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Abstract

This study identifies six key reasons explaining the social phenomenon that many practising fine artists find it so difficult to make a living in the arts.

Due to a marked paucity of research explaining this social phenomenon, the study at hand investigates the internal factors related to artists’ personality, motivation, and skills as well as various external factors influencing artists’ working and business environment by applying two acknowledged analysis tools in strategic business management.

The literature findings highlight four external threat factors mainly responsible for a very challenging working and business environment affecting practising fine artists’ chances of professional success. Consequently, two internal factors – notably artists’ motivation and ambition to conduct business and a living in the arts as well as their developed skills – turn out to be key factors to successfully deal with these external threat factors. In this context, three research aims related to practising artists’ professional education and preparation arise: the identification of crucial skills to successfully make a living in the arts as practising artists, the status of their professional education at higher education institutions (HEIs), and the capability of arts incubators as alternative education programmes to prepare large numbers of practising fine artists for professional success.

The approach to investigation is exploratory and inductive with a cross-sectional survey strategy. To identify the crucial skills for professional success in the arts, surveys of up to 219 fine art lecturers, 168 fine art undergraduates, and 149 commercial galleries are conducted. To report on the status of fine artists’ educational preparation, 87 undergraduate degree programmes, 55 post-graduate programmes, and 46 extracurricular training offerings at HEIs are investigated. The study focuses mainly on the UK and Germany. These countries are selected due to their significantly different market sizes and reputation for the purpose of identifying differences in market challenges and professional preparations faced by fine artists. To analyse arts incubators’ capability in preparing large numbers of practising fine artists for a professional career, 92 arts incubation programmes around the globe are analysed and nine structured interviews with practising fine artists are conducted.

The investigation of the crucial skills for fine artists’ professional success highlights in particular the development of an entrepreneurial mindset as well as of seven skills. Research on arts education shows evidence that fine art graduates are hardly equipped with this skillset and mindset due to HEIs’ lack of focus on the professional careers of practising artists. The analysis of arts incubation programmes illustrates serious limitations in supporting larger numbers of practising fine artists in their professional endeavours.

The research findings stimulate the discussion in, and contribute to, knowledge in the fields of artists’ professional preparation, arts entrepreneurship, and the redesigning of fine art curriculum to purposefully prepare fine art graduates for an entrepreneurial and professional career as practising artists.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

“The mission of the art is to make visible the whole reality.” (Beuys, 1974)

1.0 Introduction

The study aims to reveal the reasons why the vast majority of practising fine artists show difficulties in making a living in the arts. For the marked paucity of research in this specific field fails to provide adequate explanations. Knowledge of these reasons is considered relevant for the targeted professional preparation and career development of practising fine artists.

Generally, an artist can be considered in accordance to the definition of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), cited in Paderno (1999, p. 3) as

“Any person who creates art or gives creative expression to, or recreates works of art, who considers his artistic creation to be an essential part of his life, who contributes in this way to the development of art and culture and who is or asks to be recognised as an artist, whether or not he is bound by any relations of employment or association.”

Considering the fact that still no universally accepted definition of the term art exists, the following simple working definition can be applied in the context of this research:

Art is created when an artist creates an object or produces a stimulating experience that is considered by an audience to have artistic merit.

A fine artist is thus a person in the sense of the aforementioned definitions who is involved in making paintings, drawings, sculptures, and photographs (see Appendix A for definitions and details).

1.1 Research Motivation

According to the TEFAF report 2016, cited in Artnet.news (2016a), the global art market, as publicly presented, has considerably grown in the last decades and achieved total sales of 63.8 billion US dollars in 2015 with a total of 38.1 million transactions. These figures highlight a huge and dynamic market, even though more than 80% of practising fine artists are estimated as experiencing difficulties in getting a slice of this big cake to
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make a living (Thurnhofer, 2014), meaning to professionally survive without subsidies and multiple job holdings, as shown by recent income statistics (e.g. Towse, 1996, 2006; Hill Strategies Research, 2004; Bridgstock, 2007; AIR, 2011; Bundesverband Bildender Künstlerinnen und Künstler (BBK), 2011a, 2011b; Institut für Mittelstandsfororschung Bonn, 2011; Skalski, 2011; Söndermann, 2012; Thurnhofer, 2014; Ulloa, 2014; ONS, 2015; Künstlersozialkasse, 2016).

