

The Material Base for Contemporary Dance: Market, Funding, and Employment

Sue In Kim*

(Sungkyunkwan University, Korea)

This study investigates the material base of contemporary dance such as market, funding, and employment in western countries including U.S., France, U.K., and Germany by critically reviewing related literature. Then I reflect on the dance scene in Korea. As contemporary dance is characterized as a subsidized market in all countries examined above, my investigation uses Hillman-Chartrand & McCaughey's four models of governmental supporting the arts. I question how contemporary dance artists work and exist in the related industry and how their work practices inform their creative activities. By exploring these questions, I attempt to suggest a close relationship between the material base of present time and dance that is contemporaneous. Considering the powerful influence of postindustrial capitalism with global impact, contemporary dance world is expected to develop depending on what kinds of stance each artist and each country take in response to it.

Key words: contemporary dance, subsidized market, public funding, employment, cultural industry

Introduction

The term “contemporary dance” has been circulated since the late 20th century; however, what the term refers to remains in the area of debate. Many scholars comment that contemporary dance is a phenomenon with diverse characteristics that are difficult to be reduced in one clear and distinct definition. The term “contemporary” has a temporal designation; something is related to the present time. SanSan Kwan points out that “we seek to align the ‘contemporary’ with a series of aesthetic preoccupations while also reckoning with it as the dance that is happening now” (39). However,

* algedi4236@gmail.com

when is the “present time” or “now” in “contemporary dance?” The term is used as the title of a book by Anne Livet in 1978, which covers what is now categorized as postmodern dance. The gap between what the book covers and what is now referred to as contemporary dance implies that the characters or traits have changed since the era of postmodern dance period. Then one would question when the watershed positions.

Several scholars, including Anedr  Lepecki and Ramsay Burt, indicate 1990s as the time point. What changed from the time were not only the stylistic traits of dance but also the geographical center of dance world. The two scholars point out differences between dance in New York and Europe during the 1990s. Burt(2017) notes that “Whereas for most of the twentieth century, New York had been the centre of most of the significant developments in modern dance, in the 1990s new, more theoretically informed approaches to choreography and performance emerged in Europe...” (27). As one of the several factors catalyzed the divergence, Burt suggests the material base that has made contemporary dance possible. I use “base” in a sense that is informed by Marxist theory: the forces and relations of production. In order to produce contemporary dance in a society currently dominated by capitalism, material and financial sources are necessities. In the market economy system of capitalism, dance works exist in the art market and dancers in the job market.

Sociological studies on artistic labor markets and careers have discussed how unstable and precarious artistic jobs are in modern societies. Pierre-Michel Menger (1999) points out that artistic labor markets, where short-term contractual relationships prevail, possess the characteristics of “secondary” labor markets, even though artists are highly-skilled, educated, and quite differentiated (546). What is significant in Menger’s insight in regards to contemporary dance is that the contingent and precarious working conditions had been aggravated since 1990s. Observing the simultaneous time point (i.e. contemporaneity) of the emergence of contemporary dance and increased instability in economic condition of the dance artists, I attempt to scrutinize the material base of contemporary dance in order to understand how it has informed the tacit but specific stylistic traits of contemporary dance.

One of the reasons that aggravated the precarious working condition in 1990s was the global economic recession including 1997 financial crisis in Korea which is known popularly as the I.M.F. crisis. Countries over the globe tended to take austerity policies and neoliberalism which is ideology and policy model that emphasizes the value of free market competition. Considering contemporary dance is a field that depends heavily on public funding, neoliberal austerity policies significantly affect its existence base. Facing economic recession, however, countries have not employed a uniformed cultural policy. The differences in cultural policies of several countries parallel with different landscapes of contemporary dance in those countries. For example, New dance and subsequent contemporary dance were linked to the identity of the U.K. dance scene, distinguishing it from U.S.-led modern dance.

In France, *Jeune danse* and *Nouvelle danse* of 1980s and *Non-danse* since 1990s have marked the distinctive dance scene of France that is out of the shadows of America. In Germany, *Ausdruckstanz*, literally ‘dance of expression,’ gave rise to *der Modern Tanz*, connoting that it was a uniquely modern and different from foreign ballet, became *Deutscher Tanz* after 1933 with the influence of the Nazi Party. Because of the history of the overt intervention over artists during the Nazi era, German government after the Second World War applied regional rather than centralized system of supporting the arts and dance. Recognizing the differences, I suggest close relationships between the material base and a particular series of aesthetic preoccupation of contemporary dance.

