

The Visibility Paradox: Visual Artists in Arts Policy and Arts Impact Research in England

Paul Glinkowski

ABSTRACT

“In spite of the economic and social significance of their output, artists lack visibility in crucial ways ... They do not sit easily within the structures and methods that government – both central and local – have adopted to measure what they consider to be important ... It is as though visual artists are invisible.”

Robert Hewison and John Holden, *The Right to Art: Making aspirations reality*, 2004

This paper takes the above statement as the starting point for an enquiry into the current position and status of visual artists within the discourses through which arts policy in England is debated, shaped and articulated. It shows that within present-day arts-focussed research the field of impact assessment has emerged as a growing area of enquiry and influence, providing the data necessary to enable evidence-based policy, and that artists tend to feature only as marginal subjects in this genre of research. As a consequence, artists are increasingly being overlooked in arts policymaking. The paper concludes by suggesting that new methodologies are required that will reinstate artists as the locus of impact research. This will enable a more equitable balance to be attained between an instrumental and an intrinsic approach to arts development. The relationship between the two is widely felt, during the tenure of the New Labour government, to have become unhealthily skewed towards instrumentalism.

PREFACE

In its 2006 document *Turning Point*, which proposes a ten year strategy for the visual arts in England, Arts Council England (ACE) asserts: “The UK leads Europe in the status of its artists.” It goes on to note that: “There is recognition that the skills of British artists are an integral part of the knowledge economy ... [however] It is a paradox that visual artists are not included in the current definition of the creative industries. This masks the overall contribution that they make both in economic and social terms” (ACE 2006, 23). This paper proposes that this paradox, that visual artists should suffer from limited visibility, goes further; it argues that over the last decade, 1997-2007, the period of the New Labour government in the UK, after a promising beginning, visual artists have become progressively more invisible within arts policy-making in England, and in the research which informs it. This is particularly true in the area of arts impact assessment, which has emerged as an influential and growing field of enquiry, and in which artists tend to feature only occasionally and as marginal subjects. In England, as in other developed countries, artists are increasingly being talked of as indispensable agents in the new knowledge-based economy, within which the creative industries are a key driver¹. It seems ironic, therefore, that their status and presence within public policy and research should appear to be diminishing.

INTRODUCTION

In an era which has tended increasingly towards evidence-based policy making, visual artists in England have lost visibility within the spheres of arts policymaking and arts-policy related research. Key to an understanding of why this might be the case are the concepts of “instrumentalism” and “autonomy”. The first term describes a process by which, in determining policy and allocating funding, artistic considerations are made subservient to wider societal agendas, such as contributing to economic or social regeneration; the second term (also labelled ‘art for art’s sake’) refers to a situation in which art is seen to have a value ‘in itself’ and which is, therefore, supported with public subsidy in a way which allows it to develop according to its own immanent dynamic (or – to reinstate the agency of the author - a dynamic which is determined by the artist who produces it), unfettered by the requirement to demonstrate any form of utilitarian outcome or benefit.

After looking at the evolution of the notion of ‘evidence-based policy-making’ and tracing its influence on the type of arts policy-related research that it has given rise to, I will argue that arts-focussed impact research, which has become increasingly prevalent over the last decade, is invariably concerned with the impacts produced on the recipients or beneficiaries of arts activity – audiences, participants or communities – rather than the impacts produced on the primary producer of art, ‘the artist’. As the character within the narrative of the arts without which new, contemporary artwork would cease to exist, the visual artist perhaps deserves more attention within both arts policy-related research and in the policy that it is undertaken to inform. The absence of the artist, and of the artists interests and concerns, from such research could exacerbate the tendency towards instrumentalism which is perceived already to be a dominant feature of the national arts strategy, and which will lead to a situation where the development of the arts in England is driven by the utilitarian demands of the wider society, as interpreted by government, rather than by the creative impulse of ‘the artist’.

