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Researchers and practitioners have both acknowledged the importance of framing when presenting novel ideas, considering that the right type of framing can generate a favorable outcome especially when applying for financial support. Yet, there has been limited research about the correlation between framing and funding. This quantitative study makes an attempt to lessen this research gap by investigating how four identified framing labels namely – opportunity, threat, novelty and commonality – imbedded in three hypotheses have affected the acquiring of financial support for novel art and culture projects.

The data comprises a large set of applications from individuals requesting funding for various art and culture projects. A content analysis was applied, followed by a logistic regression to test the hypotheses. The results indicate that specific types of framing can increase the possibilities of receiving funding, as commonality was identify as an important aspect of framing. This study is only at the infancy of investigating how framing is connected to the chances of getting financial support, and further empirical research is recommended for a better understanding of the subject.
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INTRODUCTION

Money – an important detail that could make a huge difference for a person with grand visions and novel ideas. If these visions are to create and realize an expensive project, receiving financial support can be the difference between making a dream come true, or a dream remaining just another section in a note pad. Seed money is often the foundation for any venture; it may be a startup, an innovation at a company or a new play at the local theater. Applying for funds therefore becomes an essential matter. As some people succeed in receiving financial support, they are able to set their project in motion, others get rejected and see their dream crumble. So, what determines success in the acquisition of financial support? How should novel ideas and projects be presented or “framed” so they sound appealing to external evaluators and thereby result in a granted funding application?

Many fields of research have recognized the importance of framing when presenting novel ideas as particular frames can have a significant influence on the opinions of others and affect the outcomes in terms of whether or not that idea will be supported (Fiol, 1994; Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001; Martens et al., 2007; Rindova et al., 2007). It is also well-known that people commonly use framing strategically to achieve a beneficial result (Dutton et al., 2001; Howell and Higgins, 1990).

Fundamentally, the concept of framing refers to how a message or a “reality” is presented to a receiver, and how the frame influences how the recipient processes the message. The main objective with framing is to draw attention to particular ideas or issues (Benford and Snow, 2000; Fiol, 1994). This causes the chosen frames to operate as cognitive constructions that help us to structure and organize the meaning of the message (Dutton and Ashford, 1993; Goffman, 1975). Hence, when framing is successful it establishes a positive attitude towards the message (Czernich and Zander, 2010).

Although the significance of framing have been acknowledged and discussed across various disciplines, there is one area where the research is limited, and this area concerns the relationship between framing and funding. While many people regularly are in need of financial support for different reasons, exactly how they secure the financial support from others has remained largely unexplored. In other words, a broad-based empirical research on framing, and how different framing approaches are connected to financial support and general acceptance among external evaluators, is yet to be undertaken (Martens et al, 2007; Scherdin and Zander, 2010). The current study has been an attempt to lessen this research gap.
The concept of framing in this study draws upon previous research that investigated four key framing labels/categories namely: threat, opportunity, novelty and commonality (Czernich and Zander, 2010; Dutton et al., 2001; Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988; Nutt, 1998). Henceforth, this paper has used the same four framing labels/categories to explore how individuals frame novel ideas to gain acceptance and secure financial support for their projects. The specific context that has been investigated is the art and culture arena as artists and initiators in this setting are frequently in need of financial support to set their novel projects in motion. It has been affirmed that framing of artistic ideas is particularly difficult as they cannot always rely upon and demonstrate immediate value or utility, which suggests that the presentation or the framing of these projects becomes even more essential (Scherdin and Zander, 2010). Against this background, the art and culture arena represent a useful setting in which to investigate how different framing approaches can affect the chances of acquiring funding for novel projects.

The purpose of this study is thus to examine how different framing approaches affects success or failure in terms of receiving financial support for art and culture projects. More specifically, the research question has been:

-To what extent does framing affect the acquiring of financial support for culture and art projects?

The research draws upon a vast collection of data regarding how artists and initiators of novel culture projects present their ideas and initiatives. The data was collected from the Foundation for the Culture of the Future – a Swedish government-financed foundation that over the period 1995-2008 granted funds to various culture and art projects in Sweden. The data was drawn from one single and decisive point of communication – the project descriptions that were submitted for evaluation by the Foundation (Marines et al., 2007).

To empirically investigate and test the research question, a content analysis was carried out by the software NVivo, which enabled the organization of the data and a final statistical analysis by means of logistic regressions. The results show that general framing efforts have a limited effect on the chances of receiving financial support, and that instead successful framing rests upon the select use of framing labels/categories. Specifically, reference to commonality is found to have a positive and statistically significant effect on the chances of getting funded.
In terms of disposition, the thesis is structured as follows; the first section has introduced the topic of the research and stated the purpose of the study. The following section contains a literature review on framing and funding. The third section then discusses the research methodology, sample and data collection, and main and control variables as well as a critical review of the method. The fourth section presents the results followed by a discussion and final conclusions.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Framing as a concept appeared in the 18th century and has its roots in the study of rhetoric. It has been discussed across various disciplines and genres and has a rich research history especially in social science (Fairhurst, 2005). The social science literature describes framing as a set of theoretical perspectives and concepts about how individuals, groups and whole societies perceive, organize and communicate about their “reality”. It is a social construction that is to be found in many places in society; in mass media, in social and political movements, in organizations and other actors in general, also commonly use storytelling. Framing is about choosing phrases and words that influence the meaning of the individual’s perception (Benford and Snow, 2000; Druckman, 2001; Fiol, 1994). Druckman, (2001) stated that framing could be seen in one of two ways; frames of the communication, which refers to the communication of frames between various actors, or frames of the thought, which refers to the mental presentation and the interpretation of a perceived reality. This thesis will focus on frames of communication.

According to Fiske and Taylor (1991) the reason why framing is so common and wide spread is due to its nature or capacity to work as “rule of thumb”. They suggest that people are by nature cognitive misers, which imply that individuals prefer to do as little thinking as possible and frames provide an easy and quick way to process information. In other words, people use a series of schemas, i.e. mental filters (“rule of thumb”) of previous experiences to rapidly make sense of a received message. This offers the sender or “framer” of the message a great advantage as well as power to use these schemas to influence the recipient and how he/she will interpret the message (Entman, 1993).

As mentioned, the concept of framing has been applied across a numerous fields of research such as sociology, organizational science, management and corporate entrepreneurship, and it has therefor also come with various different but related interpretations. According to Entman, (1993) framing can be described as “a scattered conceptualization” and “fractured paradigm”. More specifically, his definition stated that frames operate by highlighting particular parts of information, and stated that framing “select some aspect of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, casual interrelation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (Entman, 1993: 43, 51–58; Iyengar, 1994). This definition of framing has been used in the current thesis.
Framing labels

There are different ways of calling attention and creating meaning to new information, one way is to apply particular cognitive and linguistic labels to facilitate the sense-making of that information. These labels share comparable attributes, which allow the sender to use shortcuts in conveying the meaning and connotations of the communicated information, event or new issues. Especially four labels have been identified in the framing literatures; opportunity, threat and novelty (Czernich and Zander, 2010; Dutton et al., 2001; Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988; Nutt, 1998). The label opportunity has been associated with something positive such as a positive outcome, gain or a controllable situation, whereas threat is associated with loss, a negative outcome or an uncontrollable situation (Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988). However, this does not necessarily imply that opportunity and threat represent the opposites of one another, since both opportunity and threat can signal pressure or a need for action, for example in a competitive situation (Jackson and Dutton, 1988). Accordingly, manager may perceive a new technology introduced by a competitor as a threat, but at the same time realize that it offers an opportunity to enter new markets (Czernich and Zander, 2010).