To investigate various types of material base for contemporary dance, it is useful to examine the four types of governmental support for the arts identified by Harry Hillman-Chartrand and Claire McCaughey (1989). The four types are Facilitator, Patron, Architect, and Engineer. The Facilitator State funds the fine arts through tax expenditures. In the Patron State, funding is provided by government to an arts council that then makes grants according to professional standards of artistic excellence. In Architect and the Engineer States, funding is provided directly by a government department. The Architect State tends to support the arts as part of its social welfare objectives. The Engineer State supports the arts to attain official political goals. Since contemporary dance rely its existence on public funding, this categorization helps to understand unique characteristics and histories of contemporary dance in individual countries in the light of the type of cultural policies and funding.

I first investigate the material base of contemporary dance such as market, funding, and employment in western countries including U.S., France, U.K., and Germany by critically reviewing related literature. Then I reflect on the dance scene in Korea. I question how contemporary dance artists work and exist in the related industry and how their work practices inform their creative activities. By exploring these questions, I attempt to suggest a close relationship between the material base of present time and dance that is contemporaneous.

U.S. and the Facilitator State

According to Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey, the U. S. government plays the role of Facilitator, promoting the fine arts through tax expenditures channeled by donors. Even though the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in 1965 conciliated the Facilitator aspect, tax expenditures still provide two-thirds of public support to the fine arts. The Reagan Administration (1981-89) even attempted to disband the NEA.

This type of cultural policy affects dance in general and contemporary dance in particular. Having as little intervention of the government as possible, the Facilitator State is the most likely to be

influenced by the logic of market.

Susan Leigh Foster (2002) describes the way that arts funding developed in the 1970s and 1980s, and how the development affected commodification of dance. Her account reveals complicate and delicate dynamic emerging around the types of managing the material base of dance. With the affluence of the 1960s and 1970s as well as National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) established in the latter half of the 1960s, the supply of dance artist increased. Choreographers competed over opportunities to display their works. At the same time, administrative/bureaucratic work was required to apply for and obtain public fund. Dance people worked to meet the criteria (122). Managers and officers were more frequently awarded grants (128). Foster notes that

By 1982 moneys granted by the NEA to organizations sponsoring dance events surpassed for the first time the amount given to artists. This emphasis on management, still seen as direct support for artists, allowed the NEA greater accountability because its funds went to organizations whose management structures were similar to its own. (129)

To promote greater success at attracting funding, dancers gave more attention to public review, promotion, photographs, and networking with presenters of more prestigious venue (131). With the business of promoting dance in ascendance, not only audience but also artists lost focus on the process of making work.

While public funding with its bureaucratic system and weighing on management-oriented production of dance contributed artists' inattention to innovation and experiment, corporate funding "reinforced the company model of organization and further commodified the dance as product" (131). According to Foster, corporate sponsorship became the single largest source of support by 1984 outshining all public funding. As a result, dance works became homogenized and spectacularized.

What Foster concerns as one of the results of corporatization of dance world is contingent-employment of dancers. Due to short of time and money, choreographers could not invest enough time to develop unique movement vocabulary or style. They tended to employ dancers for each project and preferred dancers with versatile techniques for rapid production. This also contributed the homogenization of dance world (135).

Ramsay Burt, in *Ungoverning Dance: Contemporary European Theatre Dance and the Commons* (2017), specifically analyzes the effect of neoliberalism, which dismantles the structures for public funding for art, on U.S. contemporary dance. Under the influence of neoliberal ideas about self-regulating markets (7), the experience of art has been "turned into a consumer activity, part of a market" (5). Although postmodern dance such as of Judson Dance Theater in 1960s and Steve Paxton's contact improvisation in 1970s U.S. produced performative critique that could channel the

counterculture of the time, contemporary dance in the neoliberalism era does not resist against “the role the market plays in maintaining dance as an institution” (16). According to Burt, European dance artists who began to show their work in the 1990s, unlike U.S. contemporary dance, were able to perform critical statements of the institutionalization of contemporary dance in the 1980s (8).