THE POSITION OF THE ARTIST WITHIN ARTS POLICY AND POLICY-RELATED RESEARCH

The premise: the *invisibility* of visual artists

*The Right to Art: Making aspirations reality*², a polemical essay published in 2004 by the thinktank Demos, includes an unexpectedly discordant section headed “Invisible artists”. In it, the authors, Robert Hewison and John Holden, argue that: “In spite of the economic and social significance of their output, artists lack visibility in crucial ways ... In the government’s own definition of the creative industries ... there is no mention of painting, sculpture or other forms of individual visual creation. This demonstrates the low value placed upon individual artists ... They do not sit easily within the structures and methods that government – both central and local – have adopted to measure what they consider to be important ... It is as though visual artists are invisible” (Hewison 2004, 9).

I measure therefore I am³

Hewison and Holden’s reference to measurement is significant in that it alludes to a key trend that has been identified within UK arts and cultural policy-making (and UK public policy more generally) over the past 20 years: an increasing proclivity

towards 'evidenced-based policy', where policy is made and resources are allocated on the basis of measurable impacts on, and therefore benefits to, society. This trend has been observed and analysed by a number of cultural sector researchers (Selwood 2001, Reeves 2002, Belfiore 2004). Belfiore, posits a fundamental shift in cultural policy making since the 1980s, by which: "Public investment' in the arts is advocated on the basis of what are expected to be concrete and *measurable* economic and social impacts. Moreover, this shift has been accompanied by growing expectations that such beneficial impacts ought to be assessed and measured before demands on the public purse can be declared fully legitimate" (Belfiore 2004, 7).

A concomitant of this trend is what appears to be an increasing tendency, beginning within central government and cascading down to 'non-departmental public bodies' (such as ACE) which have the delegated authority for distributing funding and for setting the direction of policy, to value (and therefore to 'reward') the arts for the beneficial impacts that they are perceived to have on society; impacts which have come to be defined and assessed in terms that are commensurate with the wider government agendas of economic development and social inclusion. Policy in England with regard to the arts has, according to a common consensus (Selwood 2001, Belfiore 2002, Holden 2004), become unhealthily 'instrumental'. From the instrumental perspective, the arts are not principally valued in and of themselves, but for the ancillary economic and social benefits they are thought to give rise to.

As the length of the arm⁴ grows shorter, the focus on the artist shrinks

A key factor in the imputed recent instrumentalisation of the arts is the 'hands on', rather than 'arms length', approach to cultural policy taken by the present UK government. Concern about the dangers to the arts of too much government interference and control, has been widely articulated; most tellingly, perhaps, in a speech by the current Chair of ACE, Sir Christopher Frayling, in February 2005. "The distance between the Arts Council and government is narrowing," said Frayling. "While it was the Conservative government of the 1980s that first introduced the mantra 'culture should serve the economy', since 1997 New Labour has added a whole new list of priorities – still on the basis of instrumental outcomes. The DCMS is becoming more 'hands on'... and commitment to the benefits of the arm's length principle may be slowly ebbing away... the length of the arm has become very short indeed - almost Venus de Milo length" (Frayling 2005, 19).

Since the Labour government took office in 1997, organisations funded by the government's DCMS, including ACE, have been obliged to deliver government objectives through sets of agreed targets. The DCMS is required, through a Public Service Agreement with the Treasury, to account for the impact of the cultural activities that it funds, assessing what difference they have made, and complying with the requirement to pursue evidence-based policy. Public Service Agreements were introduced in 1998, as part of the government's Comprehensive Spending Review. As a consequence, data collection has become a fundamental issue within the subsidised cultural sector.

The DCMS's Strategic Plan 2003-06 makes it clear that its remit goes far beyond what would normally be understood to be the boundaries of culture, media and

sport. In her Foreword to the Plan, the Secretary of State, Tessa Jowell, describes the DCMS as “a department which continues to make an important contribution to the Government’s agenda. Not only in culture, media and sport, but in the broader areas of the economy, education, health, crime prevention and regeneration” (DCMS 2003, 3).

One significant effect of the UK government’s instrumental approach to culture is that the focus of cultural research has become located ever more firmly on the recipients or beneficiaries of culture (be they audiences, participants, or communities) rather than on the producers (the artists). This may, in part, help to account for the ‘invisibility’ of visual artists within policy discourse posited by Hewison and Holden.