The perception of novelty has been broadly discussed in the literature on organizational change and two different connotations have been identified; the first is that it may refers to something completely new in a general sense, where the object, issue or event is equally new to all observes, such as a radical innovation. The other connotation refers to something new in a specific context, e.g. novel experiences, practices or operations in a particular organization. This implies that an event may be consider novel in one organization, whereas it is an already establish practice in another (Ahuja and Lampert, 2001; Kazanjian and Drazin, 1987; Piderit, 2000; Tyre and Hauptman, 1992). The forth word label Commonality could be considered the opposite of novelty. It describes the extent to which novel ideas, events or issues are perceived as something familiar or aligned with already established practices, both in general or in a firm-specific sense (Czernich and Zander, 2010).
The effectiveness of framing

The extant literature indeed suggests that people may use framing intentionally and strategically, especially in organizations where so-called “issue-sellers” are very aware of how they frame novelties or issues they wish to sell to top managers (Czernich and Zander, 2010; Dutton et al. 2001). The framing literature is essentially concerned with communicating and conveying a perception of reality to other individuals, which generates some assumptions and expectations about and what type of framing approach would be the most efficient for generating attention and acceptance of novel ideas (Czernich and Zander, 2010; Dutton et al. 2001).

As stated, research has discussed and acknowledged the importance of framing when presenting novel ideas (Czernich and Zander, 2010) as there is increasing confirmation that some framing approaches can be very effective (Martens et al., 2007; Rindova et al., 2007), and some people use framing strategically to achieve a favorable result (Howell and Higgins, 1990; Dutton et al., 2001). This implies that framing matters and should be used when presenting novel ideas, which is also the first assumption and expectation. It is better to frame, ideas as opportunities, as threat, as a novelty or as a commonality opposed to just plainly describing the content of the project, since it might not raise the desired attention or acceptance of that novel idea.

The second expectation, regards if new concepts or novel ideas are framed as something that takes advantage of an opportunity or as a way to avoid a potential threat (Czernich and Zander, 2010). Some studies have found that managers are inclined to pay more attention and take action when presented with a threat rather than an opportunity, since any kind of loss is considered more harmful than the lack of gain (Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988). Since ambiguity discourages the recipients’ decisions (George et al., 2006) it suggests that it is more effective to use only one framing approach (Billings et al., 1980; Gilbert, 2005; Jackson and Dutton, 1988), and from that perspective the use of threat should dominate over opportunity.

A third expectation in the framing of new concepts concerns novelty. It is more favorable to frame new concepts in ways that emphasize similarities to already existing practices or operation, rather than presenting the concept as something completely new, in other words, a commonality (Lovas and Ghoshal, 2000; Scherdin, 2007; Wholey and Brittain, 1986). Dutton and Duncan, (1987) explain that when novel ideas are presented in a way that creates a feeling of familiarity, it gives managers a sense of control, which leads to a higher
probability for the concept to get accepted. Moreover, Dutton and Ashford, (1993) states that managers are more prone to take on new business ideas if they feel that they can contribute with personal knowledge and skills. Novel ideas and concepts must also be framed in alignment with existing beliefs and norms about what is legitimate and appropriate within the organization (Dutton et al., 2001; Howell and Higgins, 1990; Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001).

**Framing and funding**

As mentioned earlier, there are many studies that discuss and addresses the importance and effectiveness of framing in various contexts, yet, there is limited research concerning the relationship between framing and funding. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, only a few empirical studies have investigated this particular relationship ( Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001; Martens et al., 2007) which suggests that there is a vast research gap that needs to be covered.

One research that covered framing and funding was a study by (Martens et al., 2007) which focused on story-telling in entrepreneurial firms and the extent to which it led to success in attracting start-up funding. They drew on a study that was based on O’Conner’s (2004) pioneering work which investigated how founders of entrepreneurial firms intentionally and successfully redesigned the story about the companies to enhance the probability of securing financial support (Martens et al., 2007). However, O’Conner’s (2004) study produced limited direct evidence on the correlation between storytelling and resource acquisition. Hence, Martens et al., (2007) performed a large-sample test comprising a set of question that investigated whether effective storytelling enabled resource acquisition. The empirical results, based on the sample of Martens et al., (2007) supported the underlying assumption that storytelling positively did effect the acquisition of financial support. More specifically, the conclusion indicated particularly that the most successful narratives; (1) created an unambiguous identity for entrepreneurial firms, (2) showed the proposed means which facilitated to minimize potential risks, and (3) invoked recognizable elements to a context that was otherwise less familiar among external evaluators.

The study by Lounsbury and Glynn (2001) found an indirect relationship between framing and funding. More specifically, framing entrepreneurial stories facilitated to create identity as well as legitimacy which in turn had a positive effect on the possibility of receiving funding (ibid).
Hypotheses

The literature review has generated three hypotheses. The first hypothesis is based on the notion that framing is important and must therefore be present when presenting novel ideas or projects (Czernich and Zander, 2010). According to theory, project proposals should be presented together with any of the four framing categories i.e. *opportunity, threat, novelty* or *commonality* instead of just purely describing the content of the project. This will help to increase the possibility of obtaining attention and acceptance of the novel proposition (Martens et al., 2007; Rindova et al., 2007). The reasoning contains an implicit assumption that attention is a prerequisite for subsequent evaluation and support, and that when present the three components work in a sequentially coherent and consistent way.

This leads to the first hypothesis which suggests that:

- **Hypothesis 1**: Framing a project using any of the word categories *opportunity, threat, novelty* or *commonality* will improve the chances of receiving funding.

The second hypothesis embraces the two word labels *opportunity* and *threat*. The word *opportunity* aims to reflect the connotation of a positive outcome, a gain or the feeling of a controllable situation in the framing approach. The word *threat* reflects some kind of loss, a negative outcome or an unmanageable situation (Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988). Prior research argues, that managers are more prone to pay attention and take action when presented with a threat rather than an opportunity, which is explained by the notion that loss is considered more harmful than the absence of gain (Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988). As there is a shortage of empirical research concerning the relationship between framing and funding, the same assumption as in the first hypothesis will be applied, i.e. – if a novel idea gains attention, it also implies that new proposition qualifies for consideration and financial support. Hence, the second hypothesis suggests the following:

- **Hypothesis 2**: Project that in their framing draws upon threat rather than opportunity are more likely to receive funding.

The third hypothesis embraces the word labels *novelty* and *commonality*. Novelty reflects, as the word suggests, that a novel element is used in the framing approach (Ahuja and Lampert,
2001; Kazanjian and Drazin, 1987; Piderit, 2000; Tyre and Hauptman, 1992). It has two denotations; it may refer to something completely new and never seen before or something new in a specific context. Commonality on the other hand represents a contrast, in other words something familiar or aligned with already established practices, however not necessarily the opposite of novelty (Czernich and Zander, 2010). It is more favorable to frame novel ideas in a way that emphasizes similarity, rather than presenting the concept as something completely new. Dutton and Duncan, (1987) explain that, when novel ideas are presented in a way that creates a sense of familiarity, it gives others a feeling of control which in turn generates a higher probability for the concept to get accepted. This reasoning is supported also by Martens et al. (2007) who conducted a research about storytelling and framing. One of their findings implies that invoking recognizable elements and familiarity to a context increased the likelihood of receiving financial support.

Thus, the third hypothesis suggests;

- **Hypothesis 3:** Project that in their framing draws upon commonality rather than novelty are more likely to receive funding.