Due to a marked paucity of research revealing and explaining the reasons responsible for this social phenomenon, the study at hand investigates the internal factors related to artists’ personality, motivations, and skills as well as the various external factors affecting artists’ working and business environment. Knowledge of these reasons is relevant for artists’ targeted professional preparation and career development.

1.2 Research Background and Aims

The vast majority of graduates holding bachelor’s and master’s degrees in fine arts have to adjust to the fact that they will, in all likelihood, find it difficult to make a living or professionally survive as practising artists, even when they have graduated with top marks (Kikol, 2017). According to the job profiles presented on Prospects.ac.uk (2016), the UK’s official graduate careers website, practising fine artists who aim to make a living face a set of very demanding business-related and non-art related tasks that are highlighted in Table 1.2-1, in stark contrast to other freelance professions, for example, solicitors or farm managers.

Table 1.2-1: Job Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Manager</th>
<th>Solicitor</th>
<th>Fine Artist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• planning finances and production to maintain farm progress against budget parameters;</td>
<td>• negotiating with clients and other professionals to secure agreed objectives;</td>
<td>• administration, correspondence, creating publicity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• marketing the farm’s products;</td>
<td>• coordinating the work of all parties involved;</td>
<td>• project planning, creating and managing a budget, financial planning, calculating expenditure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• making sure products are ready for deadlines, such as auctions and markets;</td>
<td>• corresponding with clients and opposing solicitors;</td>
<td>• managing tax and self-employment issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ensuring current government regulations concerning farm activities are complied with;</td>
<td>• attending meetings and negotiations with opposing parties;</td>
<td>• organisation and administration tasks associated with running a studio;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• keeping financial records up to date;</td>
<td>• calculating claims for damages, compensation, maintenance, etc;</td>
<td>• writing project proposals for galleries, competitions or artist residencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• planning activities for trainee staff, mentoring and monitoring them.</td>
<td>• administrative duties, e.g. completing time sheets so that charges for work can be calculated and billing clients for work done on their behalf.</td>
<td>• writing funding applications (public and private);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• applying for residencies and competitions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• liaising with contacts, gallery owners, curators and other artists;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• curating individual and group shows;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• negotiating a sale or commission;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• self-promotion, networking, attending private views and other events;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• writing press releases;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• maintaining a portfolio which will typically include a website;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluating a project and feeding back to the main funder or sponsor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source: Adapted from Prospects.ac.uk (2016)

Among other duties, they are required to manage themselves in all issues including calculating expenditures, managing their financial budget and administration tasks, conducting activities for self-promotion, as well as negotiating sales or liaising with contacts. This demanding profile results from the expectation that working fine artists are highly likely self-employed one-person businesses (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2010; Arts Council England (ACE), 2009, 2011; Artists Interaction and Representation (AIR), 2011; Bundesverband Bildender Künstlerinnen und Künstler, 2011; Centre for Economics and Business Research, 2013). It is, however, still questionable whether this challenging job profile is the key reason for working artists’ poor and uncertain professional future perspectives. The question arises as to what factors affect practising fine artists’ chances of professional success and income.

To identify these factors, this study reviews the literature in various fields comprising, on the one hand, internal factors with regard to artists’ personality, motivations, talent, developed skills, and individual luckiness. Due to the simple fact that practising fine artists operate in a specific environment, the literature additionally reviews, on the other hand, the different external factors of their working and business environment. The external environmental factors are identified with the help of two widely acknowledged analysis tools in strategic business management. Both tools enable the identification of factors particularly affecting contemporary art market’s participants (micro environmental factors) as well as the whole arts sector (macro environmental factors).

As a consequence of the literature findings, which include the key facts that the external factors are mainly beyond artists’ control, personality traits are hard to change, artistic talent alone is usually no guarantee and hunger for success is an important prerequisite for professional success in the arts, this study’s research focuses particularly on working fine artists’ educational preparation to self-manage their professional careers. This focus has high relevance since education and professional preparation seems to be the only key factor which practising fine artists can actively and directly develop and control as an individual success factor to make a living – assuming of course that artistic talent and commercial orientation are given.

