

ATINER CONFERENCE PAPER SERIES No: ART2013-0584

Athens Institute for Education and Research

ATINER



ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ART2013-0584

**The State Theatres in Turkey:
Analyses on Valuation and the
Management Model**

Yesim Tonga

PhD Candidate

IMT Institute for Advanced Studies Lucca

Italy

Athens Institute for Education and Research
8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece
Tel: + 30 210 3634210 Fax: + 30 210 3634209
Email: info@atiner.gr URL: www.atiner.gr
URL Conference Papers Series: www.atiner.gr/papers.htm

Printed in Athens, Greece by the Athens Institute for Education and Research.
All rights reserved. Reproduction is allowed for non-commercial purposes if the
source is fully acknowledged.

ISSN 2241-2891

30/09/2013

An Introduction to ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ATINER started to publish this conference papers series in 2012. It includes only the papers submitted for publication after they were presented at one of the conferences organized by our Institute every year. The papers published in the series have not been refereed and are published as they were submitted by the author. The series serves two purposes. First, we want to disseminate the information as fast as possible. Second, by doing so, the authors can receive comments useful to revise their papers before they are considered for publication in one of ATINER's books, following our standard procedures of a blind review.

Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos
President
Athens Institute for Education and Research

This paper should be cited as follows:

Tonga, Y. (2013) "The State Theatres in Turkey: Analyses on Valuation and the Management Model" Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: ART2013-0584.

The State Theatres in Turkey: Analyses on Valuation and the Management Model

Yesim Tonga

PhD Candidate

IMT Institute for Advanced Studies Lucca

Italy

Abstract

Even though accessibility of culture, preservation and promotion of arts are treated mainly as the responsibility of the State in Turkey, the government's approach was influenced by the global neoliberal currents and eventually directed towards a market-oriented approach, moving the position of the State from 'the initiator' towards 'the regulator' side over the last decades. Within this context, the State Theatres and the Istanbul City Municipal Theatre (ICMT), which are among the deep-rooted, oldest public arts institutions, have recently become the target of some regulatory changes in the government's agenda. The regulation changes in ICMT comprising the transfer of the management from actors to municipality officers, including such duties as the selection of plays, casting actors, and hiring technical staff, were put in action on 12 April 2012. Concurrently, the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan's statement in favor of privatization of the State Theatres received reactions from the public. The main argument of the public opposition was that the freedom of state-supported art would be heavily damaged with the enactment of the new regulations. State support, it was maintained, is of crucial importance for arts production in a developing country such as Turkey.

Therefore, this paper aims to contribute those debates with the examination of efficacy of the State Theatres in Turkey. Besides, valuation of the State Theatres by the public will be discussed through the results of a public opinion survey on a test group. Following the analysis, recommendations for development of a more suitable management model for state-supported theatres in Turkey will be provided.

Keywords: Arts management, theatre, cultural policy, Turkey.

Corresponding Author:

Introduction

During the 1980s, Turkey went through a transition to the free-market system that was marked by the adoption of neoliberal policies. Consequently, the field of culture was affected by that transition through policies, such as cutting public spending, adapting enterprise culture, propagating privatization with various incentives and subsidies, and paving the way for state-private sector partnerships. More recently, the wave of public fund reductions in the field of culture around the world has been washing the shores of Turkey since 2000s coinciding with the current government of the Justice and Development Party's (AKP) coming to power. The position of the State moved from 'the initiator' towards 'the regulator' side over the last decades.

Within this context, the State Theatres and the Istanbul City Municipal Theatre (ICMT), which are among the deep-rooted, oldest public arts institutions, have recently become the target of some regulatory changes in the government's agenda. The regulation changes in ICMT comprising the transfer of the management from actors to municipality officers, including such duties as the selection of plays, casting actors, and hiring technical staff, were put in action on 12 April 2012. Concurrently, the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan's statement in favor of privatization of the State Theatres received reactions from the public. The main argument of the public opposition was that the freedom of state-supported art would be heavily damaged with the enactment of the new regulations. State support, it was maintained, is of crucial importance for arts production in a developing country such as Turkey. However, the issue left in suspense after an intense couple of months of conflict between the governmental authorities and civil initiatives through media. Yet, there is still the need for deeper research about the public opinion and construction of a more inclusive decision-making structure concerning the changes in the management of state-supported theatres.