**Summary of literature review**

The concept of framing has been applied across a numerous fields of research, and it has been described as a set of theoretical perspectives and concepts about how people organize and communicate their “reality” to others. Framing works as a “rule of thumb”, i.e. as a mental filter of prior experience which helps to make sense of a received message. The sender of a message can assist crating meaning to new information by using cognitive and linguistic labels that share the same comparable attributes, which facilitates the sense-making of the received new information. Four effective linguistic word labels have been identified in the literature on framing; opportunity, threat, novelty and commonality. The efficiency of these framing labels, derived from various fields of research, has been acknowledged, yet there is one specific area where research is still limited, empirical investigation into how these framing approaches affect the chances of receiving financial support. This is the specific question that is addressed by the present study, the empirical foundation of which will be outlined next.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This empirical study draws upon a large sample of new initiatives and projects on the art and culture arena. This environment is a particularly useful context for studying framing and its effects. Firstly, the framing of artistic ideas and concepts is remarkably difficult, as they cannot always rely upon criteria of immediate value or utility. In comparison, novel ideas in a business context can, for example, demonstrate how a new product or service will increase revenues or benefit customers. Artists on the other hand, or initiators of new cultural ideas rarely have that advantage and must therefore use other “bare bone” framing methods to communicate the value of their idea or concept (Bonnafo-Boucher et al, 2010 cited by Scherdin and Zander, 2011). Artists must focus on changing the traditional perceptions and create uniqueness around the project, often with very limited means at their disposal. In these cases, the spoken word and occasionally exhibitions of more or less unfinished work are their only means of communication (Zander and Scherdin, 2011). Seen from the historical development of art and cultural movements, one great challenge has also been to create legitimacy around novel ideas or concepts that in many cases contradicts existing norms and exceeds public expectations (Meisiek and Haeflinger, 2011, cited by Zander and Scherdin, 2011). While all of this takes place in a setting which commonly emphasis novelty, in reality art and culture initiatives often encounter severe resistance among several groups of external evaluators (Zander and Scherdin, 2011).

Secondly, art and culture arena offers access to significant amount of qualitative data that connect project applications with funding outcomes. As the present study is based on a deductive approach, i.e. the three hypotheses were derived from the existing framing literature, accessible data and observations from the art and culture arena allowed for reaching a sample of adequate representative and numerical size (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009; Wrench, 2008).

As the data collection used for this study concerns original and real applications submitted by individuals applying for funding of their art and culture project, it also suggest that the data are reliable and trustworthy (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009; Wrench, 2008).
Data collection

Data collection drew upon a large, unique database collected by the Foundation of the Culture of the Future (Framtidens Kultur). The data contained applications submitted by people aspiring to secure financial support for different art and culture projects (such as exhibitions, art classes, documentaries, concerts, theater plays, preservation of traditional craftsmanship and many other types of projects). The Foundation of the Culture of the Future was a Swedish government-financed foundation that granted funds to various art and culture projects between the years 1995-2008, and it received approximately 800-1,500 applications annually. In total, the Foundation received a total of 20,598 applications, were 2,355 projects were granted funds and 18,243 were rejected.

For more detailed information, see Table A. Overview of the applications to the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number granted</th>
<th>Non-granted</th>
<th>Proportion of grand total</th>
<th>Number sampled</th>
<th>Granted sampled</th>
<th>Non-granted sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>0,135</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>0,073</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>0,082</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>0,085</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>0,076</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>0,073</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>0,064</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>0,065</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>0,069</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>0,064</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>0,059</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>0,056</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>0,047</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>0,052</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,598</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>18,243</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total 1994-2008 20,598
Proportion granted 0.114
Target granted / year 50
Target granted total 700 0.114 0.297
Target non-granted total 5,423 0.886 0.297
Total sampled 6,123

Total number includes a very small number of applications that were ultimately withdrawn.
Last year in which funding could be applied for was 2008, after that applications by invitation only.

Table A – Overview of the applications to the Foundation
Each application submitted to the Foundation contained basic information about the applicant(s) and a project description. The applications were of various lengths and some applicants enclosed news clippings, CD’s, references to websites or other informational material. In other words, the applications contained information both about a set of how the applicants’ had chosen to present or frame their projects, as well as information about structural components and variables that may influence subsequent funding decision. For a visual presentation of what an application could look like, see Appendix 1

**Sample and coding process**

The applications were sampled through random proportional sampling. This means that both granted and non-granted applications were based on their relative proportions in the overall number of applications for each individual year. The sampled applications consisted of 30 per cent granted as well as non-granted which gave each application an equal chance of being selected. Data from three years (1996, 1999 and 2005) were prepared for the analysis. These years were selected to create a representative time span where the statistical analysis subsequently controlled for any remaining individual year effects (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Wrench, 2008). The final sample that was empirically analyzed consisted of 1,262 applications.

Three people were involved in the process of coding the data, which took place between September 2014 - January 2015. The current author participated actively in the coding process and coded two of the sampled years. The sampled applications were first copied, scanned and arranged into manageable PDF-files. The coding was then performed systematically in a process that was consistent over time to create reliability and to suppress bias (Wrench, 2008). The coding procedure was divided in two phases; the first phase consisted of coding categorical information about the applicants and their projects. This data was given numerical codes or numbers, which facilitated the coding process and minimized errors (Saunders et al., 2009). Microsoft Excel was then used to arrange and structure the coded information.

More specifically, the coded information concerned the following categories, see Table B
Table B – Coding categories

(For more detailed information about the coding categories, see Appendix 2 – Coding scheme)

The second phase comprised the coding of the part of the application where the applicants had described and potentially framed their projects. This information was transferred into Microsoft Word documents as well as PDF-files to enable a content analysis (Wrench, 2008). A majority of the applications were machine-written (typewriter or computer), whereas the others had been written by hand. Since all applications had been scanned, the machine-written applications were easily copied and saved into Word documents and PDF-files. Only a minor amount of “cleaning up” and adjustments had to be done manually, as the layout of the application did not always match the Word document layout. However, the handwritten applications had to be rewritten manually by hand in Word documents before being saved. The number of handwritten documents varied over the years. Two categories of applications were excluded from the sample – applications written in unreadable handwriting and applications that in the description referred to an appendix. Both of these categories were nevertheless small, and could be considered insignificant.

**Dependent variable**

The dependent variable (also known as the outcome variable) is related to one or several independent variables and indicates whether they have an effect or not (Salkind, 2012): In the present case, the dependent variable measures whether individual project applications were successful or not in securing funding for the Foundation. Accordingly, the outcome was dichotomous, i.e. the applications were either accepted and received financial support (1) or they were rejected (0)
**Independent variable**

The creation of independent variables includes “the process of systematic observation and assignment of numbers to phenomena according to rules” (Wrench, 2008: 167). The independent variables in this study used the word labels *opportunity*, *threat*, *novelty* and *commonality* to identify and measure the occurrence of framing patterns in the applications (Czernich and Zander, 2010).

To identify the occurrence of word labels and framing patterns, the four words labels were screened for synonyms or alternative expressions that captured and reflected their essence and meaning (Synonymer.se, 2015). The selected synonyms were discussed extensively with a senior researcher to ensure that the synonyms and expressions were legitimate and conveyed the right meaning.

The word label *opportunity* aimed to reflect the connotation of a positive outcome, a gain or the feeling of a controllable situation in the framing approach. The word label *threat* intended to reflect some kind of loss, a negative outcome or an unmanageable situation. *Novelty* had two connotations; it could refer to something completely new and never seen before or something new in a specific context. *Commonality* represented something familiar or aligned with already established practices.

A small selection of the synonyms that were used and searched for, see Table C below. For greater detail about the full range of synonyms that were used for measurements, see Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Novelty</th>
<th>Commonality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Möjlighet</td>
<td>Fara</td>
<td>Nyhet</td>
<td>Vanlig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinna</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Typisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erhålla</td>
<td>Förloha</td>
<td>Innovativ</td>
<td>Traditionell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chans</td>
<td>Förlust</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Frekvent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Mistä</td>
<td>Aktuell</td>
<td>Allmän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Växa</td>
<td>Försvinna</td>
<td>Oprövad</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillfälle</td>
<td>Negativ</td>
<td>Trendig</td>
<td>Konservativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Få</td>
<td>Okontrollerbar</td>
<td>Up-To-Date</td>
<td>Genomsnittlig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table C - An example of synonyms used for measurements*

The ultimate independent variables picked up and measured if individual project descriptions contained any of the search words that revealed the existence of active framing attempts. If a project contained a search word connected with any of word labels *opportunity*, *threat*, *novelty* or *commonality*, an active framing attempt was recorded and the project was classified.
as representing one or several of the relevant framing approaches. Specifically, for each individual project that was registered for using any of the search words associated with opportunity, the variable opportunity took the value ‘1’ and ‘0’ otherwise. In a similar way, the independent variables threat, novelty and commonality took on dichotomous value: ‘1’ if the project was revealed to involve active framing efforts, and ‘0’ otherwise.