The influence of neoliberalism on contemporary dance generates a complicate and somewhat ironic movement centering on the word ‘freedom.’ Referencing French economist Éve Chiapello, Burt explains how experimental dances stressing artistic freedom have subsumed by “capitalism’s vocation to commodify desire—especially the desire for liberation” (15). Similarly, Rebekah J. Kowal, Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin’s “Introduction” to *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Politics* (2017) indicate that globalized financial capital advertises dancers’ investment in the self as authenticity and self-determination. Their creativity is converted into economic value. According to Burt, “it is necessary therefore to be cautious about claims that contemporary dance is an expression of freedom” (15).

Jennifer Roche’s *Multiplicity, Embodiment and the Contemporary Dancer: Moving Identities* (2015) also discusses funding and economy of contemporary dance but with the focus on dancers’ identity affected by their employment opportunities. According to Roche, significant changes in dance funding of New York in 1990s transformed dance landscape. Previously dance companies employed dancers offering a salary and health insurance. After the funding cut, only a handful of very narrow top tier companies can offer similar support and the majority of artists work outside institutional structures(7). Operation based on projects commissioned by companies, performance venues, or festivals becomes a global phenomenon. Roche observes that “employment as a freelance or ‘independent’ dancer is now a viable career” (7). What she concerns in regards to this phenomenon is homogeneity. Dancers working with various projects and choreographers are required to be armed with versatility at the expense of thorough commitment to a distinct dance style. In return, choreographers working with these dancers somewhat sacrifice choreographic distinctiveness. According to Susan Leigh Foster cited in Roche’s writing, homogeneity ensued by this kind of working practice “threatens to obscure the opportunity...to apprehend the body as multiple, protean and capable, literally, of being made into many different expressive bodies” (Foster 1992, 495, cited in Roche, 2015, 14).

These scholars critique U.S. contemporary dance and funding system that provides its material base. Although there exists federal and state funding, the U.S. contemporary dance scene seems to be under the influence of the logic of market. Foster indicates that the orientation of dance world is shaped by the questions “will it sell?” and “is it fundable? (133)” Contemporary dance in U.S. has been giving its leading role in theater dance to other (European) countries in terms of its power to make performative critique on the society.

France and the Architect State

Historically speaking, it is known that France had been a center in dance world up to the era of Romantic ballet in 1830s. After that time, Russia took the leading position with classical ballet in the late 19th century, and U.S. with modern and postmodern dance in the early and mid-20th century. During that time, French dance scene was influenced by socio-political fluctuation, while dances with strong popular and public relations prevailed. However, the late 20th century witnessed the re-rising of France as one of the advanced countries in the world of contemporary dance.

In-Joo Chang (2005) identifies strong governmental support, especially the success of the innovative policy of Minister of the Culture and Communication Jack Lang and the increase in budget in 1980s, as the reason of this rising (251). Under the regime of Mitterrand Government with Socialist Party, social welfare, pension scheme, medical insurance, and work space construction for the artist protected artists from unstable and harsh reality of living.

Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey (1989) identifies France as an Architect State where “the economic status of artistic enterprise is determined almost exclusively by direct government funding.” Patrick Germain-Thomas(2013, 2017) makes a similar observation, while discussing contemporary dance of France, particularly focusing on funding and subsidy. He identifies the distribution of contemporary dance as “subsidized market,” by which he means a trade system in which “the financial contribution of audiences remains minor” in contrast to the major reliance to public funding (2013, 39). He points out that despite its heavy dependence on public funding, contemporary dance as a cultural good are produced without reference to the expectations of end users.

With the establishment of Centres Chorégraphiques Nationaux (CCN) in 1984 and Centre National de la Danse in 1998, which have hired resident choreographers, France became a cradle for internationally renowned choreographers including Angelin Preljocaj, Maguy Marin, Mathilde Monnier, Philippe Decouflé, and Jérôme Bel. Currently, there are 19 CCN throughout the country in total: 5 ballet companies and 14 contemporary dance companies. These institutions provide job positions with regular income in addition to rehearsal and performance spaces and other infrastructure.

In the light of creativity, the heavy reliance on governmental fund can play an ambivalent role. On one hand, with the stable living condition, artists can be free from art market and their commitment can be put solely to individual artistic vision. Moreover, as Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey (1989) notes, France as the Architect State respects artistic choice and autonomy from government. Similarly, Germain-Thomas observes that contemporary dance production is neither ruled by the political bodies that support them financially, since the French ministry of culture avoids “the trap of acting in a normative manner.” In other words, artists can enjoy freedom from popular success at the box office as well as from governmental dictation. Indeed, French contemporary dance produced world-famous

choreographers for their addressing social issues and exploring relations of power.

