogue Cards and National Dialogues are initiatives of MinEdC facilitating anyone to practice in their organisation or community with an emphasis on creating dialogues between diverse groups and contributing to understanding and valuing diversity. Though not directly considered as a practice, intersectionality, as defined in the glossary of the Dialogue Cards is a tool for an equal and equitable world. The National Dialogues similarly have not so far addressed intersectionality per se even though critical

topics of immigration, discrimination and racism have been considered. In line with Vella & Xuereb, intersectionality as a tool, such as these dialogues, can amplify the voices of the marginalised (2021, p. 37). This indicates that intersectionality among policymakers is considered exactly that, a tool, but not a comprehensive praxis in recognising and dismantling structural discrimination.

The core of intersectionality is the recognition that identity comprises simultaneously multiple aspects, privileges and disadvantages. Understanding this helps policymakers avoid generalisations upon addressing policies (Vella & Xuereb, 2021, p. 41). Vella & Xuereb continue to emphasise the importance of recognising multiple identities, however, the objective cannot be new hierarchies (2021, p. 41). Furthermore, the policy- and decision-makers must reflect on their position, how are their choices and decisions informed by their privileges and/or disadvantages?

As a practice, intersectionality needs to be taken further. In line with the core values of cultural rights and cultural equity “It is important to challenge exclusionary and discriminatory attitudes and to make the values of inclusiveness and solidarity a priority in cultural policy.” (Vella & Xuereb, 2021, p. 41). Furthermore, changing attitudes is also not enough but the entire cultural sector must recognise the inequalities embedded within the institutions as well as the socioeconomic and political structures contributing to discrimination (Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 165-166). In practice, intersectionality requires the examination of power structures, the recognition of oppressive histories behind current policies as well as questioning of the norms creating intersectional discrimination. The norms created to govern perceptions such as gender and ability are labels that need to be replaced with the recognition of a complex, intersectional identity which then can be reflected in the policies made (Vella & Xuereb, 2021, p. 40-41). Additionally, to understand the interlockings of inequalities, intersectional practices must be included in the production of the knowledge base, namely research and within the policymaking itself.

As cultural inequalities are intersectional, manifesting in insufficient participation, even denied participation because of multiple and intersecting discrimination and power structures (Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 164), the dismantling of those unequal discriminating structures must be participatory as well as intersectional. “Nothing about us without us”

originating from disability advocacy calling for representation (Lehmuskallio, 2022, p. 110) and “cosmopolitics” demanding the presence of all affiliated (Elfving, 2022, p. 141-142) needs to be extended intersectionally to include all minorities and vulnerable groups. In creating sustainable equity in policymaking, Vella & Xuereb suggest exactly participatory policymaking and refer to research on how empowering diverse communities through including them in policymaking and budgeting has provided encouraging results in social inclusion (2021, p. 40). Thus, in addition to participatory practices, equity in cultural policy could be realised through intersectional practices, as Belfiore et al. suggest, an intersectional cultural policy (2023, p. 166).

6. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, I will summarise the results of this thesis, and briefly present the aspects for furthering equity emerging from the research material in need of development followed by final conclusions and considerations of the generalisability of this research.

6.1 Summary of the Results

The premise of this research was to investigate and analyse how equity is integrated into Finnish cultural policy and funding from three specific viewpoints: the policies, state funding and research. The aim was to understand how equity is realised, how it is addressed and described and how the possible outcomes are monitored. The language, nuances and wordings used in different levels of policymaking were examined to reveal changes perhaps in correlation with societal or governmental developments. Themes arising from the discussions with representatives of MinEdC, Taike and Cupore as well as the documents examined were then contrasted with the frameworks' literature.

The research conducted through data gathering and interviews then thoroughly scrutinised with critical discourse analysis and thematic analysis yielded simultaneously encouraging and discouraging results. Various instruments considering equity, with both implicit and explicit actions, objectives and initiatives could be identified within Finnish cultural policy and among the institutions and agencies under the MinEdC administration. However, the variety of actions, lack of cohesion and lack of monitoring of the implementation of equity render an overview of good intentions without a clear long-term objective of structural change.

The analysis of language within the MinEdC documents reveals the different objectives of the government and the policymakers. The government's focus on the economic value of arts and culture rather than on diversity and equity or ensuring cultural rights increases as the Ministry's strategies are renewed. Policymakers on the other hand progressively concentrate on topics such as cultural diversity, equality, equity, participation

and inclusion. Furthermore, the language of the reports and action plans strives to depict clear guidelines and action in achieving equity. Changes in language are evident and point to the societal significance of the topics. However, whether the change is lasting or merely dependent on singular policymakers or trends remains to be seen.

Finnish cultural policy is most prominently realised through state funding, thus many of the equity instruments are closely tied to the funding decisions. Equity through funding is mostly implemented through specific funding programmes aimed at either a certain minority group such as the MinEdC funding of the Sámi or towards general work in promoting equity such as Taike's subsidies for promoting cultural diversity and combating racism. Similar programmes within municipalities funded by MinEdC can be identified. The main challenges with these funding instruments are the lack of a clear equity criterion, the lack of positive action and the overall temporary nature without an objective of structural change.

In addition to funding, equity instruments within multiple instrument domains could be identified, such as funding and commissioning research to strengthen the knowledge base of policymaking, the MinEdC target guidance of national institutions and performance guidance of agencies with objectives for supporting diversity and equity along with regulatory instruments such as the Non-Discrimination act. Furthermore, informational and value-based instruments were evident.

The examination of these instruments discloses a varying degree of implementation and monitoring. Many of the equity objectives appear general without a transparent plan of how by whom or when they are to be executed. Furthermore, monitoring these general objectives is difficult. On the other hand, distinct actions easy to monitor were described particularly by the institutions and agencies under MinEdC, however, still missing a clear design for monitoring and outcome evaluation.