For one of the models that were tested, the independent variable framing captured the extent to which projects made use of any type of framing, including any of the four main categories. The framing variable took the value ‘1’ if a project was associated with any of the four main framing categories, and ‘0’ otherwise.

**Control variables**

A number of control variables were added to take into account a range of factors that could have had a potential effect on the extent to which applications received funding or not (Salkind, 2012).

*Type of applicant:* Two dummy variables accounted for whether the main applicant was male (0=non-male, 1=male) or female (0=non-female, 1=female), positioning these two groups against a group of different organizations and institutions (such as project groups, limited liability companies, libraries, museums, and theatres). The use of the two dummies also made it possible to examine whether through various mechanisms the chances of receiving funding were affected by gender.

A third dummy variable immigrant (entitled Name applicant in the coding scheme) reflected whether the name of the contact person signaled his or her immigrant status or not (0=non-immigrant, 1=immigrant). The non-immigrant group included both individuals with typical or common Swedish names (such as Svensson, Larsson, Johansson), and also those few examples where family names were a combination of both traditional and non-traditional Swedish names (such as Gülseren Enström, Björn Barnekow, Gloria Esteban Johansson).

*Project type:* To account for the extent to which project type might have affected the chances of receiving funding, a first control variable projectbudget measured the sum of money that was applied for (in thousand Swedish crowns). A second variable projectlength captured the length of the project, measured as the total number of months project funding was asked for.

A third control variable otherfunds captured the extent to which the project had been successful in attracting complementary funds, for example from private individuals, other
cultural institutions and foundation (e.g. Nordisk kulturfond, Konstnärsnämnden, Allmänna arvsfonden) or local municipalities. The expectation was that complementary funding could strengthen the perceived legitimacy of the project, which would improve the overall chances of receiving funding. Alternatively, the existence complementary funding could invoke feelings that the necessary funding was obtainable from other sources, thereby lessening the perceived need for financial support from the Foundation of the Culture of the Future.

Geographical location: A dummy variable cityarea (named Zip code in the coding scheme) controlled for whether the stated geographical home of the applicant or applying organization was in one of the major city areas – Stockholm, Gothenburg, or Malmö. The expectation was that being located in one of the city areas could improve project visibility and also increase the chances of being part of the ‘buzz’ around cultural activities in Sweden (Bathelt, Malmberg and Maskell, 2004).

To construct the dummy, the relevant zip codes for Stockholm (100 05 to 195 87), Gothenburg (400 10 to 418 79), and Malmö (200 01 to 217 75) were collected from Postnummerservice.se (PAN, 2015). It took on the value ‘0’ if the declared geographical home of the applicant or applying organization was outside any of the major city areas, and ‘1’ otherwise.

Period: Two dummy variables captured the specific years in which funding were applied for. Accordingly, year1996 took the value ‘1’ if applications had been submitted in that particular year and ‘0’ otherwise. Similarly, year1999 took the value ‘1’ if applications had been submitted in that particular year and ‘0’ otherwise. The remaining set of applications had thus been submitted in the year of 2005 (but were not represented by a dummy variable)

Classification and statistical methods

Two fundamental classification and statistical methods were used in this study: a quantitative content analysis and logistic regressions. To obtain the results, the process involved three distinctive but connected steps.

The first step was a content analysis performed in NVivo (a computer software for qualitative data analysis), to identify and summarize the independent variables (Wrench, 2008). The data comprising the applicants’ project descriptions (see section coding process) was first uploaded into the computer software and saved into separate files. The word labels and their synonyms (used for the construction of the independent variables), were uploaded as well, and a Text Search was performed. This means that NVivo searched for all the word
(synonyms) among the project descriptions and assembled the findings and “hit” into a file. The results were then exported and saved as Excel files.

To ensure that the findings and hits consisted of the desired results, i.e. that the words identified by the NVivo Text Search really reflected and connoted what the independent variables were aiming to measure, (in other words, that the words were used in the right context), a manual crosscheck had to be made. This implies that all applications that contained of any of the word labels were read through manually, and one by one. Those applications where the word label did not appear in the right context, were considered as invalid data and assigned non-framing status (cf. Wrench, 2008). For visual examples of what types of application were classified as framing and where the word labels where used in the right context see Appendix 4. For applications with one or more hits in terms of search words, but which were not classified as framing examples, see Appendix 5. This procedure concluded the second step of the process of obtaining the results.

The third step was to export the complete dataset into SAS, (a software used for statistical analyses) and the final logistic regressions. Logistic regression is a particular form of regression that is designed to predict and explain dichotomous variables, which means that there can only be two possible outcomes (e.g. yes/no, true/false, or funding/no funding) (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). The results of the statistical analyses are presented in the next section.

A critical review of method

The data collection and the coding process were approached systematically and under the guidance of a coding scheme (available as an Appendix 2). The coding of the basic project data was performed by three people individually, and then crosschecked for any specific questions that emerged to suppress errors and to enable transparency (Saunders et al., 2009). The independent variables derived from the theoretical framework (Bryman and Bell, 2011) were identified and structured by means of qualitative data analysis computer software and finally submitted to commonly used statistical analyses. This implies that the data collection techniques are both replicable by other researches and will most probably (unless typing errors have been made) yield consistent and trustworthy result (Easterby-Smith et al., 2012; Salkind, 2012). This gives a fair amount of support for the reliability of data collection and findings (Saunders et al., 2009).
Regarding construct validity, the independent variables were derived from the existing framing literature, which implies that they are specifically designed to measure different framing patterns (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Salkind, 2012; Saunders et al., 2009), and also examine how framing affects the possibilities of securing support in form of funding. The question might nevertheless arise whether the chosen measures are the most suitable to answers the research question in a fair and truthful manner. The same point can be made about the text-based search for word labels and whether it translates into an appropriate indicator of different framing patterns. There are obviously many alternative ways and measurement, however time limitations did not permit a more extensive content analysis and tests of alternative measurement approaches. Overall, the expectation is that the study involves a useful first cut at establishing the connection between framing and framing outcomes in the form of financial support, but the area remains open for exploration of a range of alternative measurement approaches.

Two important aspects to highlight additionally are drawbacks and risks. First, the three hypotheses mainly stem from the management and entrepreneurship literatures, in other words, from the field of business, and mechanisms and outcomes in the context of funding of art and culture may differ. Yet, the expectation is that individuals in the art and culture arena may use a similar logic when applying for funding. Moreover, Scherdin and Zander, (2010) suggest that there are many similarities between the creation of artistic work and the spirit of entrepreneurial activities in a business context, such as the introduction of novel ideas which has a central role in both fields of literature (Schumpeter, 1934; Kirzner 2009:).

Second, working with the word labels and the content analysis invariably involves a certain amount of subjectivity and judgment. Although great care has been taken to make correct assessments in the ultimate classification of projects, there may be a systematic bias on account of the interpretations and mindset of the researcher. It is difficult to make an exact estimate of the overall biases introduced by subjective judgment, but in the great majority of cases the manual search was not associated with frequent or systematic difficulties in terms of making the connection between word labels and the associated framing categories.

The evaluation committee at the Foundation could have been searching for particular projects or “buzzword” certain years as they might have been considered more or less attractive during different periods of times. There are limited indications that this has indeed been the case, and to some extent the potential problem is mitigated by the use of year dummies in the statistical analyses.
RESULTS

Descriptive data

The total number of applications in the database was 1,262. Out of these applications, 142 had received funding while 1,120 had been rejected. 442 of the observations belonged to the year 1996, 457 to 1999, and 363 to the year 2005.