THE ARTIST AND ARTS POLICYMAKING IN ENGLAND

Artists as perennial bit-part players

Internationally, literature concerning the position of the artist within the arts policy process is thin on the ground. Jane Woddis notes that: “as a rule artists and arts organisations are not considered in the literature of cultural policy research as contributors to the policy-making process ... Given the central role of arts practitioners in making the culture that is the focus of cultural policy ... it appears a surprising omission” (Woddis 2005, 1) Woddis shows that in Britain the absence of artists from policymaking has deep historical roots: “the emphasis in the Arts Council charter on high standards in professional arts tended to put arts organisations at the centre of concern, artists as a whole were not generally involved in the key decision-making, and indeed there was a general suspicion about the participation of practitioners in both policy-making and implementation ... the structures through which the arts have been publicly funded in Britain since the Second World War have neither promoted a case for arts practitioners to be involved in policy-making, nor provided the mechanisms for them to do so.” The Arts Council’s early organisation: “adopted a system of advisory panels to which only a small number of individual and prominent artists were appointed ... Despite some changes in the following decades, this approach and outlook continued to dominate in the Arts Council’s organisation and operations, and has inevitably coloured attitudes toward the role of arts practitioners in the system” (31).

The artist as leading light: a fleeting phenomenon

Their lack of inclusion in the policymaking process (as agents of, or commentators on, policy formulation) is one factor which would explain the relative absence of focus on the artist as the subject of arts policy. During the first years of the 21st century, however, it seemed that artists, particularly visual artists, were set to take centre stage. The most visible signal that a new policy emphasis was being placed on artists as the new millennium dawned was the Arts Council sponsored ‘Year of the Artist’ (YotA), June 2000 to May 2001, which aimed to create residencies for ‘1000 artists in 1000 places across England’. Paddy Masefield, Chair of the YotA advisory ‘Think Tank’ hailed the year as a great success, claiming that: ‘it has melted century-old barriers between artists and their public,

created collaborations between artists ... refreshed the inspiration of artists once accused only of playing to the same audiences, and provided a new century with the most progressive experiment in arts funding of the last decade ... [it] should stand as a model for a new appreciation of artists in a new century. This should be the 'best of times' for artists.' (Capaldi 2001, 4)

A change of tack in the direction of 'the artist' appeared to be confirmed in the ACE manifesto document *Ambitions for the Arts: 2003-2006*. This document begins by announcing a new commitment to "placing artists at the centre". "The artist is the 'life source' of our work," it declares. "In the past, we have mainly funded institutions. Now we want to give higher priority to the artist." ACE then proceeds to list its five major areas for policy development for the three-year period. First on the list is a commitment to "prioritise individual artists". This commitment proved, though, to be short-lived. An analysis of the Arts Council's declared priorities for the current period, 2006-2008 (as articulated in the ACE Annual Review 2006), shows that the artist has been displaced from the centre and is consigned once again to the margins. Six national policy priorities for the arts are now listed: taking part in the arts; children and young people; the creative economy; vibrant communities; internationalism; and celebrating diversity. The artist now warrants mention merely as a footnote to a section on the 'creative economy'. "Helping artists to be successful," it says, "we develop partnerships that help artists contribute to the creative economy." From 'life source' to a sub-category of 'the creative economy' in just three years; how can this be explained?

The new emphasis on utility and its influence on arts policymaking structures

Guided by the UK government's 'instrumentalist' agenda, ACE has over the last decade become increasingly concerned to propound the social and economic benefits of the arts and appears consequently to be less interested in the development of art and artists *per se*. Artistic autonomy is being sacrificed at the altar of public utility. In order to demonstrate public utility, the Arts Council is turning its focus away from the producer of art (the artist) and on to the consumer (the audience, as it is variously defined). Hence the emphasis in its current list of priorities on 'taking part in the arts', 'children and young people' and 'vibrant communities'. Partly in order to be able to deliver more efficiently against the priorities laid down by government, via its Department of Culture, Media and Sport, the Arts Council has undergone three major organisational restructures in the period since New Labour took office. As a consequence of the first of these, completed during 1999, the position of the artist was, temporarily, strengthened. In the Council's Visual Arts Department; a team dedicated to formulating policy to assist Artists' Development was increased from two to three full-time posts. During the next four years the Artists' Development team – in discussion with colleagues in the English Regional Arts Boards - produced, for the first time *A National Framework Plan* for visual artists' development. Its purpose was "to provide a flexible, integrated framework for strategic planning on behalf of visual artists throughout England." The overarching objective was "to create, on a national basis, a supportive infrastructure through which artists can gain the space, professional skills and critical knowledge necessary to enable them to make the most of their creative abilities." The Plan was, however, abandoned as a consequence of the second ACE restructure, completed in 2003. In the second restructure, the three Artists' Development posts in the Arts Council's National