On the other hand, Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey points out inertia as the weakness of the Architect State, which would lead to stagnation of contemporary creativity. They particularly indicate that such a phenomenon “[was] recently observed in France.” In the conversation with In-Joo Jang, Jerome Bel expresses his concern for the abolition of centralized administrative system.

Germain-Thomas gives critic on French style of funding from a slightly different angle. Since the government maintains certain distance from artistic decisions, the presentation of contemporary dance works lies at the disposition of venue manager including theater and festival directors, who themselves depend to public funding. Since the attention of creators and distributors focus on funding, they prefer developing new projects because they have higher funding possibility. Less reference to end user and more focus on funding is what Germain-Thomas diagnoses as a reason of “the unfinished nature of the process of democratization of contemporary dance and the persistent gap between artistic innovation and the expectations of potential theatre goers” (40).

The aforementioned scholars’ discussion hints at various kinds of tension among artistic value, democratic value, and market value. To manage the material base for doing contemporary dance, artists need to advocate civil society, which is run by all tax-payers’ contribution. However, they want to be free from public tastes as well as governmental intervention in order to keep pure artistic motive. Meanwhile, artists want to be generally (if not universally) acclaimed by fellow artists, market, general public, and state because of their artistic autonomy and freedom, which presumably guarantee artistic excellence.

U.K. and the Patron State

Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey identifies U.K. as the best known example of the Patron State. They observe that “The role of Patron evolved out of traditional arts patronage by the English aristocracy” (22). The Patron State supports arts through arts councils, which aim to foster artistic excellence. Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey point out that in most Patron States there are recurring controversies because the embedded elitism often conflicts with democratic aims.

Contemporary dance in U.K. of recent years is not an exception from the controversies. Far from being an exception, the recent pattern of controversies takes a new and even more complicate appearance because of neoliberalism that fuels global market to replace states’ social security. Discussing the cultural policies in U.K., Tatjana Byrne(2014) comments on “market-oriented social welfare aims” (10; 133) suggesting the overarching influence of neoliberalism. She explains that the Labour Party’s government since 2010 “attempted to combine commercial, market-oriented principles

with social welfare policies...and included objectives in areas embracing health, sport and culture” (133). Byrne seems to commend the more typical Patron State model than the model attempted by the Labour Party. According to Byrne, to meet Labour’s social-market paradigm and to successfully acquire public funding,

many dance companies became progressively more involved in educational programmes as a means to secure funding (Castle et al., 2002), as well as being encouraged to develop or foster business competencies such as fund-raising and sponsorship.(173)

In regards to the tension between market-oriented social welfare aim and aesthetic aim, community dance in U.K. stands in an interesting position. The professional dance field such as the New Dance movement with the concerns on different groups within the community contributed the development of community dance (Byrne, 141-142). However, once community dance achieved an established status, with which the Foundation for Community Dance was funded by the Arts Council of Great Britain, it challenges the hegemony of the choreographer-dancer in the professional field. Focusing on greater inclusion and accessibility, community dance was a favorable recipient of public funding. However, Byrne observes that “the participatory, inclusive nature” of community dance tends to avoid provocative topics. Hence the quality of innovation and risk-taking is diluted in community dance.

According to Byrne, professional dance companies like DV8 are desirable cases, which obtain public funding by aligning with the governmental objectives of accessibility and inclusion but is not simply subsumed under the instrumental aim; rather, the company successfully maintains artistic innovation(142). The author’s concern on social welfare aims, which she identifies as the instrumental aim (one that utilizes the arts for other goals), suggests that the emphasis on accessibility and inclusion resembles the logic of market favoring to draw large population.

Germany: From the Engineer to the Patron State

Historically speaking, German dance scene has had a close relationship with socio-political realm. Two famous figures of Ausdruckstanz (literally ‘dance of expression’) Rudolf von Laban and Mary Wigman worked under the regime of the Nazi party. Another leading figure and also widely regarded as the founder of Tanztheater Kurt Jooss choreographed *The Green Table* (1932) with a strong anti-war statement, which was made a year before Adolf Hitler became the chancellor of Germany. Both Ausdruckstanz and Tanztheater have a tendency to view dance as a mode of social engagement (Manning & Bension, 1986, 30).