Therefore, this paper aims to deal with the politics of cultural management, focusing on the State Theatres in Turkey. Following a brief summary of the evolution of theatre and cultural policies in Turkey, the State Theatres will be presented. Then, the efficacy of the organization will be analyzed through some performance indicators from 2009 to 2012. Lastly, the valuation of the institution will be discussed with the results of a public opinion survey on a test group. Following the analysis, recommendations for development of a more suitable management model for state-supported theatres in Turkey will be provided in the conclusion.

The Evolution of Theatre and Cultural Policies in Turkey

In order to understand the evolution of theatre in Turkey, it is of crucial importance to clarify what we mean by "theatre in Turkey" and, to explain spatial and temporal limitations. In general the term "Turkish theatre" is misused, representing only the theatre within the borders of the Republic of

Turkey. However, as Prof Metin And explains; 'the theatre of Turkish speaking nations should be understood with the term Turkish theatre' (And, 2009). Therefore, "theatre in Turkey" (Turkey refers to the Republic of Turkey) was chosen instead of "Turkish theatre" as the title of this section. Yet, when the term Turkish theatre is used, it refers to the Turks that settled in Anatolia, starting from the Anatolian Seljuks, continuing with the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey. Besides, since this paper focuses on the State Theatres, the time span will mainly cover from the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923 until today.

In 1839, proclamation of *Tanzimat Fermani* (Imperial Edict of Reorganization) brought along reorganization of the Ottoman Empire. This Imperial Edict was the beginning of the *Tanzimat* period with reforms to strengthen the unity and to take precautions against nationalist movements within the multi-ethnic Empire. Ottomanism was promoted to integrate non-Muslims and non-Turks with the Muslim and Turk population. 'It would not be an overstatement to claim that the change in the Ottoman culture and arts in a modern sense started with *Tanzimat*. In the modernization era of the arts, first newspapers, literature journals, first novel and novella in a Western sense, and the birth of theatre that is our main topic were in that period' (Demirci, 2010). Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Ottoman Empire got acquainted with the Western performing arts also before 1839. 'During the first quarter of the 19th century, minorities started to watch foreign theatre companies. Besides, between 1824-1828 when (Sultan) Mahmud II established a palace orchestra, theatres and operas became widespread in Istanbul' (Birkiye, 2012). However, *Tanzimat* was the beginning of the proliferation of arts in a Western sense among a relatively wider public. During this period, 'the establishment and dissemination of the modern Ottoman theatre started by local entrepreneurs, majority of which was composed of Ottoman citizen Armenians' (Gullu, 2008).

The Second Constitutional Era, which can be considered as the second phase for the theatre under Western influence, starts with the Young Turk Revolution in 1908 with the restoration of the constitutional monarchy¹. During this period, theatre serves as a platform to express excitement about the political changes both for artists and the wider public. However, the disappointment of the unfulfilled socio-political expectations resulted in a decreasing interest on theatre plays. Nevertheless, this period is remarkable with the establishment of *Darülbedayi-i Osmani* (The Ottoman House of Beauty) as the first state-supported theatre in 1914. André Antoine was invited to Istanbul by Cemil Topuzlu Pasha to establish the institution mainly for educational reasons. 'In 1916 *Darülbedayi* became a professional theatre house rather than a school and started staging' (And, 2009). Nevertheless, 'artistically there were three important problems during that period. Those were: (a) The lack of actresses; (b) Obstacles against acting to become a profession; (c) Training of actors' (And, 2009).

¹The First Constitutional Era was from 1876 until 1878, ending with the suspension of the parliament by Sultan Abdul Hamid II.

After the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, the change in cultural policies can be examined in three periods; construction of a “nation culture” by the State (1920-1950), the political segmentation and polarization era (1950-1980) and, the globalization and the EU period (1980-Present) (Ince, Oncu & Ada, 2011).

During the first period following the establishment of the Republic, there was a substantial interest on arts by the government. The political discourse of the time was built around the elimination of all kinds of diversity and creation of a “unified body without privilege or class”, as well as the construction of a “nation culture”. Accordingly, new institutions were established to centralize education and culture, such as enactment of the Unification of Education Act in 1924, establishment of the Turkish Historical Society (1931), the Turkish Language Institute (1932), People’s Houses (1932) and Village Institutes (1940).