The themes discussed display many of the aspects contributing to the shortcomings of the equity instruments. One of the most prominent issues hindering the realisation of equity is the lack of statistics on minorities. The lack of information about minorities is intertwined and contributes to the lack of positive action, representation and intersectionality, all implemental in realising equity and all mostly missing from the equity instruments described. The national institutions and agencies are consequential in setting an example of promoting

diversity and equity. The good intentions of these institutions are evident, with listings of both implicit and explicit actions in support of equity. Yet particularly the monitoring of these actions appears insufficient. Clear equity indicators missing from the instruments described would contribute to the monitoring of equity. The development of such indicators would not only add to realising equity but also to the knowledge base of cultural policy. It is evident throughout the research material that research and strengthening the knowledge base have a significant role in the development of Finnish cultural policy. However, diverse representation is needed at all levels of arts and culture from the artists to researchers to decision-makers for the plurality of identities and knowledge to affect policymaking and contribute to structural change.

6.2 Furthering Equity

The increasing diversity of the Finnish population needs to be mainstreamed into the planning and decision-making procedures in arts and cultural policy. Expertise related to cultural diversity, equity and equality should be developed in these organisations. A systematic approach is needed, and evaluating goal achievement is important. (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021, p. 7)

This quote from the *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland -report* (2021) could be the concluding remarks of this thesis reaffirming its findings. There is evident intent and will to include equity but as the results indicate, a systematic approach has not been implemented as of yet. The wheels of policymaking are slow and rigid, and although encouraging changes can be observed, more effective action and systemic change are needed.

The information gathered about Finland's population plays an important role in the realisation of equity. These statistics on minorities and diversity or "equality data" as the European Commission calls them is a theme prominent throughout this research, recognised in previous studies and a contested topic among national and international discourse on diversity. The challenges in gathering minority statistics appear to deeply affect the themes discussed such as representation, positive action and the knowledge base of policymaking as the lack of recognition is a root cause hindering the overall actualisation of equity.

Investigating the possibilities of gathering “equality data” also in Finland, particularly within state funding and recruitment could reveal its advantages to surmount the feared disadvantages. Gathered voluntarily, any information about belonging to a minority, underrepresented, marginalised or other vulnerable group could then be taken into consideration for positive action in the funding decisions as well as applied to recruitment practices. The lack of these statistics is also severely hindering research. Methods of gathering even some information about minorities require ample resources (eg. time, funds and researchers with a particular interest). It appears evident that examining the possibilities of gathering this data, even voluntarily, is called for.

Another notable topic within the framework of cultural policy and discriminative structures encompassing many of the themes discussed is the roots of these structures. The Western cultural policy has deep colonial roots. Equity cannot be realised within oppressive structures founded on colonial practices. As coloniality through its policies holds cultural and economic dominance it inevitably creates asymmetrical power structures between the majority and the minority (Mulcahy, 2019, p. 230). With its complicated colonial history and present, Finland needs to consider its policies from a decolonial perspective.

“Intersectionality foregrounds the multiple intersecting manifestations, mechanisms, and adjoining socio-political processes of settler colonialism, including land dispossession and repossession, patriarchy, ableism, heteronormativity, capital accumulation, and white supremacy” (Dhamoon, 2015, p. 33). As such, intersectionality as a framework for decolonising should expose the many forms of discrimination, not only current-day colonialism and the effects of the past assimilation, epistemicide and linguicide but also the intersections of a marginalised identity with other forms of discrimination within the Finnish society. “Building participatory, democratic interpretive communities across differences of experience, expertise, and resources has been the hallmark of intersectional projects” (Collins et al., 202, p. 692).

Within Finnish cultural policy then, recognising how the system benefits those already in a position of privilege (eg. white, native Finnish speaker, able-bodied) and hides those in need of support (eg. invisible minorities, intersectionally discriminated) or adds to marginalisation by centring the diversity needs to be thoroughly examined. In addition, the Western canon of art- and knowledge production needs to be questioned. Who does the

system recognise as a professional artist and what is perceived as art worth funding within Finnish cultural policy and funding? Imagining the alternatives through different epistemology, cognitive justice, representation and intersectionally participatory methods is required. “Rather, we need to add to the pluriversal epistemology a dialogical inclusive one in which as many as possible of the participants in a particular social encounter would take part, as the only way to approximate the truth.” (Yuval-Davis, 2017, p. 8)

6.3 Final Conclusions

The right-wing forces in power and their austerity politics along with polarisation and colonial histories pose imminent challenges to cultural policy striving for equity. No matter the government responsible for the policies or the political atmosphere, the value and cultural rights of every human being are indisputable. The forces at play operating in structural and institutional levels stemming from colonialism and white Western supremacy are reluctant to change. These challenges though make the pursuit towards equity even more important. Ensuring cultural rights and the diversity of cultural expressions through cultural policy is critical.

Finnish cultural policy appears still confined to justifying the general value of arts and culture, be it economic or well-being, specifically in times of austerity measures, subsequently concealing the current and urgent matters of diversity, equity and representation. Cultural democracy and democratisation of culture as policy objectives have not been able to effectively address the dilemmas of diversity and equity (Belfiore et al., 2023, p. 163). The intent and will to support and realise equity in cultural policy and within the national institutions is evident. However, as the implementation, the actions and the monitoring of outcomes are not cohesive it begs the question, are these actions merely good intentions reduced to DEI training in response to the growing societal pressure and as such diminished to tokens with no clear objective of structural change? Without transparency and responsibility, as Belfiore et al. suggest, these initiatives are just new versions of the same old performative actions or “fakequity” (2023, p. 162).

Reflecting on the results of this research, equity needs to be viewed as a process rather than a state of being or something that can be obtained by following certain steps. The implementation of equity needs to be as dynamic as society. For equity to become systemic there needs to be a cohesive set of equity instruments and indicators instead of general and arbitrary actions. The question then is: how to contextualise cultural policy anew, in a way that could identify and value arts and culture beyond the Western canon? How to reframe the narrative of Nordic exceptionalism from equality to equity and incorporate diversity, diverse expressions and diverse knowledge for arts and culture to reflect the true diversity of society? For Finland to be the lottery win for everyone, not only the white majority, the cultural rights of all need to be safeguarded and realised, the oppressive structures need to be recognised and dismantled, policies and policymakers should reflect and represent the pluralism of identities and equity as a principle as well and action should replace the ready-made narrative of equality.

6.4 Generalisability

A study of similar methods concentrating on identifying policy instruments in support of social justice, in this case equity could be reiterated beyond Finland. The research could certainly be repeated within other Finnish policy domains relevant to funding arts and culture to reveal the state of equity more widely. Examining policies from multiple angles, such as the policies, the key instruments and research on those policies has the potential of disclosing a multifaceted overview.