Office Visual Arts Department were effectively cut to half a post, leaving just one Senior Officer with responsibilities divided between Artists' Development and an International Fellowships Programme. The ACE *Ambitions for the Arts* policy manifesto, in which support for the artist was signalled as the number one corporate priority, was launched just at the point at which the human resource dedicated to policy development and implementation in this area was, largely, restructured out of the organisation. This lack of resource to follow through on its manifesto commitment provides one clear explanation for the marked shift in policy emphasis away from the artist in the period between 2003 and 2006. A third ACE organisational restructure was completed in October 2006. As a result, the Visual Arts Department at the Arts Council National Office, which has the remit for directing national policy and strategy for the arts in England, was dismantled completely. There is currently no human resource dedicated specifically to Artists' Development within this Office.

Artists in England lack collective lobbying power⁵

If the lack of a dedicated human resource exerting an internal influence at the Arts Council appears to have been one factor that explains why artists were losing visibility within national arts policy in the period from 2003 to 2006, artists in England were at the same time also relinquishing their potential to exert a collective external influence. In *Spear-Carriers or Speaking Parts? Arts Practitioners in the Cultural Policy Process*, Jane Woddis argues that "arts practitioners can be among the actors involved in cultural policy activity, and through self-directed action can enhance their place in the policy process ... Their involvement, or wish to be involved, in policy-making stems from an interest in ensuring that they can continue to produce their art, and that conditions are favourable for both the production and distribution of that art. It is in this context that they may seek to change policies." (Woddis 2005, 55)

However, visual artists in the England are currently lacking the kind of self-organised collective representation of the kind that Woddis argues (with particular reference to the 'new playwriting' sector) is a factor in being able to influence and participate in policymaking. This failure of collective representation for visual artists is due to the demise, in 2003, of the National Artists Association (NAA), just at the point at which the artist was set to take centre stage as the focus of national arts policy. After launching a well received Code of Practice for the Visual Arts in 1995, the NAA appeared to lose its way as an organisation that could effectively represent the professional interests of practicing artists. Encouraged by ACE, its principal funder, in 2002 the NAA commissioned an enquiry into the need for a national agency for visual artists in England. Its purpose was: "to identify the needs and aspirations of visual artists that a professional representative agency might fulfil ,, [and] if it is proven that there are gaps in provision, to produce a strategy detailing how best to meet them.' Following a national consultation process, the resulting report, *Strengthening the Infrastructure for Visual Artists*, (2003) found that: "very few of the artists and providers (of support services for artists) ... argued that the NAA should be revived ... the money earmarked by the Arts Council for the NAA could be more effectively spent elsewhere." Acting upon this finding, ACE decided to withdraw its financial support and the NAA was dissolved.

The report that led to the NAA's downfall made specific recommendations regarding how the Arts Council funding that it had previously received might best be reallocated to benefit artists. In particular, it proposed: "a nationwide specialist legal advice service for artists ... [and] the establishment of a Visual Artists' Research Unit, within, or in partnership with, a higher education institution ... to provide artists and their advocates with access to a research base ('hard facts') with which to support their case for an improvement in artists' working conditions." ACE subsequently awarded a sum approximately equivalent to that which it had given annually to the NAA to support two one-year pilot projects, Artlaw and the Visual Artists' Research Unit. Despite positive evaluations of both of these projects, ACE declined requests to continue its initial funding contribution. Both projects have been unable to source adequate alternative, sustainable funding and face an uncertain future.