As far as the theatre scene is concerned during this period, it can be claimed that more importance was given to didactic characteristics of theatre rather than the artistic side, due to its perception as a tool to disseminate the ideas of the government. The State Theatres was established in 1949, as the first national scale public theatre. At this point, inferences of Prof And are remarkable. He defines that period as follows; 'essentially, it was aimed to establish the grounds for driven and useful Public Theatre both appealing and beneficial to the public, as well as increasing its cultural level. However, it was not achieved since the idea that theatre is primarily an art and those positive aims should be complemented with aesthetic dimension was not settled' (And, 2009).

During the second period, the political segmentation and polarization era that was highlighted by the transition to multiparty system and military coups, establishment of the Turkish Ministry of Culture was among the most significant developments. While construction of a national culture continued on the one hand, transformation of culture into a commodity and an industry started. The market emerged as an alternative, liberating vehicle to promote popular culture. Five Year Plans were defining cultural investments and the development of cultural institutions as a part of the State’s responsibility. Accordingly, the Ministry of Culture was established in 1971.

On the other hand, after 1980, neoliberal policies put forward public-private collaboration as the new promoter of the national culture. Accordingly, new laws, such as Law 5225 on Tax Incentives for Cultural Investments and Enterprises and Law 5228 on Promotion of Sponsorship in Culture that were designated in 2004, endorsed collaborative work model. The state started to function more as the regulator, rather than the investor during that era. Furthermore, public administration reforms empowered municipalities as more influential actors in the field of culture. (Ince, Oncu & Ada, 2009)

Following the increasing impacts of globalization and neoliberal tendency around the world, policies became more of a global issue rather than a national one. They are prepared not only within the borders, but also beyond. International and transnational institutions are helping to form common

perspectives regionally and globally. Hence, it is inevitable to stay away from the influences coming from outside the borders of a country in the formation of cultural policies. Accordingly, the period after 1980 is very critical in the case of Turkey since it incorporates a drastic shift, concerning the attitude of the government towards culture under global influences. Privatization, reduced role of the government as a cultural investor and the increasing power of the market structure, all coming out of the neoliberal discourse, became more prominent in Turkey during that period. Particularly with the increasing power of the Justice and Development Party (“Adalet ve Kalkinma Partisi” - AKP) during the last decade, this mind shift was reflected on policies and practice more effectively.

At this point, it should also be noted that the institutional structure to handle arts and culture issues has been changed for 14 times since 1923 (Birkiye, 2012). Even after the establishment of the Ministry of Culture in 1971, there have been structural changes, such as the merger between culture and tourism in the Ministry in 2003. The high frequency of those changes is among the obstacles against developing a common concept of culture and sustainable cultural policies. Consequently, the State Theatres has been affected by those changes as well.

As far as the theatre scene is concerned, first government subsidies were given to private theatres in 1982. Concurrently, the number of private theatres has been rising until today. Particularly after 2000's there was a drastic increase in the new theatre companies. Besides, the State Theatres has been expanding geographically with the new theatre houses and provincial organizations. Nevertheless, after the discussions about privatization of the State Theatres that took place during mid 2012 left an ambiguity about the future of state-supported theatre. In case of institutional transformations within the State Theatres, there is the need for better collaboration between governmental authorities and civil society in order to develop and implement sustainable, effective solutions.

The State Theatres in Turkey

The State Theatre and Opera was established in 1949. After nine years, it was renamed as the State Theatres with the separation of the State Opera and Ballet in 1958. It is a legal personality with a private budget, connected to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The organizational structure and working principles are defined by law no 5441 that was prepared in 1949.

The mission of the State Theatres is mentioned as; 'fulfilling the cultural needs of the society in the light of the principles of the Republic, to improve Turkish language, to spread theatre and to contribute to raise individuals with universal values' (Annual Report of the State Theatres, 2012). With this mission, the State Theatres is composed of the General Directorate in Ankara and provincial organizations. It is under management of a Director General, two Assistant Director General and Executive Director at the General

Directorate that is composed of main and support service units. Provincial organizations are managed by an art director and assistant art directors at city scale (Annual Report of the State Theatres, 2012). It is also one of the oldest state-supported arts institutions in Turkey. Accordingly, it became the most wide-spread and large scale theatre with continuous state-support, biggest number of permanent staff (including artists), production ateliers and 56 stages in 23 cities. Besides, national and international tours are organized to reach more audience, increase collaboration between cities and with other countries, as well as social responsibility projects to contribute to the community development. Overall, this deep-rooted institution can be defined as the main national scale contributor for arts production at the theatre scene in Turkey.