The number of individual female applicants was 116 while the number of individual male applicants was 148. The remaining 998 observations thus represented projects proposed by various types of organizations and institutions. A minority of the applications, or 125 applications, featured a name of the contact person which suggested his or her immigrant status. The average size of requested project funding was SEK 549,000 (median 300,000), ranging from 5,000 to 13,895,000. Average project length was 15 months (median 12), with a minimum length of less than one month and maximum length of 113 months\(^1\). The total number of projects that had received funding from other sources was 269. Within this group, the average amount that had been received was Skr. 455,936 (median 115,000), ranging from less than Skr. 1,000 to 16,728,000. About half of the projects had their geographical origin in one of the major city regions. 464 of the projects were formally located in Stockholm, 110 in Gothenburg, and 61 in Malmö. The correlation matrix suggests limited concerns about multicollinearity (Appendix 6). Correlations between the independent variables are generally low, and in all cases the VIFs were below 1.5.

Hypothesis testing

Three logistic regressions and models were used to test the hypotheses. The first model included only the control variables, whereas the second model added *framing* as an overall measure of framing attempt among the applicants. In the third model, *threat*, *opportunity*, *novelty*, and *commonality* were entered as the main variables. Because of missing information

\(^{1}\)For 20 of the 1,262 observations, project length exceeded four years, suggesting that the applicants described a project that was expected to continue also after the period for which funding had been requested. While this created a small number of outliers in the analyses, it had no substantial effects on the results. Excluding all projects where the reported project length exceeded 48 months had no significant effect on any of the observed relationships.
and values for select variables, the total number of observations that entered the logistic regression analyses was 1,154.

The first model revealed moderate influences from the control variables on the likelihood of receiving funding (Table D). The only statistically significant effect concerns individual male applicants, who are associated with a significantly lesser likelihood of receiving funding than other groups of applicants (p<0.05). A similar and fairly strong effect can be observed for individual female applicants (p<0.10), although the effect is smaller than for male applicants. Overall, it appears that the selection process disfavored individual applicants in favor of various types of organizations and institutions. Although the effect is statistically insignificant, there is a tendency that projects with contact persons of immigrant background were less likely to receive funding than other projects.

Type of project, captured by projectbudget, projectlength, and otherfunds (the extent to which additional funds had been secured from other sources), seem to have had a limited influence on the likelihood of receiving funding. In contrast, there is fairly strong indication that cityarea, or being formally located in one of the three main city areas, comes with improved chances of being funded (p<0.10).

As indicated by the year1996 and year1999 dummies, in both of these years the overall chances of receiving funding were lower than for the year 2005.

The second model explored if, overall, the use of any type of framing effort has a positive effect on the likelihood of being funded. The results indeed suggest a generally positive effect from framing attempts, but the effect is not statistically significant. Hypothesis 1 is therefore not supported.

The third model then added the four main explanatory variables (opportunity, threat, novelty and commonality). The results show that three of the variables had no statistically significant effect on the likelihood of receiving funding. Framing in terms of both opportunity and novelty had a weak positive impact on the chances of being funded. In contrast, and contrary to expectations, the use of the word label threat in the framing of projects had a negative but statistically insignificant influence on the likelihood of receiving funding. Hypothesis 2 is not supported.

The only statistically significant effect is associated with commonality, which measures the extent to which individual projects were framed in a way that emphasized how they related to something familiar or already established practices and activities. The effect is positive and statistically significant (p<0.05), suggesting that projects presented in a way
which emphasizes commonality are significantly more likely to receive funding that other projects. Hypothesis 3 is thus supported.

The goodness of fit statistic rejects the hypothesis that in the second and full model coefficients for all variables, except the constant, are zero. Improvements in Chi-square and likelihood also show that adding the four main explanatory variables results in a statistically significant improvement in model fit.

Regression analysis, table D below
### Table D - Regression Analysis

The effects of framing on the likelihood of receiving funding, binary logistic regressions (modeled on reject=0, accept=1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-1.038*</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-1.035*</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-1.078**</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.010]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.010]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.008]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.763†</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-0.757†</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-0.781‡</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.061]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.064]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.056]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>-0.420</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.244]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.254]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.280]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectbudget</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.598]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.552]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.642]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectlength</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.836]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.857]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.919]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherfunds</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.836]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.874]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.859]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cityarea</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.140]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.144]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.147]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year1996</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.150]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.143]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.115]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year1999</td>
<td>-0.613**</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>-0.614**</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>-0.626**</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.008]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.008]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.007]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.393]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.707]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.629</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.548]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.803]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.957*</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.036]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagnostics**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>20.303</td>
<td>22.002</td>
<td>26.411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr &gt; ChiSq</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (number of observations)</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates significant at the 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001 level are indicated with †, *, **, and *** respectively. Significance levels reported in brackets. All tests are two-tailed.
DISCUSSION

It can be concluded from the literature review that many fields of research have highlighted the importance of framing when presenting novel ideas (Czernich and Zander, 2010; Fiol, 1994; Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001), and also that some framing approaches can be very effective (Martens et al., 2007; Rindova et al., 2007). Research also suggests that some individuals use framing strategically to secure a desired outcome (Czernich and Zander, 2010; Howell and Higgins, 1990; Dutton el al, 2001). The empirical result however show that the effects of framing may not be as significant as expected, as the first hypothesis (Framing a project using any of the word categories opportunity, threat, novelty or commonality will improve the chances of receiving funding) - was not supported. The only word label that showed a statistically significance effect was commonality. This implies that at the overall level, there are some signs that framing matters in a positive direction, but it does not seem to have a decisive impact on the chances of receiving funding. The reason for this lack of support can only be speculated upon. One possibility could be that the applied word labels; opportunity, threat, novelty and commonality are not as relevant or important when it comes to acquiring of financial support as they are in other situations and contexts. Or, put it differently, maybe replacing one or two of the framing labels and approaches might have altered the results.

A more detailed analysis of the different framing categories and their individual effects nevertheless reveals an interesting pattern. While both opportunity and novelty tend to work in the expected direction, (they both have a weak positive impact) the negative influence from the framing category threat is notable. According to the literature, threat connotes loss, a negative outcome or an uncontrollable situation and can signal pressure or the need to take action. Prior research also implies that, especially managers are more prone to pay attention when presented with a threat, since loss is perceived more harmful than the absence of gain (Dutton and Jackson, 1987; Jackson and Dutton, 1988; Dutton et al. 2001). In the present study and context however, the theories regarding threat were not applicable as it is demonstrated that is has a negative impact instead. In other words, the second hypothesis – Project that in their framing draws upon threat rather than opportunity are more likely to receive funding found no support. Using threat might be an efficient way of drawing attention to an issue, yet in the present case it did not have any impact on decision about whether to allocate funds or not. The explanation for this might be that in the context of art and culture, using the threat variable is not suitable, or that the evaluators of the Foundation of the Culture
of the Future did not care for or appreciate to this type of framing approach. To elaborate, in a business context for example, where revenues, strategic advantages, efficiency etc. are important aspects of staying competitive, using the word label threat might be more efficient as it can signal pressure or call for action as mention above. However, the art and culture arena may not have the same focus, perhaps because of frequently heard calls for action to save a range of cultural expression for disappearing. A related explanation for why the threat category has a slightly negative impact may be that people are generally wary of others who cry “wolf” too often, as is might be perceived as overly dramatic or as a “false alarm”.

The most interesting result concern the commonality variable, as the hypothesis Project that in their framing draws upon commonality rather than novelty are more likely to receive funding was supported. Research around the word label commonality states that new concepts or ideas should be presented in a way that emphasizes something familiar or similarities to already existing practices, rather than being presented as something completely new (Lovas and Ghoshal, 2000; Scherdin, 2007; Wholey and Brittain, 1986). Dutton and Duncan (1987) explain that when novel ideas are presented in a way that creates a feeling of familiarity, it gives a sense of control, which leads to a higher probability for the concept to get accepted. This could also be a valid explanation why those who emphasized the commonality aspect when framing their projects, received financial support, since their projects were based on something that the evaluators could recognize and felt comfortable with.