In light of this research background, the thesis at hand was driven by three research areas, as illustrated in Figure 1.2-1., starting firstly by identifying the crucial skills for the
professional success of practising artists, defined as being able to make a living in the arts without multiple job holdings or receiving further governmental subsidies. This is followed secondly by revealing the status of fine artists’ professional preparation at HEIs in the UK and Germany. These countries were selected due to their significantly different market sizes and international reputations with the purpose in mind of identifying differences in market challenges and professional preparations faced by fine artists. The third research area addresses the training programmes of arts incubators as policy tools to alternatively facilitate the professional development of working fine artists who want to earn a living in the arts. The analysis focuses in particular on art incubators’ capability to scale up their business support services for large numbers of fine artists, since they usually provide them to only a few local artists.

Figure 1.2-1: Research Areas
Source: Author’s own illustration

The research findings stimulate the discussion in the fields of fine artists’ professional preparation, arts entrepreneurship, and the redesigning of fine art curriculum.

1.3 Dissertation Structure

The thesis is structured in six chapters. Chapter 2, following this introducing chapter, provides a brief overview of what this study is basically about: the contemporary fine arts market. It describes the various key participants and their main roles in the market
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(section 2.2.1) as well as the structure and segments of the art market (section 2.2.2). This environment is assumed to contain several factors enormously influencing fine artists’ chances for professional success and income.

The identification and review of these factors is the key task of the literature review in Chapter 3. Essentially, two categories of factors influencing fine artists’ career success and income are distinguished: internal and external factors. The former are explicitly related to artists’ personality including their motivations, typical personality pattern (traits), talent, abilities, skills (education), attitudes, and their individual luck factor. The internal factors are reviewed in the sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.6. The latter, external factors are related to fine artists’ working and business environment. In order to identify and classify the various areas in which external factors can arise, two widely acknowledged strategic business management tools provide valuable indications. Both tools are usually applied for analysing industries and evaluating organisations’ competitive positioning in their markets, but they are also useful for determining the different factors of practising fine artists’ working and business environment. These tools are Porter’s Five Forces (Porter, 1980, 2000, 2008a, 2008b) and the PESTLE analysis (Professional Academy, 2016). The analysis of the contemporary fine art market or industry in accordance to Porter’s model follows in sections 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.5 of Chapter 3. The PESTLE analysis can be used to consider the impact of political, economic, social, technological, legal, and ecological or environmental issues (Professional Academy, 2016) on fine artists’ working and business environment. These factors are beyond artists’ control. This analysis is part of the sections 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.6 of Chapter 3. The three aims of investigation, as illustrated in Figure 1.2-1 above, are identified and derived as research gaps from the literature reviewed.

Chapter 4 describes the research methodology for the thesis including its philosophy as well as applied design and research methods chosen for achieving the different research aims. The approach to investigation is exploratory and inductive with a cross-sectional qualitative survey strategy. The applied research methods to achieve the first research aim include the analysis of secondary data as well as surveys by questionnaire of 219 fine art lecturers (see Appendix D), 168 fine art undergraduates (see Appendix F), and 149 commercial and contemporary fine art galleries (see Appendix G). To achieve the second research aim, 87 undergraduate degree programmes, 55 post-graduate
programmes, and 46 extracurricular trainings offered at higher education institutions (HEIs) in the UK and Germany as well as institutions’ strategic objectives, missions, and visions towards arts entrepreneurship education were examined (see Appendix H for details). Both countries were selected, again, for the purpose of identifying any differences in educational systems. Finally, to achieve the third research aim, structured interviews with nine practising fine artists (see Appendix C) were conducted as well as the business models of 92 art incubators (see Appendix I for details) presented, analysed, and evaluated. This research was conducted between December 2013 and April 2016. Scientific saturation of this qualitative study was reached.

Chapter 5 is devoted to presenting the research findings addressing the three research aims and research methods illustrated in Chapter 4, i.e. to identify fine artists’ crucial skills for professional success and earning a living in the arts (section 5.1), to investigate the arts education and professional preparation at HEIs in the UK and Germany (section 5.2), and to analyse the scalability of business services for large numbers of working artists provided by arts incubation programmes (section 5.3). This is concluded by a summarising section (section 5.4).