THE RISE OF ARTS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A problem for the arts: the requirement to demonstrate value and measure 'impact'

ACE's failure to commit ongoing funding to support a Visual Artists' Research Unit seems likely to add to the problem of the visibility of artists within arts policy. It is already apparent that there is a dearth of artists-related research in one of the crucial areas that is producing the data which is fuelling evidence-based arts and cultural policy: the field of impact assessment. Impact assessment has emerged as a major sub-section of cultural research over the last ten to fifteen years. Literature reviews undertaken by ACE (Reeves 2002) and on behalf of the Scottish Executive (Ruiz 2004) point to an explosion of studies in this area. Despite the volume of new material produced on impact, however, it is widely considered that the quality of the research is not necessarily of a high order, and that its value as an aid to policy is consequently dubious. In her introduction to *The UK cultural sector: profile and policy issues*, 2001, Sara Selwood raises the question: "How can we have 'evidence-based policy', when there's no evidence?" She continues: "This [book] is the first time that a comprehensive profile of the sector has ever been attempted and the lack of data is shocking ... There has been a consistent failure to establish dependable data on the cultural sector, and much of the information currently available is inconsistent and unreliable .. This means that policy decisions and government initiatives are rarely based on an accurate picture of the sector, and little is known about their impact."

Acknowledging the criticisms and shortcomings related to arts-sector research identified by Selwood and others (e.g. Reeves 2002, Belfiore 2004), in 2004, ACE joined with the then Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB, now called the Arts and Humanities Research Council, or AHRC) to establish fellowships in arts impact evaluation in three English universities. A fourth arts impact fellowship was established in the following year, funded solely by the AHRC⁶. The sponsoring bodies hope that the work done in the course of these fellowships will lead to: "better methodologies, systems and data for the evaluation of socio-economic impacts arising from the activities we fund," (ACE, 2004, p.3). The emphasis within these respective fellowships on measuring 'socio-economic impacts' militates against the probability that the artist will be a key concern within the programmes of work that result from the fellowships.

Evidence of the invisibility of artists within arts impact research

In recognition of the growing prevalence and importance of impact research, the Centre for Cultural Policy Research at the University of Glasgow, with funding from the Scottish Executive, has initiated a comprehensive international 'Impact research database' focussed on the cultural sector (<http://ccpr.designiscentral.net>). A search of this database, on May 26 2007, using the keywords 'artists' and 'artist' identified 30 reports of potential relevance, out of a total of 436. An analysis of the 'Objectives' and 'Key Findings' of these studies revealed, however, that only three⁷, all drawn from the United States, had artists, or artists' related issues, as their principal subject of enquiry. The absence of any UK-initiated studies focussed on artists would appear to confirm my hypothesis that artists are largely invisible in the research evidence-base which is said to be driving arts policy development in England.

CONCLUSION

'The tail is wagging the dog'

Impact assessment research has in the past decade assumed a new priority within the arts sector in England. Driven by an instrumental imperative to demonstrate the value of the arts to society, this category of research pays little attention to the intrinsic situation of artists; the impact that funding has on the producers of art is overlooked in favour of an analysis of the impact that art has at the point of consumption.

The practice of impact measurement which has begun to dominate arts-sector research in England could have negative consequences for artists. Its demonstrable bias towards measuring the effects of arts activities on the recipients (the audiences) will mean that the evidence captured to inform arts policy will be skewed towards the needs of the consumers of art rather than the needs of the producers. Following the logic of 'evidence-based policymaking', the consequence must inevitably be that the policies that ensue will privilege the arts consumer, rather than the artist. This, in turn, will lead to a situation where the cycle of instrumentalisation, which is perceived to have developed a stranglehold on the arts in England during the period of New Labour, is perpetuated, if not exacerbated. The link between impact assessment and instrumentalisation, has been well-noted by John Holden: "The gathering of evidence about the impact of the sector has assumed centre stage in the management of the subsidized cultural sector in England. It is closely associated with an extension of government control over the sector" (Holden 2004, 14).

Holden observes that the audit culture that has been imported into the arts may, through the public-sector funding practices that it encourages, already be having a detrimental effect on the art that gets made: "Many artists, feel that they are made to jump through hoops and that they create art in spite of the funding system. Their ability to 'play the game' and write highly articulate funding proposals is more important than the work ... the identifiable measures and 'ancillary benefits'

that flow from culture have become more important than the cultural activity itself: the tail is wagging the dog” (14).