There are possibilities for both narrowing and widening the perspective. Adding more angles, such as funding statistics could offer more substantial information. Adding more interviewees from several institutions might offer a more detailed account beyond policy papers and action plans perhaps revealing the true extent to which equity is implemented. On the other hand, narrowing the study to include a single policy instrument, such as funding, examined through the same steps might render significant details on factors contributing to and hindering equity.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has perhaps raised more questions than it has answered. One of the significant results of this thesis then is the evident need for more research from a clear perspective of equity. As stated in earlier chapters, to convey the multi-layered state of equity there are numerous aspects in need of further examination. I will continue to present some of them as a recommendation for further research.

7.1 Further Research on Equity

Multiple avenues of research could be taken in further search of equity. A significantly important aspect would be the minorities themselves. Though hindered by the unavailability of statistical information about minorities, qualitative methods could be applied in examining how minorities view the current equity measures within Finnish cultural policy and funding. It would be important to evaluate if the current measures for equity are achieving the goals set from the viewpoint of the minorities. The voices of minorities need to be amplified to understand the discriminatory systems from an intersectional viewpoint. This would not only centre minority knowledge and minorities as active agents but also offer possibilities for participation.

Another perspective would be that of the funds allocated for arts and culture. As politicians look for ways to present the impactfulness of arts and culture in numbers, a quantitative study on state funding from the specific perspective of diversity and equity could reveal the reality and numbers needed for structural change. Again, the non-existent statistic on diversity makes this approach difficult, however, important data could be found from funds allocated to diversity and/or equity programmes as well as certain minorities giving an overview of how equity is implemented through funding. Also, contrasting the state funding with the funding provided by non-governmental and private cultural institutions is called for.

In addition to funding, contrasting DEI initiatives with arts and culture foundations, private and other non-governmental organisations could provide valuable insights into how

equity has been implemented within the somewhat more agile sector of arts and culture. What kind of equity instruments are in place within the private sector?

7.2 Further Research on Cultural Policy

For equity to be realised systematically within policies, the structures behind the policies require examination. More perspectives on cultural policy would include a historical perspective in identifying the origins of Finnish cultural policy and its colonial roots. Acknowledging the origins of Finnish cultural policy could lead to decolonial practices contributing to solving current challenges in realising equity. An in-depth investigation of the history of colonial practices and their influence on past and present cultural policy is called for. For instance, how are the current policies and funding decisions contributing to the ongoing struggles for self-determination and the realisation of cultural and linguistic rights of the Sámi? Or how does the Western canon of art dictate whose arts and culture are recognised and valued within the state funding systems?

The lack of distinct equity indicators within Finnish cultural policy and funding is evident. The development of such indicators to support the knowledge base of decision-making within policies and funding is crucial. Not only would these indicators facilitate funding decisions but offer tools for monitoring. In addition, a cohesive funding criterion with integrated equity indicators would again enhance the realisation of equity and support systemic change.

The final challenge affecting all research recommendations here is to find an answer to the dilemma of gathering data on minorities. What information is required needs to be identified as well as the possibilities of voluntary disclosure of minority status within state statistics. As previous research along with this thesis suggests, there is a growing need for this equality data in light of equity to be realised. Statistics on minorities are needed for a general overview of the diversity of the Finnish population but also for equity matters. Minority statistics could also be beneficial for state funding systems to be able to thoroughly detect where there is a need for supportive measures and which population groups are perhaps overrepresented.

8. REFERENCES

- Adams, W. C. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In K.E.Newcomer, H.P.Hatry, J.S.WHoley (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation*, (pp. 492-505). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386.ch19>
- Aikio-Puoskari, U. (2018). Revitalization of Sámi languages in three Nordic countries: Finland, Norway, and Sweden. In *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (pp. 355-363). Routledge.
- Aldrin Salskov, S. (2020). A critique of our own? On intersectionality and “epistemic habits” in a study of racialization and homonationalism in a Nordic context. *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 28(3), (pp. 251-265). <https://doi/pdf/10.1080/08038740.2020.1789218>
- Aura, V. (2024, March 20). *Musiikkialalla esiintyy yhä runsaasti syrjintää – erityisesti etniseen taustaan, ikään ja sukupuoleen liittyvä syrjintä yleistä - Teosto*. Teosto. <https://www.teosto.fi/musiikkialalla-esiintyy-yha-runsaasti-syrjintaa/>
- Balta Portolés, J., & Dragičević Šešić, M. (2017). Cultural rights and their contribution to sustainable development: Implications for cultural policy. *International journal of cultural policy: CP*, 23(2), (pp. 159-173). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1280787>
- Bailey, J., Steeves, V., Burkell, J., Shade, L. R., Ruparelia, R., & Regan, P. (2019). Getting at equality: Research methods informed by the lessons of intersectionality. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919846753>
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2011). *The second sex*. Vintage Books.
- Belfiore, E. (2016). Cultural policy research in the real world: curating “impact”, facilitating “enlightenment”. *Cultural Trends*, 25(3), (pp. 205-216). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2016.1204050>
- Belfiore, E., Hadley, S., Heidelberg, B. M., & Rosenstein, C. (2023). Cultural Democracy, Cultural Equity, and Cultural Policy: Perspectives from the UK and USA. *The*

Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 53(3), (pp. 157-168).

<https://doi/pdf/10.1080/10632921.2023.2223537>

Bemelmans-Videc, M. L., Rist, R. C., & Vedung, E. O. (Eds.). (1998). *Carrots, sticks, and sermons: Policy instruments and their evaluation* (Vol. 1). Transaction Publishers.

Bennett, O. (2004). Review essay: The Torn Halves of Cultural Policy Research.

International journal of cultural policy: CP, 10(2), (pp. 237-248).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663042000255844>

Canyürek, Ö. (2022). *Cultural Diversity in Motion: Rethinking Cultural Policy and Performing Arts in an Intercultural Society* (Vol. 144). transcript Verlag.

Caust, J. (2019). Cultural rights as human rights and the impact on the expression of arts practices. *Journal of Citizenship and Globalisation Studies*, 3(1), (pp. 17-30).