The empirical results are also aligned with Scherdin and Zander’s (2011) suggestion about that the art and culture arena may be a setting that generally emphasizes novelty, yet in reality more groundbreaking art and culture initiatives often encounter severe resistance. Furthermore, the authors explain that framing novel artistic ideas and concepts is particularly difficult, as such concepts cannot always rely upon criteria of immediate value or utility. The reason why novel ideas encounter resistance might have its explanation in the fact that they often lack a context. This reasoning is also supported by the statistically significant effect of the word label commonality. The commonality aspect is important because it creates a context for the proposed project, at the same time illustrating how the project builds upon and develops a particular idea. Further, without a context, it appears to be much more difficult to estimate the relevance and value of the new project, especially among those who would not be intimately familiar with the particular issue or area in question.
The fact that the word label *commonality* has a statistically significant effect could be considered rather discouraging. What comes to mind when contemplating the result is the fact that the art and culture arena, which is considered to be a “free zone” for creation, innovation, individuality, thinking outside the box etc. does not appear to be as free and open-minded as one might expect. To illustrate with a parallel: when applying for financial support from an institution, a bank for example, there is often an expectation that the project should be presented in a specific manner. The investors at the bank need to know that the investment will be safe and preferably comes with a guarantee. The more grounded and “inside the box” the project appears to be, the better it is. Even though there are differences between applying for funding from an art and culture foundation and from a bank, the gist is the same – they both grant funds to projects that appear to be safe and familiar. This is confirmed by the empirical results as the evaluators on the art and culture arena embrace similarities and familiarities which indicates that there has been an “institutionalization” in this area as well.

The point is: if foundations such as the *Foundation of the Culture of the Future*, who is supposed to foster the development of art and culture and to support innovative thinking and novelties, prefers *commonality*, does it not become counterproductive? How can art and culture flourish if there is a tendency to hold on to familiar? Although framing is not about the novel project itself, but rather how it is presented, the bottom line seem to be the same – people prefer to support what they have seen before and recognize. This is an essential finding and point that needs to be highlighted as it reflects what kind of rhetoric is nourished when it comes to art and culture. It also raises the question whether the evaluators at the foundation were making conscious choices, or it they were are colored by institutional biases when allocating the funds.
CONCLUSION

To summarize and to reconnect to the research question: *to what extent does framing affect the acquiring of financial support for art and culture projects?* – the answer does not seem to be the simple case that framing is important for the chances of securing funding, it is rather the type of framing that matters. Specifically, the results suggest that *commonality* is an important aspect of framing, which was perhaps the most interesting and intriguing finding of this study. None of the other framing categories had any statistically significant effect on the likelihood of receiving funding. As the results indicate that the framing categories *opportunity, threat* and *novelty* are not as significant as expected, this invites further research and there seems to be much more to learn regarding how framing is connected to the chances of acquiring financial support.

Limitations

Along with this study, several limitations surfaced and must be discussed further. One notable limitation it is that it concerns a specific setting i.e. the sector of art and culture – which raises the question whether the results are transferable to other contexts as well (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). The fact that only one of the hypotheses was supported, even though the theoretical framework brings together contribution and finding from organizational, management and entrepreneurship literatures, could indeed suggest that results are limited to this particular area of study.

Also, it should be emphasized that the data was collected from only one art and culture foundation. However, as the sample was drawn from three different years to create a timespan of observations and several different evaluators were thus involved in the selection process. This could indicate that to some extent the results are generalizable to other parts of the art and culture arena as well (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). It might be suggested that the Foundation is to be regarded as an "outlier" with a specific evaluation processes, yet, there has been few clear and direct indications to support this reasoning.

Another limitation might be that the results are only valid in Sweden and that the outcome is tied to the specific conditions of this national context. Other counties have different cultures and values which implies that the chosen variables and framing approaches could have generated another outcome if applied in another country setting.
Furthermore, there could have been other ways of deriving and classifying the word labels (the synonyms) which might have generated other results. However to capture the connotations of the word labels, a wide and inclusive range of synonyms was used. A senior researcher was also consulted regarding the synonyms to minimize overrepresentation and biases.

Additionally, it has not been the purpose to maximize the explanatory power of the theoretical framework, yet several additional factors and variables may have influenced the result of this study. Firstly, an underlying assumption has been that the word labels and their synonyms have generally reflected the contents of the project and the way they were presented at greater length. Secondly, members at the evaluation committee might have created year-dependent biases in the funding of projects, i.e. that they may have been looking for particular themes or topics (to some extent, this bias would have been, to some extent, captured by the year dummies). Thirdly, the thesis has not explored the full extent to which combination of framing approaches influence the chances of receiving funding. While extended and exploratory analyses have included some preliminary assessments of the effects of combined framing approaches, it remains an issue to be explored in future research. Cluster analysis and how different categories of mixed framing approaches affect the chances of receiving funding, could prove particularly useful.

**Practical implications**

Regarding contributions to practice, artists and initiators on the art and culture arena could take advantage of the result to become more aware of framing issues and perhaps also successful in generating acceptance and financial support for novel projects. In particular, the careful positioning of novel projects against a background of the established and familiar could prove valuable. Furthermore, spreading information and educating evaluators on how to design more effective evaluation and funding systems emerges another important practical implication for the future.

**Further research**

One future research avenues that was revealed in the process of carefully reviewing all the funding applications was the indication that legitimacy may be an important framing variable to investigate. This notion is also supported by the results from testing of the control variables.
where it appeared that individual applicants were disfavored and various types of organizations and institutions were instead favored in the selection process. The reason for this might be that organization and institutions are often established and experienced which might give them the legitimacy needed for undertaking and securing support for new initiatives.

In conclusion, there has been limited research on how framing affects the possibility of receiving funding in general, and this thesis has been an attempt to fill a small part of this research gap. More comprehensive and profound empirical investigations comprising more variables and also other settings must be conducted to gain wider knowledge and understanding about how framing is connected to the chances of receiving financial support from others.
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APPENDIX 1 – A general funding application

1. BIDRAGSANŠOKAN 2005

Bidragsansökan och Ekonomisk kalkyl samt eventuella bilagor lämnas
i ett original och tre kopior varandra till Stiftelsen framtidens kultur.
Handlingar skickades per telefax och e-post godkändes ej.

Stiftelsen Kanal9 Gatinvision

Målsättning: Projektet anses förhålla sig till de områden där jag anses vara mest kvalificerad att genomföra denna aktivitet.

Kontaktinformation

Mikaela Mikaelsson

0709-370505 0413-69015

mikaela.mikaelsson@telia.com

Höres kommun

3 266 000 3 066 000

Kanal 9: TValternativet med Gudis Nyheter


September 2005

September 2006

Höres kommun

356 90

Färjestaden

0485-560680 0485-560689

Sökandans underskrift

Mikaela Mikaelsson

08002

Charlotte Allberg, BDO Revision (sakvittoräder)
Appendix 2

Coding scheme

Project Id
Year of applied application
Title (Word Search)
Rejected/Accepted
Accepted = 1
Rejected = 2
Format
1 = Typed
2 = Hand-written
3 = Mixed
Type of Applicant
1 = Male applicant
2 = Female applicant
3 = Private organization, “forening”, “sällskap”, “förbund”, “stiftelse”
4 = Project group
5 = Public authority, “kommun”, “län” “landsting”
6 = Museum, exhibition hall (konsthall), gallery
7 = Theatre, opera
8 = Library
9 = Educational institutions, “universitet”, “högskola”, “skola”,
10 = Aktiebolag, handelsbolag
11 = Other, ”nämnden”, ”byråd”, ”fridiskontoret”, ”grafikens hus”, ”RUM-akademín”, ”främjandet”, ”institut”
C/O-Applicant
1 = Male
2 = Female
3 = Mixed
Name Applicant
1 = Swedish
2 = Foreign
3 = Mixed
Title Applicant
1 = No
2 = Yes
Zip Code
Project Budget

**Sum Applied For** - Sum applied for at Framtidens Kultur may not equal the total budget

**Start Year**

**Finish Year**

**Months** - Some projects are “ongoing”. Starting year then assumed to be the same the year as before the application, number of months for one-year project assumed to be 24.