While the Nazi Party willingly sponsored dances that supported their views on social order and

distinct German culture, their principles accentuated dance as an expression of the health and strength of those undertaking it (Byrne, 148).

The overt and often crude interventions used to force artists to conform to a centralised ideology of what dance was during the Nazi era meant that subsequent German governments and their agencies avoided absolutist statements about the direction and intent of national cultural policy. Indeed this stance is enshrined in the constitution itself. (Byrne, 150).

This way of supporting the arts and dance prompted the highly individualistic and regional, rather than nationalistic, characteristic of German contemporary dance. Federal states and municipal bodies take charge of infrastructure and funding and maintain regionally diverse focuses. Byrne points out Berlin as the only notable exception. In 2006 a reform of the federal system regulated the government to assume more responsibility for culture in Berlin.

According to Byrne, the decentralized system of Germany functions in favor of artistic autonomy and independence. She describes that performing arts organizations supported by the state or city council are not commanded by commercial success or popularity.

Although he or she is responsible for financial management as well as programming decisions, the director's main objective is to gain a high profile amongst a peer group of fellow artists through the staging of 'high quality' performances (Krebs & Pommerehne, 1995). Budgets and individual remuneration tend not to be linked to the relative success of programming decisions and there is little need to worry about competition from other local cultural offerings. (180)

Despite the decentralized nature of German cultural policies, the wake of recession and economic uncertainty in the early 21st century prompted a more federal level measure. Byrne notes that “the number of dancers at state and municipal theatres was cut by 120 in just one year between 2002 and 2003” (149). Even the uncertain future of Pina Bausch’s Tanztheater Wuppertal was openly discussed. In 2002, the *Federal Cultural Foundation* (Kulturstiftung des Bundes) was founded and sponsored the *Tanzplan Deutschland* initiative. *Tanzplan* aims to improve the overall infrastructure for dance in Germany covering primarily dance education and training, dance heritage and scholarship (272).

However, this kind of federal level intervention was ambivalently perceived. *Tanzplan* has diverse objectives such as accessibility, inclusion, as well as artistic excellence. While recognizing tensions between the artistic aim and non-artistic aim, Byrne observes that Germany case tends to favor the artistic aim by privileging professional choreographer-dancers.

Responses to attachment policies featured in Tanzplan that focused on social inclusivity

and access through specific forms of dance practice like community dance were more skeptical [sic.] than in the UK, suggesting that there was a greater sense of artistic autonomy and independence amongst Berlin's dance artists than in the UK.(292)

Generally it is viewed that German cultural policy promotes cultural education without sacrificing artistic autonomy and independence. It might be possible because decentralized system of cultural policy not only protects dance professionals from a commercial logic but also satisfies general populations through local-specific focuses of performing art organizations.

Korea and the Material Base of Contemporary Dance

Contemporary dance in Korea also is a field heavily dependent on public subsidy and funding, as the European countries discussed earlier. Since the earlier half of the 20th century Korea suffered Japanese occupation (1910-1945) and the Korean War (1950-1953), full-fledged development of dance world in Korea was possible after 1960s. Dance as fine art settled mostly through national level organizations such as the National Dance Company (1962), the National Ballet Company (1974), National Gugak Center (1950), intangible cultural asset system (1962), and Korean Culture and Arts Foundation (1973, Arts Council Korea since 2005). The Korea National Contemporary Dance Company (KNCDC) was founded in 2010, much later than other national dance companies.

Compared to other countries, the unique thing about Korean dance scene is that university dance departments take a major portion of the dance world in Korea. According to *The Analysis of the Formation Structure and Support for Dance Professional Manpower* (2005, hereafter *The Analysis*) published by Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, professional dance companies including the national companies stated above are 27 while alumni dance groups count more than 50 (10). The conspicuous position of university dance departments has begun with the first dance department in Ewha Womans' University in 1963. It is generally acknowledge that the Marth Graham style modern dance introduced in Korea by Yuk Wan-soon¹⁾ marked the beginning of full-fledged enactment of modern dance. Yuk Wan-soon's influence was maximized by her position as a professor of Ewha Womans' University. Since then, the number of universities dance departments has increased to about 50 and the number of graduate per year is approximately 2000 (Baek Ji-yeon, 2009; Kim Tae-won, 2010). Every university offers professor positions, which are job positions with steady income as well

¹⁾ Korean personal names are written as follows: family name first, followed by a space, and then the given name. Because many Korean authors share a common family name, here both family and given names are used in all references and citations to avoid confusion.

as respectable occupational status. Also, alumni dance groups, which could incorporate well-trained human resource of students and facilities of university, formed a big force in the dance scene of Korea.