<https://ojs.deakin.edu.au/index.php/jcgs/article/view/1051>

Citro, C., Nielsen, N., Koenig, J., & Edley Jr, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Monitoring educational equity*. National Academies Press.

<https://cradall.org/sites/default/files/Monitoring%20Educational%20Equity.pdf>

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The journal of positive psychology*, 12(3), (pp. 297-298). <https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004>

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of*

Sociology, 41(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>

Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons.

Collins, P. H., da Silva, E. C. G., Ergun, E., Furseth, I., Bond, K. D., & Martínez-Palacios, J. (2021). Intersectionality as critical social theory: Intersectionality as critical social

theory, Patricia Hill Collins, Duke University Press, 2019. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 20(3), (pp. 690-725). <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41296-021-00490-0>

- Connolly, F., Durant, T. L., & Durham, R. E. (2020). Indicators to assist in addressing equity through policy adoption. *Teachers College Record*, 122(14), (pp. 1-32).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812012201411>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. In *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, (pp. 139-168).
<https://philpapers.org/archive/CREDTI.pdf?ncid=txtlnkusaolp00000603>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (2013). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In *The public nature of private violence* (pp. 93-118). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Creswell, John W. (2009). *Research designs. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf
- Dhamoon, R. (2015). A feminist approach to decolonising anti-racism: Rethinking transnationalism, intersectionality, and settler colonialism. *Feral Feminisms*, 4(1), (pp. 20-37). https://feralfeminisms.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/ff_A-Feminist-Approach-to-Decolonizing-Anti-Racism_issue4.pdf
- Dragičević Šešić, M. (2022). Professionalisation of the Cultural Sector Through the Development of Arts / Cultural Management and Cultural Policy as Academic, Research-based Disciplines. In V. Simjanovska & T-M. Karjalainen (Eds.), *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Management*, (pp. 33-55).
<https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-329-297-0>
- Eddo-Lodge, R. (2020). *Why I'm no longer talking to white people about race*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Elfving, T. (2022). Cultivating Cultural Change – Notes on Art, Ecology and Social Justice. In V. Simjanovska & T-M. Karjalainen (Eds.) *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Management*, (pp. 136-145.) <https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-329-297-0>

- Ekvalita. (2022, March 2). (Mis)understanding the terms of Equality and Equity in a Finnish context. <https://ekvalita.fi/en/misunderstanding-the-terms-of-equality-and-equity-in-a-finnish-context/>
- European Commission. (2021). Guidance note on the collection and use of equality data based on racial or ethnic origin. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2838/06180>
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2023). *Being Black in the EU - Experiences of People of African Descent*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2811/327480>
- Frenander, A. (2008). What are they doing, the cultural policy researchers? Or The theoretical universe of cultural policy research. In The Fifth International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (ICCPR 2008). Istanbul: August 20-24. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:886664/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Ghani, A. M., & Read, T. (2024). From equality to equity: A case study of Creative Shift's 'the leader within Women+ of Colour Leadership Programme'. *Industry and Higher Education*. <https://doi/10.1177/09504222231224086>
- Grove, J. (2017). Researching a marginalised group: Reflections on being an outsider. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 17(3), (pp. 176-180). <https://doi/10.1002/capr.12120>
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (2008). Beyond 'culture': space, identity, and the politics of difference. In *The cultural geography reader* (pp. 72-79). Routledge. https://elearning.unito.it/scuolacle/pluginfile.php/216451/mod_folder/content/0/Gupta-Ferguson_CultAnth92_BeyondCulture%20%281%29.pdf
- Haanpää, S., Manu, S., & Siltanen, K. (2020). *Taiteen ja kulttuurin toimialan tilasto- ja tietoperusta : Nykytila ja kehittämisohdotukset*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-263-708-6>

- Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., De Neve, J., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. (2024, March 20). *World Happiness Report 2024*. The World Happiness Report.
<https://worldhappiness.report/ed/2024/>
- Honkasilta, J., Ahtiainen, R., Hienonen, N., & Jahnukainen, M. (2019). Inclusive and special education and the question of equity in education: The case of Finland. *The SAGE handbook on inclusion and diversity in education*, (pp. 481-495).
<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/334792>
- Huckin, T. N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications. (pp. 87-92).
- Hylland, O. M. (2020). Negative cultural policy: tools, elements and analytical potential. *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidsskrift*, 23(2), (pp. 143-158).
<https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2000-8325/2020-02-05>
- Jakonen, O., Kurlin Niiniaho, A., Oksanen-Särelä, K., & Sokka, S. (2021). Mahdollisesti kulttuuria? Valtion kulttuurirahoitus Suomessa vuonna 2019. Cuporen työpapereita 13. Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuskeskus Cupore.
<https://www.cupore.fi/julkaisut/mahdollisesti-kulttuuria/>
- Jakonen, O. & Renko, V. (2023, August 24). *A review of the government programme's cultural policy in Finland - Cupore*. Cupore. <https://www.cupore.fi/en/newsroom/a-review-of-the-government-programmes-cultural-policy-in-finland/>
- Jakonen, O. & Sokka, S. (2022). Finnish cultural policy as public funding: Regime view across policy domains. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*, 25(3), (pp. 293-313).
<https://doi/full/10.18261/nkt.25.3.9>
- Jokela, E.-L. (2012). Kulttuuripoliittisesti relevantti tutkimus Suomessa. Cuporen verkkojulkaisuja 10. Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuskeskus Cupore.
<https://www.cupore.fi/julkaisut/kulttuuripoliittisesti-relevantti-tutkimus-suomessa/>
- Joona, T. L. (2018). Safeguarding Cultural Rights of Sámi Children and Youth in Finland, with Special Emphasis on the Linguistic part of Cultural Identity: Current Challenges. *The yearbook of polar law*, (pp. 9-129).

https://lacris.ulapland.fi/ws/portalfiles/portal/5938467/Yearbook_of_Polar_Law_2018.pdf