**Area 1** - There are the codes used by Framtidens Kultur, they represent e.g. dance, theatre, etc.

**Area 2**

**Area 3**

**Sum Applied From Others**

**Number of Other Applied** - The number of the funding sources that have been approached

**Sum Received From Others**

**Number of Other Received**

**Funding Framtidens Kultur**

1 = No
2 = Yes (have gotten funded previously, continuation of project)

**Project Income** - And additional streams of income mentioned (e.g. ticket sales)

**Number of Income Items** - This refers to “övriga intäkter” and includes own contributions

**Own Contributions** - If applicants are putting any own money (real or “invested”) into the project

**Number of Own Contributions**

**Sum Expenditures** - Sometime the sum of expenditures relates to one individual year, while the entire sum of expenditures is greater and runs over several years. Sometimes, the sum of expenditures refers to the entire project budget, sometimes only to the part applied for from Framtidens Kultur.

**Number of Cost Items**

**Notes**
APPENDIX 3 – Synonyms

The words typed in capital letters have been used to search synonyms at www.synonym.se. The lower case letters were the synonyms found. Words with brackets have been deselected since they do not denote or reflect the meaning of the targeted word labels (Opportunity, Threat, Novelty, Commonality) or are duplicates.

OPPORTUNITY - The word opportunity aims to reflect the connotation of a positive outcome, a gain or the feeling of a controllable situation in the framing approach.

MÖJLIGHET: möjligheter, utförbarhet, tänkbarhet, görhet, möjlig utväg, potential, möjlig åtgärd, utsikt, (utväg), tillfälle, chans

VINST: förtjänst, överskott, avans, profit, reveny, (lön), (räntabilitet), (behållning), utdelning, (resultat), (återstod), (netto), (avkastning), intäkt, vinning, fördel, nytta, (utbyte) seger, viktoria, triumf, vunnet pris

VINNA: segra, utgå som segrare, triumfera, komma först, vinna över, besegra, betvinga, slå, klå, förtjäna, tjäna; erhålla vinst, få som vinst; (erhålla), förvärva, få, vårva, skaffa sig, (göra bättre intryck), förändras till sin fördel

ERHÅLLA: (få), ta emot, mottaga, uppbära, inkassera, få ut, utfå, komma i besittning av, förvärva, tilldelas, få vidkännas

FÅ: (erhålla), (ta emot), motta, bekomma, erbjudas, (tilldelas), beviljas, (vinna), åtnjuta förmå, övertala, påverka, beveka åstadkomma, bringa, lyckas ordna, fixa

CHANS: gynnsamt tillfälle, tillfälle, (möjlighet), utsikt att lyckas, utsikt, hopp, (odds), (fördel)

POTENTIAL: förmåga, kapacitet, kraft, resurser, (möjligheter)

VÄXA FRAM: spira

TILLFÄLLE: (möjlighet), (chans), lägenhet

THREAT - The word threat reflects some kind of loss, a negative outcome or an unmanageable situation

FARA: farlighet, våda, risk, oråd, hot, nöd, fördärv, anledning till oro

HOT: varning, hotelse, skrämsel, överhängande fara
FÖRLORA: mista, bli av med, tappa, förlägga, ha bort, sumpa,

FÖRLORAD: förkommen, borttappad, tillspillogiven, dömd att gå under, (såld), slut, förtappad, fallen, förvillad, vanartad, urspårad

FÖRLUST: förlorande, mistande; skada, avbräck, åderlåtning; underskott, avbränning, minus, bortfall, svinn, utgift, nederlag, motgång, stryk, debacle

MISTA: förlora, (gå miste om), gå förlustig, (bli av med), (tappa), (sumpa)

GÅ MISTE OM: förfela, försitta, förverka, missa, mista, (sumpa)

TAPPA: släppa, låta falla; (mista), (förlora), förlägga, glömma; tappa sugen ge upp, ge tappt, misströsta

FÖRSVINNA: komma bort, inte synas till, upphöra att synas, gå förlorad, komma på avvägar; ge sig iväg, (rymma), (sticka), avdunsta, dunsta, droppa av, flykta, förflyktigas, gå upp i rök, fara sin kos

NEGATIV: (omvänd), (konträr), upphävande, minus-, nekande, resultatlös, destruktiv, ofördelaktig, dålig, ogynnsam, kritisk, avvisande, avog, nejsägande, fientlig, omedgörlig, (neggo), (missnöjd)

OKONTROLLERBAR: oregerlig

OHANTERLIG: svårhanterlig, besvärlig; åbäkig, opraktisk; ostyrig, oregerlig, omöjlig

RISKABEL: vanskelig, farlig, (äventyrlig), farofylld, riskfylld, riskfull, vådlig, vågsam, halsbrytande, osäker, chansartad, utsatt, kritisk, prekär

NOVELTY - Novelty has two denotations; it may refer to something completely new and never seen before or something new in a specific context

NYHET: ny information, upplysning, underrättelse, aktualitet, bulletin, novitet, nymodighet, modernitet, ny sak, ny idé, innovation, nyskapelse, nybildning, novation,

NY: modern, aktuell, nutida, färsk, gyrende, ung, av idag, recent, nyss inträffad, nygjord, nybyggd, nyutkommen, oanvänd, obegagnad, obrukad, ovikt, fräsch, frisk, förut okänd, sällsam, oprövd
INNOVATIV: (modern), (aktuell), (nutida), (färs), (gryende), (ung), (av idag), (recent), (nyss) (inträffad), (nygjord), (nybyggd), (nyutkommen), (oanvänd), (obegagnad), (obrukad), (ovikt), (fräs), (frisk), (förut okänd), (sällsam), (oprövad), skapa, utveckla, utveckling

INNOVATION: (modern), (aktuell), (nutida), (färs), (gryende), (ung), (av idag), (recent), (nyss inträffad), (nygjord), (nybyggd), (nyutkommen), (oanvänd), (obegagnad), (obrukad), (ovikt), (fräs), (frisk), (förut okänd), (sällsam), (oprövad)

MODERN: (nutida), (ny), (samtid), (aktuell), tidsenlig, (nymodig), på modet, fashionabel, i ropet, en vogue, populär, inne, (up-to-date), nutidsmässig, trendig, moderiktig, chic

AKTUELL: intressant just nu, av intresse för dagen, dagsaktuell, angelägen, brännande, i förgrunden, i fokus, på tapeten, (ny), (modern), (färs), (tidsenlig), (up-to-date) nuvarande, pågående, föreliggande, ifrågavarande, närvarande, rådande

OPRÖVAD: (ny)

NUTIDA: (modern), (samtid), nutids, (aktuell), (av idag), dagens, (tidsenlig)

FÄRSK: alldeles ny, (ny), (fräs), (frisk), nyligen gjord, (aktuell), nyutkommen, (omogen), (grön), (ung), (späd), (nybakad), (nyplockad), (nyfångad), (osaltd), (orökt)

AV IDAG: (nutida), (ny)

TRENDIG: inne, toppmodern, (modern), (på modet), moderiktig

UP-TO-DATE: (tidsenlig), (aktuell), (modern), sista skriket, (välinformerad), med sin tid

COMMONALITY - Commonality represents something familiar or aligned with already established practices