Nevertheless, the State Theatres, particularly its management structure, has been also criticized internally and externally. As stated in the annual reports, one of the main problems of the State Theatres can be defined as the lack of autonomy in the management. 'Although it has a legal personality, it is connected to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.' (Annual Report of the State Theatres, 2012) This affiliation leaves the State Theatres vulnerable to the political changes. For instance, as Selen Korad Birkiye indicates, the governmental managerial structure to handle arts and culture issues have been changed for 14 times since 1923 (Birkiye, 2012). Consequently, political power struggles resulted in frequent change of staff at the State Theatres and, an unstable basis deterring to develop and implement long-term strategies. Besides, 'even though the activities are carried out with a different procedure compared to other public institutions, it is considered similarly as other institutions with government budget.' (Annual Report of the State Theatres, 2012) The law no. 5441 about the establishment of the State Theatres is not capable of fulfilling the actual managerial needs anymore. The high bureaucratic structure complicates coordinating this wide-spread organization efficiently and innovatively. For instance, 'the obligation to work with a limited number of artists and the delay to fill in leaving employees ... are hindering the quality to reach ultimate level.' (Annual Report of the State Theatres, 2012)

Taking those strengths and weaknesses into account, the accomplishments of the State Theatres can be examined in a more accurate way. For instance, as far as the performance indicators, such as number of performances, number of audience and ticket revenues, are concerned, there is an increase during the seasons between 2009 to 2012. As an example, during the season of 2011-2012, the State Theatres reached 1.599.839 audience with 5.903 performances on its stages and national tours. Considering the low rate of overall participation in arts in Turkey, these numbers are remarkable in terms of both quantity and spatial distribution. In this respect, the contribution of the State Theatres in arts participation is very valuable (Please see Table 1 and Table 2 for the details).

Apart from the performance indicators, the budget of the State Theatres has been subjected to discussions since it is mostly composed of government subsidies. While guaranteed resources, together with unmovable assets, assure a certain amount and quality of its activities and support its aims, there are also

some drawbacks, such as the misconception of politicians to legitimize their interventions, the lack of ambition and innovation within the organization. When we look at the seasons between 2009-2012, the total of government subsidies (the sum of prevalent subsidies, financial expenses and spare subsidies) per season, excluding the liquid amount transferred from the previous year, constitutes 92 %, 90,6 % and 91,9 % of the overall budget respectively (Please see Table 3). Despite the increase in ticket revenues from 5.917.600,5 TL in the 2009-2010 season to 7.420.705 TL in 2010-2011 and 7.442.849 TL in 2011-2012 (Please see Table 4), those numbers are still very low. For instance, the ticket revenues were only approximately % 4,6 of the total revenues for the 2011-2012 season. Since the low-priced ticket policy of the State Theatres is essential for increasing the accessibility of arts by citizens from different socio-economic groups, raising ticket prices would not be a feasible solution to increase self-generated revenues. Considering the governmental tendency to cut cultural subsidies, alternative strategies, such as increased utilization of social media for promotion, organizing paid workshops, training programmes and backstage tours, printing and marketing special editions for plays, should be developed to diversify sources of income.

On the other hand, the government subsidy is not as excessive as it seems regarding the scale of the State Theatres. As an extreme case, the National Theatre in UK can be compared with the State Theatres. UK is recognized as a rare example conducting arm's length principle with success. Arts Council is in charge of distributing government subsidies as an autonomous organization and those subsidies are limited with a certain percentage of the general budget of the institution that receives support. Within this context, the National Theatre received approximately 50.871.644 TL (18.300.000 GBP) from the Arts Council England for the 2011-2012 season. This amount corresponds to 23 % of its overall budget. For the same season, The State Theatres received 149.109.805 TL government subsidy. However, those numbers might be misleading by themselves. The scale of the organizations should also be examined through some measures. For instance, as far as the government subsidy per stage is concerned, it is approximately 16.957.214,7 TL (6.100.000 GBP) per stage for the National Theatre in UK that has 3 stages, while it is 2.662.675 TL per stage for the State Theatres with 56 stages in Turkey. Thus, even though the government subsidy that the State Theatres receive is more than the National Theatre numerically, the sufficiency of it is open for discussion.