- Kallio, A. A. (2021). Doing dirty work: Listening for ignorance among the ruins of reflexivity in music education research. *The politics of diversity in music education*, (pp. 53-67).
- Kangas, A. (2001). Cultural policy in Finland. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 31(1), 57–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632920109599579>
- Kanninen, O., Virkola, T., Lilja, E., & Rask, S. (2022). *Tavoitteena syrjimätön työelämä : Työsyöjinnän nykytila ja keinoja tasa-arvon ja yhdenvertaisuuden edistämiseksi*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-383-362-3>
- Karttunen, S., Lahtinen, E., Valkama, H., & Leppänen, A. (2023). *Ulkomaalaistaustaiset taiteilijat Suomessa. Moninaisuusraportti 2023*. Cuporen verkkojulkaisuja 75. Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuskeskus Cupore. <https://www.cupore.fi/julkaisut/ulkomaalaistaustaiset-taiteilijat-suomessa/>
- Keskinen, S. (2019). Intra-Nordic differences, colonial/racial histories, and national narratives: Rewriting Finnish history. *Scandinavian Studies*, 91(12), (pp. 163-181). <https://doi.org/10.5406/scanstud.91.1-2.0163>
- Koivunen, H., & Marsio, L. (2007). *Fair Culture? Ethical dimension of cultural policy and cultural rights*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-485-383-5>
- Kumar, N. (2021). Understanding equity and equality: Some conceptual and pragmatic considerations. In *Comprehending Equity* (pp. 28-37). Routledge India.
- Lahtinen, E., Mäenpää, M., Karri, S., Kurlin Niiniaho, A. (2020). Avaus: ulkomaalaissyntyisten taide- ja kulttuurialan ammattilaisten asema Suomessa. Cuporen verkkojulkaisuja 63. Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuskeskus Cupore. https://www.cupore.fi/images/tiedostot/2020/avaus_raportti.pdf
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. Guilford Publications.

- Lehmuskallio, L. (2022). Repositioning Power and Privilege – Implementing Intersectionality and Adapting Activist Approaches in a Museum. In V. Simjanovska & T-M. Karjalainen (Eds.) *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Management*, (pp. 102-116.) <https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-329-297-0>
- Liikanen, H. (2010). *Art and Culture for Well-being : Proposal for an action programme 2010–2014*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-485-918-9>
- Loftsdóttir, Kristín & Jensen, L.. (2012). Introduction: Nordic exceptionalism and the Nordic 'others'. In *Whiteness and Postcolonialism in the Nordic Region: Exceptionalism, Migrant Others and National Identities*, 9781315547275, (pp. 1-11).
- Loh, C. G., Ashley, A. J., Durham, L., & Bubb, K. (2022). Our diversity is our strength: Explaining variation in diversity, equity, and inclusion emphasis in municipal arts and cultural plans. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 88(2), (pp. 192-205). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2021.1936127>
- Lorde, A. (2019). *Sister outsider*. Penguin Classics.
- Lummepero, M. (2023). *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland: The Ministry of Education and Culture's action plan to promote diversity in the field of arts and culture*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-263-932-5>
- Malesevic, S. (2006). *Identity as ideology: Understanding ethnicity and nationalism*. Springer.
- Mangset, P. (2020). An account of the academic institutionalisation of cultural policy research. A Nordic perspective. *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidskrift*, 23(1), (pp. 7-28). <https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2000-8325/-2020-01-02>
- McMullin, C. (2023). Transcription and qualitative methods: Implications for third sector research. *VOLUNTAS: International journal of voluntary and nonprofit organizations*, 34(1), (pp. 140-153). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-021-00400-3>
- Ministry of Education. (2003) *Ministry of Education Strategy 2015*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:952-442-556-4>

- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2009). *Strategy for Cultural Policy*. Valto.
<http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-485-775-8>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2010). *Ministry of Education and Culture Strategy 2020*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-485-907-3>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2016). *Meaningful in Finland: Action plan*. Valto.
<http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-263-415-3>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2017). *Strategy for Cultural Policy 2025 – Ministry of Education and Culture*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-263-471-9>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2021). *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland: Final Report of the Working Group for Cultural Policy, Immigrants and Promotion of Cultural Diversity*. Valto.
https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/162665/OKM_2021_5.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2023). *Ministry of Education and Culture Strategy 2030*. Valto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-263-632-4>
- Ministry of Justice. (2014). *Non-Discrimination Act*. <https://urly.fi/3qM8>
- Minow, M. (2021). Equality vs. equity. *American Journal of Law and Equality*, 1, (pp. 167-193). https://doi.org/10.1162/ajle_a_00019
- Montañez, S. R. (2023). Advancing equity through research: The importance of asset-based approaches and methods. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 86, 101540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2023.101540>
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2019). Combating Coloniality: The cultural policy of post-colonialism. *Políticas culturais em revista*, 12(1), (pp. 228-258.)
<https://doi.org/10.9771/pcr.v12i1.30433>
- Nyangweso, M. (2016). Negotiating cultural rights to affirm human rights. *Journal of Religion and Violence*, 4(1), (pp. 39-58). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26671486>

- Nygren, K. G., Mulinari, D., & Martinsson, L. (2018). Gender equality and beyond: At the crossroads of neoliberalism, anti-gender movements, " european" values, and normative reiterations in the Nordic model. *Social Inclusion*, 6(4), (pp. 1-7).
<https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/60578>
- Pekkarinen, J. (2022). In Search of an Enhanced Societal Role for the Arts – A Cultural Sustainability Point of View to Arts Sector Reconstruction. In V. Simjanovska & T-M. Karjalainen (Eds.), *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Management*, (pp. 87-100). <https://taju.uniarts.fi/handle/10024/7675>
- Rastenberger, A. K. (2022) We're Breaking All the Rules. Even Our Own Rules. In V. Simjanovska & T-M. Karjalainen (Eds.), *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Management*, (pp. 78-84). <https://taju.uniarts.fi/handle/10024/7675>
- Renko, V., & Jakonen, O. (2024). Kulttuuripolitiikan tulevaisuus on politiikan asia. *Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuksen vuosikirja*, 7(1), 6–9.
<https://doi.org/10.17409/kpt.142158>
- Renteln, A. D. (2006). Reflections on the Theory and Practice of Cultural Rights. In *Proceedings of the ASIL Annual Meeting* (Vol. 100, pp. 324-326). Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, B., & Stamatopoulou, E. (2004). Reflections on culture and cultural rights. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 103(2), (pp. 419-434). <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/169148>
- Rodriguez, D. (2020). Engineering for Equity. In *Software engineering at Google: Lessons learned from programming over time*. O'Reilly Media.
<https://abseil.io/resources/swe-book>
- Ruusuvirta, M. (2020). Kohti valoa, kulttuuripolitiikka : Tutkitulle tiedolle on tilausta. *Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuksen vuosikirja*, 5(1), (pp. 4–5).
<https://doi.org/10.17409/kpt.100483>
- Saukkonen, P. (2007). Maahanmuutto, monikulttuurisuus ja kulttuuripolitiikka: taustatietoja tutkimukselle ja toiminnalle. *Cuporen verkkojulkaisuja* 1/2007. Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuskeskus Cupore.