The role of university does not restrict in education and training; rather, its importance in part results from its social capital that can and does influence dance artists' employment and funding acquisition. According to *The Analysis*, most of the Korean dancers (44.5%) reply on personal connections, primary source of which is one's school ties, to get a job (441). Also, most dance professionals enter to job market through university (448). Although many job seekers hope to get a position in employment-stable public or cultural-arts institutions, they prefer graduate degree holders. In addition, in many cases, directors, board members, and even president of those organizations consist of university professors. For example, the current artistic director of Korea National Contemporary Dance Company is a professor of Korea National University of Arts. Moreover, most of the jury members of the support programs of public institutions, companies and private organizations are composed of university professors.

Beak Ji-yeon cites from her interviews with young choreographers about supporting programs for young dancers. The interviewees comment on the connection between university and other organizations.

Usually, The Exhibition by Young Choreographers can be applied through a recommendation from professors. However, I did not have one, because I participated the event after I left [alumni] company... Connection is a necessity in Korean dance world.

The judges of '[C] festival' consisted of professors and critics.

In the dance world, which is developed with connections and personal networking, it is so difficult to live as a choreographer. It's too hard to get funding. If you are in school, you are forced to choreograph. But for independent choreographers, there is not many place to work and perform. It's a real irony.(100)

With the rapid development of university dance departments until 1990s, the dance scene of Korea had tended to focus on aesthetic-artistic performance, paying less attention to market and general public taste. Likewise, Arts Council Korea has focused on supporting the dance groups that encourage high-profile performances (17). As a result, the dance scene had been overtly concentrated on performance and creative activities, not closely connected with daily life of public (19). Consequently, the rate of viewing in the dance field is the lowest among artistic genres, and the pay audience ratio is only 30% (14). *The Analysis* sharply points out that the autogenic power of dance is extremely low.

However, in the wake of economic austerity affecting Korea particularly with 1997 IMF crisis

and 2008 global financial crisis, cultural policies of Korea has operated around the issue of employment and market-profit. Dance groups, where previously consisted only of choreographers and dancers, are engaged in aggressive marketing by hiring people in charge of planning and public relations (14). Funding, which traditionally supported creative arts, is broadened to achieve accessibility and inclusion, paying attention to children, youth, the local people, the underprivileged, and the disabled (14-17). *The Analysis* regards this kind of change as a trend to the proliferation of the dance market.

Of course, the conspicuous position of national-level companies and universities in Korean dance scene does not mean there is no dance outside them. Several art organizations introduce programs that support choreographers' experiments and research. They include MAP of the Seoul Foundation for Culture and Arts, Korea Arts Academy program of Arts Council Korea, and Choreography Lab, which is a choreographic experiment program of the National Contemporary Dance Company. There also exist individual and independent contemporary dance artists. However, it is difficult for them to perform without subsidy and support from institutions and organizations.

In sum, dance scene in Korea has been led by government-established institutions and universities, both of which operate through centralized administrative systems. They contributed elitist high-art image of dance, freeing dance artists from public tastes and market as well as allowing them to make commitment to artistic-aesthetic creation. Funding was focused on high-profile performance. University dance departments and alumni dance groups took a conspicuous position in dance ecology of Korea. About 50 universities provide the significant number of job positions with secure income, which is rare in the artist job market. There exist connections among university professors, funding bodies, and performance venue presenters. However, with in the wake of economic austerity, the dance scene of Korea moves toward a neoliberal model emphasizing free market competition. Its reformation adopts the terms of 'market' and 'commodity' to describe dance world and dance work. The new focus on accessibility and inclusion is fused with marketability.

Conclusion

This article examines contemporary dance world in U.S., France, U.K., Germany, and Korea in terms of the material base including market, funding, and employment. As contemporary dance is characterized as a subsidized market in all countries examined above, my investigation uses Hillman-Chartrand & McCaughey's four models of governmental supporting the arts.