Under the guidance of those indicators, it can be claimed that the State Theatres, with its drawbacks such as the need for structural advancements, is capable of meeting the expectations to fulfill its responsibility towards the public as a state-supported institution at an adequate level. Nonetheless, it is apparent that there is the need for some reforms concerning the current management model, as well as the relation with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The burden of bureaucracy with the old legislation, negative affects of political fluctuations and the pressure to balance classical plays with artistic innovation in the program are among the obstacles damaging the efficacy and

efficiency of the institution. Therefore, the reform attempts of the governmental authorities are meaningful. However, it should be noted that precipitated changes without adequate basis and inclusive decision-making process would be detrimental for the future of the theatre scene in Turkey. Thus, careful analyses of the current situation and multiple stakeholder approach are required for sustainable improvements. Accordingly, the next section will analyze the results of a public opinion survey on a test group. It is aimed to understand how people value the State Theatres and to discuss the applicability of such a method for following an inclusive approach to advance institutional reforms.

Valuation of the State Theatres by the Public

Culture field can be considered as a unique one that can combine non-use values with use values and economic benefits. 'Such values relate to the public good nature of the arts and are sometimes referred to as positive externalities because they are external to the market.' (Snowball, 2008) Therefore, it is important to recognize these non-market characteristics and conduct research activities accordingly. However, it is challenging to reflect those non-use values in numerical terms for better estimation of cultural goods' real values. 'Diamond and Hausman (1993) outline three types of non-use values: the value of one's own possible future use of the good, the value of one's enjoyment of the use of the good by others (also called bequest value) and finally, values unrelated to human use of the good.' (Snowball, 2008) That is also the case for public-supported theatres, such as the State Theatres in Turkey. Therefore, public opinion on the State Theatres, including users and non-users, requires more attention. As in the case of one of the earliest willingness to pay studies conducted by Thompson, Throsby and Withers (1983) in Australia, public opinion can be contradictory with the expectations. 'There was wide-spread agreement with the idea that the arts provided "community public benefits", such as national pride, assistance in understanding and interpreting "our country and its culture", as well as general educational value. ... The authors conclude that "The notion of the arts as a luxury and as only an elite pleasure foisted on an unknowing or resentful public is simply wrong". (Snowball, 2008)

Accordingly, it is of crucial importance to integrate public opinion, their priorities and interests in the decision-making process to serve for the public benefit better and to develop effective management solutions concerning the State Theatres as well. Towards this end, a questionnaire was prepared and conducted within a test group of 30 respondents to understand the disponibility and challenges of such a public opinion survey for this aim.

The questionnaire is composed of 13 questions, in addition to some information about contact, education level, income and personal interests. Istanbul was selected as the focal city due to its cosmopolit characteristics. Since it is important to reach non-users, as well as the theatre audience, in

order to understand real value of the State Theatres, a test group, representing a relatively higher socio-economic part of the society, with the potential of comprising both users and non-users was selected. It was composed of 30 respondents, with the age range from 20 to 30. All of the participants were minimum bachelor degree graduates. Besides, the ones having a monthly income were earning minimum 1000 TL per month (approx. 430 Euro).

Survey Results

The average number of theatre plays that the respondents attended during the last year is 3. Besides, 8 of them did not attend any play within the same time frame. Therefore, % 26,6 of the respondents, can be considered as non-users.

People generally claim that a change in their living conditions would increase their attendance in arts. Accordingly, under which conditions the attendance of the respondents to theatre would increase was asked and five choices were provided. The respondents were free to choose more than one option. There was also an 'other' option for the respondents to reflect their opinions better. The answers were as follows:

- Increase in my income - % 30,
- Having more free time - % 53,3,
- Having a theatre closer to my house / office - % 43,3,
- Having plays that are more appealing to my taste in the program - % 50,
- Reduced pricing for tickets - % 20,
- Other: Three respondents specified increased availability of tickets and one respondent mentioned increasing the number of theatres and returning the ownership of old theatre houses back to the State Theatres.