<https://www.cupore.fi/julkaisut/maahanmuutto-monikulttuurisuus-ja-kulttuuripolitiikka-taustatietoja-tutkimukselle-ja-toiminnalle/>

Saukkonen, P. (2010). Kotouttaminen ja kulttuuripolitiikka - Tutkimus maahanmuutosta ja monikulttuurisuudesta suomalaisella taiteen ja kulttuurin kentällä. Cuporen verkkojulkaisuja 19. Kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimuskeskus Cupore.

<https://www.cupore.fi/julkaisut/kotouttaminen-ja-kulttuuripolitiikka/>

Saukkonen, P. (2021). Cultural policy and cultural diversity.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429026690-9>

Saukkonen, P., & Pyykkönen, M. (2008). Cultural policy and cultural diversity in Finland. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(1), (pp. 49-63).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630701856518>

Scullion, A., & García, B. (2005). What is cultural policy research?. *International journal of cultural policy*, 11(2), (pp. 113-127).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500198104>

Shaheed, F. (2014). Foreword by Farida Shaheed Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights in *Gender equality, heritage and creativity*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000229418_eng

Silverman, S. K. (2010). What is diversity? An inquiry into preservice teacher beliefs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(2), (pp. 292-329).

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210365096>

Simjanovska, V. (2022) Re-Thinking of Cultural Policies on Diversity and Participation – A Case Study on the Public Art Organizations In the Helsinki Central Area. In V. Simjanovska & T-M. Karjalainen (Eds.), *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Management*, (pp. 118-145). <https://taju.uniarts.fi/handle/10024/7675>

Smela, B., Toumi, M., Świerk, K., Francois, C., Biernikiewicz, M., Clay, E., & Boyer, L. (2023). Rapid literature review: definition and methodology. *Journal of Market Access & Health Policy*, 11(1), <https://doi.org/10.1080/20016689.2023.2241234>

- Sokka, S., Berge, O. K., Bille, T., Johannisson, J., Kaaber, E., & Lindqvist, K. (2022). *Cultural policy in the Nordic welfare states: aims and functions of public funding for culture*. Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Striebing, C., Müller, J., & Schraudner, M. (2023). *Diversity and discrimination in research organizations* (pp. 481). Emerald Publishing.
- Sundqvist, J. (2023, November 17). *Elokuvien ja sarjojen suomalainen on melkein aina valkoinen vammauton hetero – ”Kyse on siitä, miten rikasta kulttuurimme on”*. Yle. <https://yle.fi/aihe/a/20-10005794>
- Symonides, J. (1998). Cultural rights: a neglected category of human rights. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(158), (pp. 559-572).
- Taike. (2023, December, 4) *Taiken apurahoihin ja avustuksiin 5 prosentin leikkaus vuonna 2024 – Taike turvaa taidealojen uusiutumisen myös leikkaustilanteessa*. <https://www.taike.fi/fi/uutiset/taiken-apurahoihin-ja-avustuksiin-5-prosentin-leikkaus-vuonna-2024-taike-turvaa-taidealojen>
- Taike. (2024, March 11). *Taideneuvosto varoittaa kehysriihen alla taiteen ja kulttuurin leikkausten vaikutuksista*. <https://www.taike.fi/fi/uutiset/taideneuvosto-varoittaa-kehysriihen-alla-taiteen-ja-kulttuurin-leikkausten-vaikutuksista>
- Tenny, S., Brannan, J. M., & Brannan, G. D. (2017). Qualitative study. <https://europepmc.org/article/NBK/nbk470395>
- Thomas, K. (2020). Intersectionality and Epistemic Erasure: A Caution to Decolonial feminism. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 35(3), (pp. 509–523). <https://doi.org/10.1017/hyp.2020.22>
- Tilastokeskus. (n.d.). *Key figures on population by Area, Information and Year-PxWeb*. PxWeb. https://pxdata.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin_vaerak/statfin_vaerak_pxt11ra.px/table/tableViewLayout1/
- Tulostavoiteasiakirja VN/2068/2020-OKM-22. (2023). <https://urly.fi/3sOw>

- United Nations Human Rights Council. (2010). Report of the independent expert in the field of cultural rights, Ms. Farida Shaheed, submitted pursuant to resolution 10/23 of the Human Rights Council. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G10/124/40/PDF/G1012440.pdf?OpenElement>
- Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2009). Diversity is in the eye of the beholder: How majority and minority group members define diversity. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/20p3h64t>
- Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: an integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(6), (pp. 1008-1022). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1008>
- Vella, R., & Xuereb, K. (2021). Intersectional dialogues around cultural policy in Malta. *Malta Review of Educational Research*, 15(S), (pp. 29-43). <https://www.um.edu.mt/library/oar/handle/123456789/86699>
- Vickery, J. (2018). Cultural Rights and Cultural Policy: identifying the cultural policy implications of culture as a human right. *Journal of Law, Social Justice & Global Development*, 22(1), 128-151.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2017). Situated Intersectionality and the meanings of culture. *Europa Fortaleza. Fronteiras, Valados, Exilios, Migración*, (pp. 1-10). https://consellodacultura.gal/mediateca/extras/Texto_Nira_maquetado.pdf

APPENDICES

Interview questions with Maija Lummepero and Johanna Vuolasto (7.12.2023), presented here in Finnish and *English*.