VANLIG: (allmän), gängse, ofta använd, bruklig, sedvanlig, övlig, usuell, rådande, frekvent, spridd, utbred, alldaglig, vardaglig, (normal), ordinär, konventionell, trivial

TYPISK: utpräglat, utmärkande, karakteristisk, betecknande, representativ

TRADITIONELL: nedärvd, hävdvunnen, sedvanlig, (förhärskande), konservativ, (schablonmässig), (föräldrad)

FREKVENT: ofta förekommande, (vanlig), (allmän), upprepad, tät

ALLMÄN: generell, (general) allomfattande, allmängiltig, universell, global, allmännelig, (vanlig), (spridd), (rådande), (gängse), (utbredd), obestämd, (vag), (abstrakt), (svävande)
BRUKLIG: (gängse), övlig, (vanlig), vedertagen, hävdvunnen, (usuell), (sedvanlig), som används, brukad, nyttjad, i bruk

SEDVANLIG: (gängse), (övlig), (vanlig), (vedertagen), (hävdvunnen), (usuell), (sedvanlig) (som används), (brukad), (nyttjad, i bruk)

KONVENTIONELL: enligt konvenansens regler, enligt god ton, (vedertagen), traditionsenlig, (hävdvunnen), (gängse), (stel), formell, (ceremoniell), traditionell, (vanlig)

NORMAL: (vanlig), (genomsnittlig), typisk, reguljär, ordinär, naturlig, regelrätt, riktig, (vedertagen), (gängse), som alla andra

KONSERVATIV: samhällsbevarande, högersinnad, moderat, (traditionell), (avog mot nyheter)

GENOMSNITTLIG: genomsnitts-, (medel), (normal), (ordinär), (vanlig), (allmän), (alldaglig), typisk
APPENDIX 4

Good examples of applications were the word labels appeared in the right context. (Print screens from the applications)

Opportunity


Threat

Om affärerna i byn (idag finns ingen) om gengasknubbens period, om soldaterna, om Homa-gubben (klädn "medicinman i norra Hållängland), skolans utveckling (nu nedläggningshotad) mm mm
Forskningsgruppen anser att det material som hampars bör bevaras till eftervärlden i sammanhålet skick i form av en bok. Om man inte samlar fakta idag - text, bilder och muntlig tradition så blir sannolikt en stor del av bokens historia forlornad. Gruppen vill också skapa ett material som lämpar sig för skolans behov. Forskningsgruppen söker bidrag för att sammanställa text och bilder i en bok till gagn, nyta och nöje för såväl dagens som morgondagens Elgeredsbor, hemma och ute.

Novelty


Communality

APPENDIX 5

Examples of applications the word label did not appear in the right context

Opportunity


Threat

Inte helt som konstnärt kan använda på sin anda materiell nangenom färde ett teoretiskt verktyg att kunna betrakta sin produktion med.

Genomförandet av projektet bygger på en pilotstudie av 7000 negativ ur den egna konstnärliga produktionen där skilda bilder form och innehåll ställs mot varandra i arbetet med att utforma koden

Slutligen som ett test på kodens funktion kosteras ett specifikt och avancerat

Novelty

är dock rekryteringen och vidareutvecklingen av körlade och den osäkra framtiden för kyrkans körverksamhet.


Sveriges Körförsamling ansöker om medel till ett projekt med huvudsaklig stöd att stärka det regionala körlivet i landet. I samråd med andra köroorganisationer

Commonality

Kommunen, ett kapitel ingående ett ett annat. Dessa kulturaktiviteter praleras, som båtbyggande, performances, körer, dansuppträdanden, diskussionskvällar. 4. Inspirerad av resan har jag för första gången på många år ritar en ny serie möbler, som även de presenteras i utställningen. 5. En bok om LIV är under utarbetande, som gör i samarbete med Bonnier Alba bokförlag. LIV blir således inte en vanlig utställning utan en bred iscensättning av en resa som förändrade mitt liv.

40
### Appendix 6 – Correlation table

|                  | Spearman Correlation Coefficients | Prob > |\(|r|\) under H0: \(\rho=0\) | Number of Observations |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Male             | 1.0000                           |        |                             |                        |
|                  | 1,262                            |        |                             |                        |
| Female           | -0.116                           | <0.001 |                             |                        |
|                  | 1,262                            |        |                             |                        |
| Immigrant        | 0.069                            | -0.050 | 1.0000                      |                        |
|                  | 0.015                            | 0.074  |                             |                        |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  |                             |                        |
| Projectbudget    | -0.154                           | -0.043 | 1.0000                      |                        |
|                  | 0.083                            | <0.001 | 0.131                       |                        |
|                  | 1,247                            | 1,247  | 1,247                       |                        |
| Projectlength    | -0.065                           | -0.011 | 0.355                       | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.111                            | 0.025  | 0.689                       | <0.000                 |
|                  | 1,179                            | 1,179  | 1,165                       | 1,179                  |
| Otherfunds       | -0.035                           | -0.063 | 0.027                       | 0.085                  | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.009                            | 0.219  | 0.025                       | 0.353                  | 0.004                  |
|                  | 1,244                            | 1,244  | 1,244                       | 1,232                  | 1,166                  | 1,244                  |
| Cityarea         | 0.101                            | 0.075  | 0.123                       | -0.029                 | -0.112                 | -0.043                 | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.000                            | 0.008  | <0.0001                     | 0.311                  | 0.000                  | 0.127                  |                          |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,247                  | 1,179                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Year1996         | 0.019                            | 0.068  | -0.012                      | 0.036                  | -0.074                 | -0.081                 | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.151                            | 0.491  | 0.016                       | 0.670                  | 0.222                  | 0.009                  | 0.004                  |                          |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Year1999         | -0.056                           | -0.029 | 0.058                       | -0.035                 | 0.004                  | 0.023                  | -0.553                 | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.001                            | 0.839  | 0.302                       | 0.040                  | 0.232                  | 0.900                  | 0.409                  | <0.000                 |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Opportunity      | -0.024                           | -0.002 | 0.083                       | 0.050                  | 0.011                  | -0.015                 | 0.030                  | 0.018                  | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.126                            | 0.385  | 0.921                       | 0.003                  | 0.089                  | 0.692                  | 0.066                  | 0.282                  | 0.514                  |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Threat           | 0.003                            | -0.036 | -0.038                      | 0.041                  | 0.082                  | -0.007                 | -0.015                 | 0.020                  | -0.012                 | 0.041                  | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.923                            | 0.201  | 0.182                       | 0.151                  | 0.065                  | 0.818                  | 0.600                  | 0.462                  | 0.678                  | 0.145                  |                          |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Novelty          | -0.010                           | -0.066 | 0.100                       | -0.008                 | 0.0556                 | 0.007                  | -0.019                 | -0.018                 | 0.043                  | -0.016                 | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.712                            | 0.468  | 0.020                       | 0.000                  | 0.795                  | 0.049                  | 0.794                  | 0.489                  | 0.522                  | 0.123                  | 0.566                  |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Commonality      | 0.018                            | -0.037 | -0.012                      | -0.029                 | -0.013                 | -0.001                 | 0.030                  | -0.006                 | 0.013                  | -0.018                 | 0.029                  | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.071                            | 0.512  | 0.194                       | 0.667                  | 0.320                  | 0.644                  | 0.971                  | 0.294                  | 0.827                  | 0.638                  | 0.517                  | 0.300                  |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |
| Commonality      | 0.051                            | 0.018  | -0.037                      | -0.012                 | -0.029                 | -0.013                 | -0.001                 | 0.030                  | -0.006                 | 0.013                  | -0.018                 | 0.029                  | 1.0000                 |
|                  | 0.071                            | 0.512  | 0.194                       | 0.667                  | 0.320                  | 0.644                  | 0.971                  | 0.294                  | 0.827                  | 0.638                  | 0.517                  | 0.300                  |
|                  | 1,262                            | 1,262  | 1,262                       | 1,262                  | 1,262                  | 1,262                  |                          |