In line with the following question, % 100 of the respondents consider the State Theatres as an important institution and are willing to sustain it. When the reason of their positive response was asked, four choices were provided, as well as an 'other' option in the answer section, and they were free to choose more than one option:

- It contributes to dissemination of theatre nationally - % 66,6,
- It increases the accessibility of theatre by different socio-economic groups, through its low-priced ticket policy - % 76,6,
- It contributes to artistic production - % 53,3,
- It contributes to the consolidation of the national identity and enhancement of national art - % 33,3,
- Other: One respondent mentioned the contribution of the State Theatres to the education of successful actors / actresses and another respondent mentioned the importance of the opportunity to attend very good productions for low ticket prices.

When the opinions on the required improvements and changes within the State Theatres were asked, the answers merged in four main points. This was an open question to give to the respondents the freedom to write whatever they think. Those four main points were; autonomous management structure free from political interventions, the need for renovation of both the program and style of plays with more contemporary and dynamic performances, more promotion particularly through social media, the need for better technical conditions and increased number of theatre houses.

After providing the mission statement of the State Theatres, whether the respondents believe that private theatres can fulfill the mission of the State Theatres was asked. % 70 of the respondents replied negatively. % 10 replied positively and % 20 did not provide any answer.

Discussion

The presented results of the test group indicate that the segment of the society this sample represents (well educated, young students and professionals in Istanbul) is aware of the current issues regarding the State Theatres. Non-users that is % 26,6 of the group can be defined as potential users since they already define the State Theatres as an important institution and stated that they can attend theatre plays in case of some changes in their living conditions. Besides, if the State Theatres consider this segment among its target groups, the revision of the program can be utilized to be more appealing.

As far as the importance of the State Theatres is concerned, the strong points can be identified as the broad geographical scale and the contribution to the accessibility of theatre. Besides, the four points indicated for the improvement of the organization precisely captured the current needs and covered a range of issues even though the test group was not composed of experts.

The most striking result of the survey was that a big percentage, % 70 of the respondents do not believe that private theatres would be capable of fulfilling the mission of the State Theatres. The respondents mostly define private theatres as profit oriented, small scale organizations with limited range of audience. Even the respondents who replied positively uttered their concerns about the potential increase in ticket prices that would limit the accessibility of plays. In this sense, it can be concluded that the results of this survey indicate that the public is not in favor of privatization of the State Theatres.

However, there is the need to reach a more representative sample reflecting the wide range of socio-economic backgrounds of the population in Istanbul. The test group represents a minority within the city. For instance, it is very likely that the percentage of non-users would be much higher within a more representative sample.

Conclusion

All things considered, it can be claimed that the lack of consistent,

sustainable cultural policies has been hindering the development of arts and culture sector in Turkey. The centralist managerial approach has been damaging the autonomy of state-supported arts institutions and their artistic production, while the old legislation has been a burden of bureaucracy. Within this context, the influences of neoliberal policies on the culture sector brought along some discussions, including privatization, for the state-supported theatres. 'The main reason of those tremors is the tension between the governments' cultural policies and arts in general, theatres in particular, stemming from the difference between their mechanisms, nature and functions. ... Neglected precautions, regulations, the low importance given to arts by the politicians and majority of the public, and international enforcements can be counted as laying beneath that tension, to which all the parties that have been in power contributed'. (Birkiye, 2012)

Within this context, the State Theatres, as one of the most prominent public arts institutions, needs legislative, managerial and structural changes. However, precipitated, radical reforms that does not fit in the cultural needs and interests of the society would be harmful for the public benefit in the long-run. Inclusive decision-making approach is a must for the development and implementation of such improvements. Therefore, better performance analysis in comparison with alternative models, as well as more research on the public valuation of the State Theatres are required. Towards this end, public opinion surveys can be utilized to have a wider perspective.