The research findings reveal the importance of an entrepreneurial mindset, including open-minded thinking and behaviour to be prepared for opportunities, as well as of seven entrepreneurial skills, along with art-specific talent and skills (section 5.1). The identification of these skills were used to define a working model of the ‘five plus two’ crucial entrepreneurial skills, which was in turn applied for further research with regard to fine artists’ educational preparation in section 5.2. This said section addresses in particular the second research aim by considering, probably for the first time, the questions of whether, how, and to what extent fine art students are educated to become successfully working artists. In this context, fine art students’ professional preparation was determined by applying particular key performance indicators. It became quite clear what skills were taught, how they were taught, and to what extent they were taught in the regular fine art curriculum and additional extracurricular training courses at HEIs. Research shows that fine art students are hardly equipped with the entrepreneurial mindset and crucial ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills due to several serious reasons. After that, section 5.3 analyses arts incubation services as alternative means of improving fine artists’ professional and entrepreneurial development and preparation. The
investigation of arts incubators shows serious limitations in existing programmes to scale up their services for facilitating larger numbers of working fine artists who want to earn a living.

Chapter 6 finalises the thesis by highlighting its key findings and contributions to knowledge, showing its limitations in the confines of this research study, and providing interesting approaches for further research in the fields of fine artists' business environment, professional preparation, arts entrepreneurship education, redesigning fine art curriculum, and incubation in the fine arts.
Chapter 2 The Contemporary Fine Arts Market

“Nobody knows you when you’re down and out.” (Eric Clapton, song text)

2.0 Introduction

The term *art market* is often understood as encompassing all fine and decorative art and antiques, ranging from classical and medieval artefacts to contemporary art (British Art Market Federation (BAMF), 2011). In the context of this study, the term art market is used specifically in relation to the art disciplines and sectors of contemporary fine art including paintings, drawings, sculpture, collages, and photographs (see Appendix A for definitions and details).

Section 2.1 of this chapter focuses on the international contemporary art markets by providing an overview of the largest geographical and most influencing markets. The detailed description of art market’s structure including the identification of key market participants and market barriers for artists has been barely studied. These issues will be discussed in section 2.2.

2.1 The International Art Markets

In the current epoch of the Internet, the contemporary fine art “market has become internationalised up to the point to becoming a worldwide market” (Codignola, 2003, p. 87). However, precise and complete data of the complete international contemporary fine art market is not available due to its highly fragmented nature, ranging from small local markets to worldwide auction markets with a great variety and number of art buyers and sellers (Codignola, 2003).

However, the global art market, as publicly presented, achieved total sales of 63.8 billion US dollars in 2015 with a total of 38.1 million transactions and was dominated by the three major art markets of the U.S. (43%), the UK (21%), and China (19%), according to recent market data of TEFAF Art Market Report, cited in Artnet.news (2016a). The European art market was absolutely dominated by the UK with 64% (at 13.5 billion US dollars), followed by France with a market share of 19% and Germany with 5% (Artnet.news, 2016a). Yet these figures only represent published transactions, such as auction trades, which is a trading level of the art market. Transactions in other market segments or trading levels (see section 2.2.2) are rarely highlighted, usually due to their
lack of transparency. According to Artpace.com (2016a), paintings generated 67% of the art market’s total turnover, followed by sculptures (15%) and drawings (11%). Photography (5%) and prints (2%) lay at the bottom of the list in the contemporary fine art auction markets.

2.2 Structure of the Contemporary Fine Art Market

The structure of the contemporary fine art market is characterised by its different participants (section 2.2.1), market segments and trading levels (section 2.2.2), including the primary (first-time sale of artworks) and secondary (reselling of artworks) trading levels (e.g. Singer and Lynch, 1994; Throsby, 1994; Robertson, 2005; Thompson, 2008; Resch, 2011).

2.2.1 The Role of Art Market Participants

Artists are the producers of works of art and therefore considered “the heart of the activities” in the art market (Jyrämä and Äyväri, 2006, p. 5). As schematically illustrated in the inner circle of Figure 2.2-1 below, the art market in the narrow sense comprises art-producing artists as well as art-demanding collectors (art buyers) as the two major poles. Between these key poles there is a third group of highly important market participants, the so-called commercial intermediaries. The key commercial intermediaries are individuals and institutions, such as galleries, art dealers, or art consultants, devoted to both dissemination and interpretation of art and its quality (Boll, 2011; Jurevičienė and Savičenko, 2011; Thurnhofer, 2014). Considering the relationship between these key participants, the art market in the narrow sense can also be considered a commercial intermediary itself, matching supply and demand for artistic works. Participants who are not considered the core of the art market are illustrated in the outer circle of Figure 2.2-1. The illustration is not exhaustive since many more groups have established business models in the art market.