There are signs that an anxiety about the possible detrimental effects of too overtly instrumental an approach to cultural development is also beginning to be felt at government level too. In May 2004, in what was billed as a ‘personal essay’ the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Tessa Jowell, admitted: “Too often politicians have been forced to debate culture in terms only of its instrumental benefits to other agendas ... we have to understand it and speak up for it on its own terms ... at the heart of this Government’s core agenda, not as a piece of top down social engineering” (Jowell, 2004, 10).

A way forward: artist-centred models of impact assessment

Speaking up for culture and art ‘on its own terms’ must inevitably mean paying more attention to the artists who produce it. Alongside the proliferating evidence-base testifying to the social impacts of the arts, artist-centred methodologies for impact assessment should be developed. These would provide perspectives on arts development priorities from the point of view of the producer and would offer a valuable counter-balance to user-centric research. Policy for arts development could then be more producer-led, rather than, as now seems overwhelmingly to be the case, consumer-driven.

A recent fellowship at the University of the Arts London provided a context within which it was possible to demonstrate what an artist-centred impact study might look like. The focus of the study⁸ was the impacts of the funding given by a private foundation on the practices and careers of artists; not, as would usually be the case, the impact of arts activity on the economy or society. In terms of the overall field of impact assessment, the study therefore marks a shift of emphasis from consumer to producer. It asked the question: ‘What were the impacts of independent trust funding on the practices and careers of the visual artists who were supported?’

Arts funding is usually awarded on the expectation of some kind of direct and tangible output, such as the creation of a new facility or the staging of an exhibition. However, in addition to the primary anticipated result, many secondary or indirect benefits and impacts can flow from a particular instance of arts funding. ‘Softer’ impacts, such as, in this instance, benefits of esteem, often go unobserved and unrecorded. This study, which involved fact-to-face interviews with 41 artists, provided an opportunity to take an uncommonly holistic overview of the kinds of impacts and consequences that might be either caused or facilitated by the provision of independent funding. The artists who formed the sample were not awarded funding on the expectation that they would produce social or economic impacts of the kind normally looked for in impact studies. Nor were they required by their funder to measure and account in any significant way for the money they were awarded. This created a context whereby it was possible to examine in an exploratory way, privileging the artists’ perspective, the range of outcomes (be they positive or negative) that resulted from an act of funding.

It is hoped that this study might provide useful insights into the outcomes of a non-instrumental type of cultural investment which regards support for artists as a

sufficient value in itself. It is also hoped that the methodologies devised might be of use to other researchers with an interest in measuring cultural impact, or in examining the practices and careers of artists and that it might consequently, in its modest way, contribute to making visual artists more visible within cultural policy discourse and research.

REFERENCES

Allen, K. & Shaw, P. (2003), *Strengthening the infrastructure for visual artists*, January 2003.

Arts and Culture in the New Economy (special edition 2002) *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Summer 2002

Arts Council England (2003), *Ambitions for the Arts: 2003-2006*

Arts Council England (2006), *Annual Review 2006*

Arts Council England (2004), *The impact of the arts: some research evidence*, May 2004

Arts Council England (2006), *Turning Point: A Strategy for the Contemporary Visual Arts in England*

Arts Council England (2002) *Visual Artists: A National Framework Plan: The Planning Guide for Visual Artists Development*, Produced by the National Steering Group for Artists' Development, July 2002 (internal document)

Belfiore E. (2002), *Art as a means towards alleviating social exclusion: does it really work? – A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK*, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8.1, 2002

Belfiore, E. (2004), *Auditing Culture: the subsidized cultural sector in the New Public Management*, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10.2, 2004

Belfiore, E. (2003), *Economic Impacts: Inconclusive Evidence*, *Arts Professional*, Issue 43, 10 February 2003

Capaldi, N., and Chadbourn, D., (eds) (2001), *Year of the Artist*, June 2000 – May 2001, Arts2000, Sheffield

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2003), *Strategic Plan 2003-2006*

Frayling, C. (2005), *'The only trustworthy book...'* *Art and public value*, speech, February 16 2005, London, Arts Council England

Hewison, R. & Holden, J. (2004), *The Right to Art: Making aspirations reality*, London, Demos, June 2004

Holden, J. (2004), *Capturing Cultural Value: How culture has become a tool of government policy*, London, Demos