- Miten ymmärrätte yhdevertaisuuden ja moninaisuuden käsitteet? | *How do you understand the concepts of equity and diversity?*
- Näetteko että yhdenvertaisuus on oleellinen osa suomalaista kulttuuripolitiikkaa eikä vain trendi? | *Do you see equity as an integral part of Finnish cultural policy or a mere trend?*
- Mitkä näette keskeisinä keinoina edistää yhdenvertaisuutta? Millaisilla instrumenteilla? Ovatko keinot näkemyksenne mukaan epäsuoria vai täsmällisiä? | *What do you see as the central instruments in promoting equity? Are the instruments in your opinion implicit or explicit?*
- Pyritäänkö rahoitusta ohjaamaan niin että se edistää yhdenvertaisuutta? | *Is funding directed in support of equity?*
- Taide, kulttuuri ja moninainen Suomi -toimenpideohjelmassa seurantaan kiinnitetään huomioita vain 2 lauseella, näettekö että tämä on riittävää ja riittävän läpinäkyvää? | *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland Action Plan describes monitoring in just 2 sentences. Do you see this as sufficient and transparent enough?*
- Onko muita mittareita tai seurannan keinoja yhdenvertaisuuden toimenpiteiden mittaamiseen? | *Are there other meters or ways of measuring equity instruments?*
- Millaisia lakisääteisiä instrumentteja on yhdenvertaisuuden edistämiseen kulttuurin ja rahoituksen saralla? | *What kind of legislative instruments there are within cultural policy and funding?*
- Tekeekö ministeriö yhteistyötä yksityisten tahojen esim. säätiöiden kanssa koskien yhdenvertaisuuden edistämistä? | *Does MinEdC collaborate with the private sector on supporting equity?*
- Moninaisuus otetaan usein huomioon nimenomaan tutkimusaiheena, onko se riittävä toimenpide? | *Diversity is often considered as a research topic, is this a sufficient measure?*

- Moninaisuudella tarkoitetaan usein vain kulttuurista moninaisuutta. Tämän ulkopuolelle jäävät useat kansalliset vähemmistöt. Myös tutkimus moninaisuudesta on usein siiloutunutta, tutkitaan yhdenvertaisuutta vammaisten näkökulmasta, kulttuurin moninaisuuden jne, mutta ei intersektionaalisesti. Onko ministeriöllä tavoitteetta kohdentaa yhdenvertaisuuden toimenpiteitä, jotka huomioivat myös muut vähemmistöt? | *Diversity often refers to cultural diversity excluding national minorities. Research on diversity is often siloed, considering such as disabilities or cultural diversity but not intersectionally. Does the ministry have measures that would focus equity also on other minorities?*
- Lainsäädäntö estää vähemmistöjen järjestelmällisen tilastoinnin (esim. etnisyys, muu vähemmistöstatus). Onko ministeriössä tunnistettu tämä ja etsitäänkö tähän tilastointiongelman ratkaisua? | *Legislation prohibits ethnic / racial statistics. Has the issue been recognised in MinEdC and are they looking into solutions?*
- Otetaanko kansainvälisistä kulttuuripoliittisista ohjelmista mallia Suomessa? | *Are international cultural policies followed or modelled in Finland?*
- Kuinka moninainen on ministeriön henkilöstö? Otetaanko rekrytoinnissa huomioon tietotaitoa yhdenvertaisuudesta ja moninaisuudesta? | *How diverse is the staff of MinEdC? Is knowledge or knowhow on equity and diversity considered in the recruitment processes?*
- Millaisena näet suomalaisen kulttuuripoliittikan tulevaisuuden yhdenvertaisuuden näkökulmasta? | *How do you see the future of Finnish cultural policy equity wise?*

Additional questions sent via e-mail and answered (19.12.2023).

- Onko ministeriön moninaisuuskoulutukset koko henkilökunnalle, myös ministereille? Onko koulutus pakollista vai vapaaehtoista? | *Are MinEdC diversity training for the entire staff including ministers? Is training voluntary or mandatory?*
- Kohdennetaanko rahaa selkeästi vähemmistöille yhdenvertaisuuslain pohjalta? Esim. kaksi samanlaista projektia, toinen valtaväestövetoinen, toinen vähemmistövetoinen, suositaanko tässä tapauksessa vähemmistövetoista? Onko tällaista linjausta tehty? | *Is funding directed towards minorities on the basis of the Non-Discrimination Act? E.g.*

two similar projects, one majority led, one minority led, is the minority led project favoured? Is there a policy for this?

- Haastattelussa mainittiin EU:n julkaisu, joka pohtii ihmisten taustan (etnisen) kartoitusta, mikä julkaisu oli kyseessä? | *During the interview there was a mention of an EU publication on statistics about background (ethnicity), what publication was this?*

Interview questions with Mikka Pyykkönen (12.12.2023), presented here in Finnish and English.

- Miten ymmärrätte yhdenvertaisuuden ja moninaisuuden käsitteet? | *How do you understand the concepts of equity and diversity?*
- Onko kulttuuripolitiikan tutkimus mielestänne merkittävä osa suomalaista kulttuuripolitiikkaa ja sen kehitystä? | *Is cultural policy research in your view a significant part of Finnish cultural policy and its development?*
- Moninaisuus otetaan usein huomioon nimenomaan tutkimusaiheena, onko se mielestänne riittävä toimenpide yhdenvertaisuuden edistämiseksi? | *Diversity is often considered as a research topic, is this a sufficient measure in promoting equity?*
- Onko monivuotiset barometrityyppiset tutkimukset mielestänne tehokkaita luomaan painetta muutokseen? | *Is yearly barometer type research in your view efficient in creating pressure for change?*
- Kuinka hyvin eri tutkimusten suositukset ja toimenpide-ehdotukset yleensä otetaan näkemyksesi mukaan huomioon? | *How are different suggestions and measures emerging from research taken into consideration in you view?*
- Onko nimenomaan Cuporen tutkimusten tuloksia mielestänne huomioita suomalaisessa kulttuuripolitiikassa? | *Have the results of Cupore's research in your opinion considered in cultural policy?*
- Onko tiedossa uutta tutkimusta koskien moninaisuutta ja yhdenvertaisuutta, ehkäpä intersektionaalisesta näkökulmasta? | *Is there new research to be expected from diversity and equity, perhaps from an intersectional point of view?*