The relations between artists and galleries/collectors will be discussed in section 3.2.1.4 within the literature research. The upcoming section shall briefly introduce the commercial intermediaries so as to better understand their basic role in artists’ chances of professional career and income. In this context, a more differentiated view of the art
market structure and intermediaries’ impact on fine artists’ professional success will be, however, discussed in section 2.2.2 of this chapter.

![Image: Art Market Participants](Source: Author’s own illustration)

### 2.2.1.1 Commercial Intermediaries

Commercial intermediaries can be divided into three basic categories: galleries and auction houses, art dealers, and art consultants (Jyrämä, 2002; Jyrämä and Äyväri, 2010; Boll, 2011; Jurevičienė and Savičenko, 2011; Niklasson, 2014; Thurnhofer, 2014). The key difference between galleries and auction houses is that they operate mainly on different trading levels, as described in section 2.2.2.1 in more detail. Traditionally, galleries primarily help artists to establish artworks on the art market for the first time (primary market), while the business of auction houses mainly focuses on secondary trading levels by reselling already established works of art (Boll, 2011; Thurnhofer, 2014). However, traditional barriers for businesses have increasingly disappeared over the last decades, since (at least the major) galleries also operate on the secondary markets or since auction houses and galleries increasingly work hand in hand or are closely connected as investors and shareholders in each other’s businesses (Boll, 2011).
Art dealers are also actively involved in secondary trades. The key difference between an art gallery and art dealers is their service spectrum. While galleries’ and art dealers’ main function is to make artworks “accessible to the public in both a concrete and an intellectual sense” (Boll, 2011, p. 29; Jyrämä, 2002; Jyrämä and Äyväri, 2010; Niklasson, 2014), an art gallery is usually additionally involved in curating and organising exhibitions at an art space (Boll, 2011). Both service providers can therefore be considered the ‘central place’ to introduce artists to the market. Jyrämä and Äyväri (2006, p. 6) speak in this context of galleries’ task of presenting and opening art to society and “participat[ing] in the dialogue to advance contemporary art.”

Art consultants also play an important role in the art market. They provide support to wealthy private or institutional collectors or museums with their in-depth knowledge of art history, tax laws, trends, or business. In a few countries, art consulting is legally regulated. For example, independent art consultants in Germany or France are certified by the Chamber of Industry and Commerce or by the Auctioneers Council and must be publicly appointed and sworn in (Boll, 2011). Their main task is to establish the authenticity and value of artworks, and to operate as advisors for insurance purposes and before courts of law.

Interior decorators are further representatives of commercial intermediaries. They are, however, not considered key market participants in the art market (Resch, 2011; Thurnhofer, 2014) and therefore illustrated in the outer circle of Figure 2.2-1. Interior decorators usually advise wealthy clients in matters of home interior and living environment (also see section 3.2.2.3.1 for details). Their influence on determining trends in the fine arts is not to be underestimated. Interior decorators are ‘opinion formers’ for their clients with regard to trends in the arts (Boll, 2011).

Banks and insurance companies also offer art consulting as a service for their wealthy clients in the context of their financial service and asset management departments (Boll, 2011).

**2.2.1.2 Content-related Intermediaries**

Museums are considered the most important content-related intermediaries in the art market. The main difference between them and commercial galleries is that museums do not offer art for sale. They do not pursue monetary rewards as primary business
objectives. Instead they preserve, research, expand, and present collections of works of specific artists who usually have developed a high market reputation and social value. Museums therefore regard themselves as research institutions permanently seeking aesthetic quality (Boll, 2011; Jurevičienė and Savičenko, 2011). With their main function as an ‘aesthetic authority,’ museums have an enormous, indirect impact on the art market that transcends far beyond their role as art buyers. Artworks sold to or exhibited in museums raise their social value and thus also their market reputation and price (Boll, 2011). This is why commercially oriented market participants aim to work together with museums, since they are better able to create an appropriate environment for presenting quality (see also section 3.2.2.3.2 with regard to the importance of an appropriate setting for the presentation of high-quality artworks).