Jowell, T. (2004), *Government and the value of culture*, speech May 2004, London, DCMS

Kimbell, L. (2003), *I measure therefore I am*, website information on AHRB Fellowship at Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art, University of Oxford, www.lucykimbell.com

Reeves, M. (2002), *Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts*, London, Arts Council England

Ruiz, J. (2004), *A Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, The Arts and Sport Policy*, Edinburgh, Social Research, Scottish Executive Education Department, February 2004

Selwood, S. (2002), *The Politics of Data Collection*, Cultural Trends 47, London, Policy Studies Institute

Selwood, S. [ed.] (2001), *The UK cultural sector: profile and policy issues*, London, Policy Studies Institute

Woddis, J., (2005), *Spear-Carriers or Speaking Parts? Arts Practitioners in the Cultural Policy Process*, University of Warwick, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, May 2005

NOTES

¹ Steven Jay Tepper (*Creative Assets and the Changing Economy*, JAMLS, Vol. 32, No. 2, Summer 2002, 159) writes: "Many arts advocates and policymakers have argued that certain changes in the economy (globalization, digitalization, the rise of the 'knowledge' worker, the boom in intellectual property, changes in leisure consumption) are having a catalytic effect on art and culture. In particular the arts are heralded as engines of economic growth and development. Scholars and pundits have written about the central role of the creative cities, creative clusters, creative economies and the rise of the 'creative class'. Governments have begun to measure the size and scope of the creative economy as an important indicator of economic health. In short, there is a growing belief that changes in the economy have pushed creative assets to the center of economic life."

² Commissioned by the UK Visual Arts and Galleries Association (VAGA), this essay argues that, in accordance with Article 27 of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, the right "freely to participate in cultural life" and to "enjoy the arts" should be regarded as a basic human right.

³ The title here is borrowed from the artist Lucy Kimbell's, practice-based AHRB research fellowship at the Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art, University of Oxford (2003-2005). The premise for the fellowship was that: "Practitioners across all disciplines in business, government, academia and the arts are measuring more and more things. The measuring is supposedly helping them determine the value of things such as return on investment, but frequently becomes an end in itself." Kimbell's project set out "to query and engage with the culture of measurement by asking different practitioners what and why they measure." (source: www.lucykimbell.com). The logic of Kimbell's project seems to mirror the thinking of Hewison and Holden: in contemporary society measurement = existence; absence of measurement = non existence, or (in Hewison and Holden's terms) invisibility.

⁴ The 'arms length principle' is a defining characteristic of how the arts have been funded and managed in Britain since the formation of the Arts Council in 1946. It is defined, by Sir Christopher Frayling, thus: "... it means that, while Arts Council England is funded by the Treasury through the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), it is independent

of government. Technically, we are known as a 'non-departmental public body'. The government evolves the policy framework but it is not supposed to interfere with implementation." (*The only trustworthy book*, 16 February 2005, p.15)

⁵ The situation in England contrast with that in Scotland where the Scottish Artists Union (SAU) was constituted in 2001. The SAU lobbies for the rights and values of artists within Scottish culture through regular meetings and contacts with the Ministers and MSPs at the Scottish Parliament and senior officials at the Scottish Arts Council.

⁶ The fellowships are located at the Universities of Southampton ('the impact of musical performance'); Warwick ('the social impact of the arts' with a focus on literature, theatre and music); Newcastle ('the economic impact of arts and humanities'); and Leeds, funded solely by the AHRC ('the impact of higher education on the creative industries').

⁷ *Artists' centers. Evolution and impact on careers, neighborhoods and economies*, Markusen A. and Johnson, A.; *The economic impact of Montana artists*, Adair, A. L. and Kristin S Wagner, K. S.; *The artistic dividend: the arts' hidden contributions to regional development*, Markusen, A. and King D.

⁸ A version of this report, *Independent Trust Funding for the Arts in the UK, a Case Study: a Report on the Impact of Rootstein Hopkins Foundation Funding*, which looks at the impacts of funding on arts institutions as well as on artists, can be viewed at <http://rhf.wimbledon.ac.uk>. For the purposes of my PhD research, an alternative version of the report, which considers artists only, will be produced.