The typical Facilitator State U.S. recently moves toward even more market-oriented approach while spending more and more resource to marketing and public relations instead of artistic

experimentation and statement. France, the model Architect State, supports dance through national-level dance centers, which successfully generated internationally celebrated choreographers with artistic innovations and insightful critiques. However, more recently, the government-led centralized administrative system has been pointed out as the cause for alarm. The Patron State model of U.K. shows the tension between arguments for artistic excellence and for social welfare. A dance area such as community dance proclaiming accessibility and inclusion contends funding opportunities and cultural hegemony with the traditional choreographer-dancer professional field. Germany supports dance on the regional level rather than national or federal level till recently, while maintaining a relatively suitable balance between artistic aims and public friendly aims. A more recent policy attempts federal level intervention aiming to improve the overall infrastructure for dance in Germany. The Korean way of supporting dance seems positioning in between the Patron and Architect State. What is conspicuous comparing to other countries examined above is the significant role of university dance departments. They take a great part in dance creation and dancers' employment with the connections with funding bodies of all kinds. More recently, the dance scene of Korea is affected by neoliberalism incorporating the terms of market and commodity. The new focus on accessibility and inclusion is fused with marketability.

Through the investigation of the material base of contemporary dance, this article suggests complex matrices of dance artists' livelihood and aesthetic works. Considering the powerful influence of postindustrial capitalism with global impact, contemporary dance world is expected to develop depending on what kinds of stance each artist and each country take in response to it.

References

- Baek, Ji-yeon(2009). *jeolm-eun annuga jiwon peulogeulaem-ui gaeseonbang-an-e gwanhan yeongu* [A Study on Improvement Plans of Support Program for Young Choreographers] (Unpublished master thesis). Sangmyung University: Seoul.
- Burt, Ramsay(c2017). *Ungoverning Dance: Contemporary European Theatre Dance and the Commons*. Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, Tatjana(2014). Critical discourses of cultural policy and artistic practice: a comparative study of the contemporary dance fields in the UK and Germany(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Birkbeck: University of London.
- Chang, In-joo(2005). *munhwajeongchaeg-eul tonghae bon peulangseu muyong-ui jeongcheseong : guglib-annusenteoleul jungsim-eulo* [Identité de la danse à travers la politique culturelle en France - Par référence aux Centres Chorégraphiques Nationaux]. *Etudes de la Culture Francaise et de*

- Arts en France*: 231-259.
- Foster, Susan Leigh(1992). Dancing Bodies. In *Incorporations*, Jonathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter (eds). New York: Zone 6: 480-95.
- Foster, Susan Leigh(2002). *Dances that Describe Themselves: The Improvised Choreography of Richard Bull*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
- Germain-Thomas, Patrick(2017). Development of French Contemporary Dance: An Interaction between Public Intervention and Market Mechanisms. *Dance Research*, 35(1): 61-74.
- Hillman Chartrand, Harry & Claire McCaughey(1989). The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective - Past, Present And Future. In *Who's to Pay? for the Arts: The International Search for Models of Support*, M.C. Cummings Jr & J. Mark Davidson Schuster (eds.). American Council for the Arts, N.Y.C.
- Kim, Tae-won(2010). [*muyong(1)*] 1960nyeondae ihuleul jungsim-eulo - hangug hyeondaemuyong-ui hyeongseong-gwa geu chum-ui gyeon-inchadeul [[Dance (1)] Focusing on the 1960s and Beyond - The Formation of Modern Dance In Korea and the Driving Forces of The Dance]. *Performance and Review* 70: 31-42.
- Kowal, Rebekah J., Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin(2017). Introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Politics*. Rebekah J. Kowal,, Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin(eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kwan, SanSan(2017). When Is Contemporary Dance? *Dance Research Journal*, 49 (3): 38-52.
- Livet, Anne, ed(1978). *Contemporary Dance*. New York: Abbeville Press.
- Manning, S. & Benson, M(1986). Interrupted Continuities: Modern dance in Germany. *The Drama Review: TDR*, 30(2): 30-45.
- Menger, Pierre-Michel(1999). Artistic Labor Markets and Careers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 541-574.
- Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism [Republic of Korea](2005). *The Analysis of the Formation Structure and Support for Dance Professional Manpower*.
- Roche, Jennifer(2015). *Multiplicity, Embodiment and the Contemporary Dancer: Moving Identities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Received: April 30, 2018

Reviewed: May 25, 2018

Accepted: June 25, 2018