Media coverage also makes an important impact on the art market and artists’ professional success, given the fact that public and media interest in the art market has grown over the last decades. In the digital age, evaluations of artists and their works have essentially been a product of many voices in (social) media constantly expressing subjective commentaries (Boll, 2011; Jurevičienė and Savičenko, 2011). Previously, the evaluation of art in the media belonged to a mere handful of participants, including museums, collectors, galleries, and some more or less selected art critics and journalists. With the Internet and social media, however, everyone is able to individually express subjective evaluations to the community interested in the arts (see section 3.2.2.4 for more details with regard to technology as a business factor in the arts).

Art education organisations such as art colleges and universities have an indirect influence on the level of art quality produced by the art market because they have a direct impact on the process of developing high-quality art personalities who are ideally prepared for their working and business environment in the best possible way (Jurevičienė and Savičenko, 2011). The analysis of arts education is part of the sections 3.1.5.2 and 5.2.

Considering all this, Jyrämä (2002), Jyrämä and Äyväri (2010), and Niklasson (2014) describe the contemporary art market as a “network structure consisting of different networks” (Jyrämä and Äyväri, 2006, p. 5) of the abovementioned market participants, while the power and relationships within and between these existing networks permanently change (Velthuis, 2012).
2.2.2 The Contemporary Fine Art Market Trading Levels and Segments

2.2.2.1 Difference between the Primary and Secondary Trading Levels

The primary art market refers to an artwork’s coming to the market for the first time at a gallery or any other art exhibition. This is the time when the price for the artwork is established for the first time. In technical terms, the art gallery or dealer, in conjunction with the artist, establishes a selling price based on the cost of research and development and creation of the product. The age-old truism from the economic theory on supply and demand defines this pricing structure, whereas the initial market price of the first artwork of an artist is very often indicated by a standard calculation due to a lack of comparable market prices and price history. In the case of paintings, for example, galleries often indicate the initial market price of the first artwork of totally unknown emerging artists by applying the following calculation formula: height plus breadth (in centimetres) multiplied by the art coefficient 10 (Koldehoff, 2012). Depending on further factors, such as current trends or the artist’s personality and expected future perspectives, this art coefficient may change considerably. When demand grows for the works of a particular artist, whether paintings, sculptures, photographs, or graphic prints, the market prices also increase.

Once the artwork is purchased on the primary market and the purchaser, whether a collector, business, foundation or dealer, decides to sell it, it enters the secondary market or trading level. In more simpler and even disrespectful terms, one would refer to the secondary market as the ‘used’ or ‘second-hand’ market.

2.2.2.2 Differences between the Art Market Segments

When art market research institutes such as TEFAF (section 2.1 above) or media refer to ‘the art market,’ this expression is inaccurate for exactly knowing what is meant or what this term comprises. Thurnhofer (2014, p. 9) claims in this context that “there does not exist the one unified art market, but many art markets and the permeability is infinitesimally between the markets” (see Appendix L for more details). He provides a detailed overview of the structure of the contemporary art market that can be classified in his opinion as strictly hierarchically structured like a pyramid with explicit barriers between them (Figure 2.2-2). The five different market segments mainly differ in their degrees of access (Appendix L), visibility, and organisation including matching of supply and demand.
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2.2.2.2.1 The Olympus

According to Thurnhofer (2014), the Olympus includes more or less the top 100 artists worldwide, globally known by the vast majority of the people. Representatives of this top level were and still are artists the likes of Andy Warhol, Pablo Picasso, Damien Hirst, Jeff Koons, Jean-Michel Basquiat, or Gerhard Richter. The prices achieved at auctions for artworks by these artists regularly achieve up to several tens of millions of US dollars. This market segment is highly organised by top auction houses and the major galleries. They match the current supply of art in this segment with the demand of wealthy art collectors and institutional investors.