- Onko näitä aiheita tutkittu ja miten näkökulmat otetaan huomioon yleisesti tutkimustoiminnassa (ei siis vain moninaisuutta tai yhdenvertaisuutta koskevissa erillistutkimuksissa)? | *Are these topics taken into consideration in the overall research, not only those focused on diversity?*
- Onko Cuporessa törmätty etnisen tilastoinnin dilemmaan? | *Have you in Cupore stumbled upon the dilemma of ethnic statistics?*
- Onko suomalaisessa kulttuuripolitiikassa selkeitä yhdenvertaisuuden instrumentteja, joita kuvataan englanniksi implicit ja explicit? | *Are there clear equity instruments in Finnish cultural policy, are they implicit or explicit?*
- Miten näette uuden hallituksen ottavan huomioon kulttuurin, moninaisuuden ja yhdenvertaisuuden? | *How do you see the new government considering culture, diversity and equity?*
- Kuinka moninainen on Cuporen henkilöstö / tutkijakunta? | *How diverse is the staff / researchers in Cupore?*
- Otetaanko rekrytoinnissa huomioon tietotaitoa yhdenvertaisuudesta ja moninaisuudesta? | *Is knowledge or know-how about equity and diversity considered upon recruitment?*
- Millaisena näet suomalaisen kulttuuripolitiikan tulevaisuuden yhdenvertaisuuden näkökulmasta? | *How do you see the future of Finnish cultural policy from an equity point of view?*

Additional questions sent via e-mail and answered (5.1.2024).

- Onko tiedossa uutta tutkimusta moninaisuudesta ja / tai yhdenvertaisuudesta ehkäpä intersektionaalisesta näkökulmasta? | *Is new research planned from diversity or equity perhaps from an intersectional point of view?*
- Onko Cuporessa jotain tiettyjä mittareita tai seurannan keinoja yhdenvertaisuuden toimenpiteiden mittaamiseen? Tai onko sellaisia kehitteillä? | *Does Cupore have certain meters, indicators or ways of monitoring equity? Are such in development?*

Interview questions with Kaisa Rönkkö (7.1.2024), presented here in Finnish and English.

- Miten ymmärrätte yhdenvertaisuuden ja moninaisuuden käsitteet? | *How do you understand the concepts of equity and diversity?*
- Millaisena näette suomalaisen kulttuuripolitiikan ja rahoituksen moninaisuuden ja yhdenvertaisuuden näkökulmasta? | *How do you see Finnish cultural policy and funding from the view point of diversity and equity?*
- Mitkä näette keskeisinä keinoina edistää yhdenvertaisuutta? Millaisilla instrumenteilla? Ovatko keinot näkemyksenne mukaan epäsuoria vai täsmällisiä? | *What do you see as the central instruments in promoting equity? Are the instruments in your opinion implicit or explicit?*
- Taide, kulttuuri ja moninainen Suomi -toimenpideohjelma esitetään useita toimenpiteitä Taikelle. Miten niitä on toteutettu ja toteutetaan? Miten tuloksia seurataan? | *Art, Culture and Diverse Finland Action Plan displays numerous actions for Taikela, how are these actions implemented and how are the outcomes monitored?*
- Lainsäädäntö estää vähemmistöjen järjestelmällisen tilastoinnin (esim. etnisyys, muu vähemmistöstatus). Useat tutkimukset ovatkin huomioineet, että kun vähemmistöjä ei tosiasiallisesti tunnusteta, yhdenvertaisuuden toteutuminen jää usein puolittiehen. Onko Taikessa tunnustettu tämä ja etsitäänkö tähän tilastointiongelman ratkaisua? | *Legislation forbids the gathering of minority statistics. Various research has recognised this and argue equity is not realised because these minorities are not recognised. Has Taikela recognised this and is Taikela looking for solutions to this?*
- Miten vähemmistöt huomioidaan apurahahakemuksissa? Kysytäänkö vähemmistötaustasta, moninaisuudesta? Mitä tietoja hakijoista kerätään? | *How are minorities considered in the applications for subsidies? Is minority status or diversity asked about? What information is gathered about the applicants?*
- Miten huomioidaan vähemmistöjen valmiudet tehdä apurahahakemuksia? Onko tieto ja ohjeistus saavutettavaa, onko mahdollista hakea ns. helpotetulla hakemuksella tai onko tällaisia toimenpiteitä mietitty? | *How are minorities access and capability considered in the application for subsidies? Is the access to*

information and guidance, are there so-called simplified applications or has such been considered?

- *Tehdäänkö teillä moninaisuus- tai yhdenvertaisuusraportteja? | Do you collect reports on diversity and equity?*
- *Onko tiedossa tutkimusta Taiken rahoituksen yhdenvertaisuudesta? | Do you know of future research on the equity of Taike's subsidies?*
- *Erilaiset kehittämissuunnitelmat kuten "Kulttuurinen moninaisuus ja liikkuvuus" ja "Verbaalisen paradigman muutos: kulttuurinen moninaisuus, yhdenvertaisuus ja antirasismi", kenelle nämä ohjelmat on suunnattu? Onko Taikella täysi päätäntävalta kehittämissuunnitelmistaan? Onko jotain uutta suunnitteilla yhdenvertaisuuteen liittyen, ehkäpä intersektionaalisesta näkökulmasta? | To whom the different programmes are directed at (Cultural diversity and mobility etc.)? Does Taike have full quorum on these programmes? Is there anything new in the future considering equity, perhaps from an intersectional point of view?*
- *Kuinka moninainen on Taiken henkilöstö? Otetaanko rekrytoinnissa huomioon tietotaitoa yhdenvertaisuudesta ja moninaisuudesta? Anonyymi rekrytointi, entä haastattelut? | How diverse is the staff in Taike? Is knowledge and know-how about equity and diversity considered upon recruitment? Taike practices anonymous recruitment, how about anonymous interviews?*
- *Koulutetaanko Taiken henkilökuntaa yhdenvertaisuudesta ja moninaisuudesta? | Is the staff of Taike trained on issues of equity and diversity?*
- *Millaisena näet suomalaisen kulttuuripolitiikan ja rahoituksen tulevaisuuden yhdenvertaisuuden näkökulmasta? | How do you see the future of Finnish cultural policy and funding equity wise?*
- *Millaisilla keinoilla taiteen rahoitus saataisiin yhdenvertaisemmaksi? | What means could make art funding more equitable?*