Table 1. Number of Performances

	Number of Performances (State Theatres Venues)	Number of Performances (National Tours)	Total
2009 - 2010	4.807	810	5.617
2010 - 2011	4.894	873	5.767
2011 - 2012	4.966	937	5.903

Table 2. Number of Audience

	Number of Audience (State Theatres Venues)	Number of Audience (National Tours)	Total
2009 - 2010	1.205.134	259.919	1.465.053
2010 - 2011	1.232.877	299.451	1.532.328
2011 - 2012	1.261.574	338.265	1.599.839

Table 3. Government Subsidies of the State Theatres (in Turkish Lira)

	Government Subsidy for the season / Prevalent	Government Subsidy for the season / Financial Expenses	Spare Subsidy for the season	Government Subsidy for the season / Total	Total Budget of the State Theatres	Percentage of the Government Subsidy in the Total Budget
2009 - 2010	105.195.000	5.500.000	11.086.000	121.781.000	132.307.350	% 92
2010 - 2011	127.061.000	4.500.000	1.400.000	132.961.000	146.743.000	% 90,6
2011 - 2012	134.464.000	5.500.000	9.145.805	149.109.805	162.319.805	% 91,9

Table 4. Ticket Revenues (in Turkish Lira)

	Ticket Revenue (State Theatres Venues)	Ticket Revenue (National Tours)	Total
2009 - 2010	5.103.087,5	814.513	5.917.600,5
2010 - 2011	6.383.114	1.037.591	7.420.705
2011 - 2012	6.352.180	1.090.669	7.442.849

References

- Ada, S (Ed.). (2011). *Sivil Toplum Gozuyle Turkiye Kultur Politikasi Raporu / Turkish Cultural Policy Report: A civil perspective*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- Adorno, T. (2001). *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Routledge.
- Aksoy, A. & Z. Enlil (Eds.). (2011). *Cultural Economy Compendium Istanbul 2010*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- Aksoy, A. (2009) 'The Ataturk Cultural Centre and the AKP's 'Mind Shift' Policy'. In: Ince, H. A. & S Ada (Eds.). *Introduction to Cultural Policy In Turkey*, 191-213. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- And, Metin. (2008). *From the Beginning until 1983: The History of Turkish Theatre*. Istanbul: Iletisim Publications. [In Turkish].
- Birkiye, S. K. (2012). 'Cultural Policies, Turkish Theatre and the State Theatres Example'. *Tiyatro Elestirmenligi ve Dramaturji Bölüm Dergisi*, (10). [In Turkish].
- Byrnes, W. (2008). *Management and the Arts*. Focal Press.
- Colins, M. (2008). *Putting Culture First: Commonwealth perspectives on culture and development*. Commonwealth Foundation.
- Conte, D. & S. Langley. (2007). *Theatre Management*. Quite Specific Media Group Ltd.
- Demirci, E. U. (2010). *The Political Role of Theatre in Turkey (1850-1950)*. Istanbul: Federe Publications. [In Turkish].
- Frey, B. S. (2003). *Arts & Economics: Analysis & Cultural Policy*. Springer.
- Demirkanli, M (Ed.). (2012). 'Panel: In Search for a Model'. *Monthly Journal of Theatre* 238: 12-16. [In Turkish].
- Ginsburg, V. A. & D. Throsby. (2006). *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*. North Holland.
- Gokturk, D.& L. Soysal & I. Tureli. (2010). *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?.* Routledge.
- Hutter, M. & D. Throsby. (2011). *Beyond Price: Value in Culture, Economics, and the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ince, H. A. & S. ADA (Eds.). (2009). *Introduction to Cultural Policy In Turkey*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- Ince, H.A. (2009). 'Cultural Policies and Local Public Administration'. In: Ince, H. A. & S. Ada (Eds.). *Introduction to Cultural Policy In Turkey*, 191-213. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- Kaiser, M. (2008). *The Art of the Turnaround: Creating and Maintaining Healthy Arts Organizations*. Brandeis.
- Ozpinar, C. (2011). 'Conditions for Artistic Creativity'. In: Ada, S (Ed.). (2011) *Sivil Toplum Gozuyle Turkiye Kultur Politikasi Raporu / Turkish Cultural Policy Report: A civil perspective*, 213-221. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- Sener, S. (2012). *Turkish Theatre in the Development Process*. Istanbul: Mitos Boyut Publications. [In Turkish].
- Stein, T. S. (2008). *Performing Arts Management: A Handbook of Professional Practices*. Allworth Press.
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Unsal, D (Ed.). (2011). *Istanbul Kultur ve Sanat Sektoru*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications.

Webb, D. (2005). *Running Theatres: Best Practices for Leaders and Managers*.
Allworth Press.