2.2.2.2 The Nations’ Top 100

On the second level of the art market pyramid are the Nations’ Top 100 artists. According to Thurnhofer (2014), it can be assumed that approximately 100 artists in each country enjoy considerably more publicity than the rest of the artists. The reason for this is explained by means of the phenomenon of people’s cognitive and perceptual limitations (Thurnhofer, 2014). The media is focused on a manageable number of artists and reports mainly on those personalities who are already known and people are interested in. Like
the Olympus, the match of supply and demand in this segment is also managed by the major galleries and auction houses. The latter, however, represent the access barrier to art market’s highest segment (Thurnhofer, 2014).

2.2.2.2.3 Established Artists

Thurnhofer (2014, p. 13) considers artists to be established “when represented by commercial galleries”. In this context, commercial fine art galleries are considered experts and gatekeepers (van Overdam, 2011) in terms of being the key barrier between the organised market segment of the third level and the self-managed segments from the fourth segment of Thurnhofer’s market pyramid (segment of emerging artists) downwards. Commercial galleries are the key organisers of the third segment of established artists by matching supply and demand and providing pricing information. This role requires specialised market knowledge that therefore provides them with a high level of market power (Byrnes, 2009; Thurnhofer, 2014).

According to Thurnhofer (2014) and the international art index of Artprice.com (2016b), the leading provider of art news, the number of established artists is estimated at approximately 500,000 to 600,000 worldwide. This number means that on average 2,500 to 3,000 artists are practising in this segment per country.

2.2.2.2.4 Emerging Artists

Emerging artists are normally fine art graduates and not yet represented by commercial galleries. They usually manage their professional career unassisted. To promote their artworks, they sometimes run or work with producer galleries. By these means, they are able to gain access to the local public and sometimes also to the wider market. Thurnhofer (2014) estimates the number of emerging artists in this segment of the pyramid at a few million worldwide. They all compete in attracting galleries to gain market access.

2.2.2.2.5 Artists of All Kinds

The fifth segment of the pyramid encompasses, in Thurnhofer’s (2014) classification, the artists of all kinds who make art mainly for themselves, e.g. hobby painters or wood carvers. The number of artists of all kinds is assumed to be countless since this market segment is open to everyone.
According to Thurnhofer (2014), the vast majority – approximately 80% of fine artists – are relegated to the fourth and fifth segments and therefore out of reach of the market and market demand. **Being excluded from the market and hence from collectors’ demand can be considered a key reason for hardly being able to make a living as a practising artist.**

**2.2.3 Conclusion**

To briefly conclude at this point, the market segmentation of Thurnhofer (2014) and Thompson (2008) as well as the analysis of market actors’ roles by Jyrämä and Äyväri (2006, 2010) help to gain a deeper understanding of markets’ hierarchical structures and the relationships and dependencies between market participants. The literature illustrates that neither the international nor national and local art markets are homogeneous in structure; they are in contrast horizontally and vertically highly heterogeneous with different networks of key actors, roles, requirements, obstacles, and opportunities. Due to their exclusion from the visible gallery-market segments and thus from buying collectors, emerging fine artists as well as artists of all kinds are dependent on their own abilities to attract attention of art lovers and potential art buyers. While artists of all kinds are classified as hobby or amateur artists, making art mainly for themselves and obviously not interested in making a professional career as working artists, emerging artists are presumed to aim at making a professional career as practising artists owing to their passion for art. For this reason, **emerging fine artists are the focus of this research study.** They are on the threshold to the market, as illustrated in Figure 2.2-2 above, but not yet represented by commercial galleries or supported by other networks. It is therefore enlightening to discover what specific factors influence their chances of making a living in the arts as well as what they can actively do to overcome the challenges of their professional situation.
Chapter 3 Literature Review

“Luck is what happens when preparation meets opportunity.”

(Seneca, Roman philosopher)

3.0 Introduction

The study at hand is expected to face a very complex phenomenon with various factors influencing practising fine artists’ abilities and chances to make a living in the arts. Consequently, a categorisation of influencing factors seems inevitable to identify the different fields for the literature review.

In essence, two categories of factors influencing fine artists’ career success and income are to be distinguished: internal and external factors. The internal factors are explicitly related to artists’ personality including their motivations, typical personality pattern (traits), talent, abilities, skills (education), attitudes, and their individual luck factor. The internal factors are reviewed in the sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.6 of this chapter. The external factors are related to fine artists’ working and business environment. For reasons of identifying and classifying the various areas in which external factors can arise, two widely acknowledged strategic business management tools provide valuable indications. Both tools are usually applied to analysing industries and evaluating organisations’ competitive positioning in their markets, but they are also useful for determining the different external factors in the working and business environment of individually working fine artists. These tools are Porter’s Five Forces (Porter, 1980, 2000, 2008a, 2008b) and the PESTLE analysis (Professional Academy, 2016). Porter’s Five Forces model identifies and analyses five competitive forces that shape every industry’s profitability or income. These forces are:

1. threat of substitute products,
2. potential of new entrants into the industry,
3. power of suppliers,
4. power of customers, and
5. rivalry or competition in the industry.

The review of these factors in accordance with Porter’s model follows in sections 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.5 of this chapter. The other tool, the PESTLE analysis, can be used to consider the impact of political, economic, social, technological, legal, and ecological or
environmental issues (Professional Academy, 2016) on fine artists’ working and business environment. These factors are beyond artists’ control. The review of these factors is part of the sections 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.6 of this chapter.

The PESTLE factors, combined with Porter’s industry forces and artists’ internal factors, can be classified as a ‘pool of opportunities and threats’ for fine artists’ chances to make a living in the arts. This pool of factors determines the different fields for the literature review of this study. The following Figure 3.0-1 summarises the different influencing factors.

Figure 3.0-1: Influencing Factors of Fine Artists’ Professional Career and Income

Source: Author's own illustration

3.1 Internal Factors (Fine Artists’ Personality)

According to leading international recruitment and human resource management agencies for professionals and scientists with a research focus on personality as well as career management and work psychology, one’s future performance in a profession is strongly based on personality characteristics, including work ethic, motivation, traits, work-related talent, abilities, and skills (e.g. Barrick and Mount, 1991; Winner, 1996; Judge et al., 2002; Roberts et al., 2003; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Scollon and Diener, 2006; Judge and Hurst, 2007; Sutin et al., 2009; Coco and Asare, 2012; Spain et al., 2014; Ranstad, 2016; KPMG, 2016; PwC, 2016).
Translated into this study's context, this means that fine artists' personality characteristics, including their commercial motives and primary professional aims, their typical personality pattern to identify specific traits as well as their developed skills required to make a living in the arts are to be discussed in the following sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.5.

The review of literature starts with the internal factors, including motivations to create art. In order to make the discussion of the 'starving artist' as a social phenomenon and the research background more robust, the literature review additionally focuses on the different professional identities by distinguishing between different types of commercial motives for earning a living.

3.1.1 Human Motivations

Historically, motivation research can be traced to the works on human instincts by Freud (1900, 1915, 1924) and the research that followed (e.g. Maslow, 1943, 1954; Deutsch and Krauss, 1965). Motivation has been studied in order to answer questions related to different stimuli that activate individuals and make them choose specific behaviours and activities to satisfy needs and achieve goals (e.g. Nuttin, 1984; Gollwitzer and Brandstätter, 1997; Ryan and Deci, 2000; Perwin, 2003; Locke and Latham, 2002, 2004; Carsrud and Brännback, 2011). Considering this, one of Maslow's lasting and most significant contributions to psychology is what he calls the "hierarchy of prepotency" (Maslow, 1943, p. 376, 2013, p. 85) and later "hierarchy of needs" (Maslow, 1954, p. xiii). In his quest to understand human motivation and the pursuit of happiness, he formulated a list of basic human needs that had to be fulfilled for maximum psychological health. Through his interviews and studies, he came to the conclusion that every individual is motivated by needs. The most basic needs are inborn, having evolved over tens of thousands of years. He categorised a hierarchical list of five different needs that help to explain how these needs motivate people (Figure 3.1-1).
Maslow insists that the overarching motivation for self-actualisation is deeply entrenched in the human psyche but only surfaces once the more basic needs are fulfilled. His hierarchy states that individuals must satisfy each need to achieve self-actualisation, starting with the first, which deals with the most obvious needs for survival itself. Conversely, if the things that satisfy lower-order needs are swept away, individuals are no longer concerned about the maintenance of their higher-order needs. The fixed order of human needs and motivations, as illustrated in Figure 3.1-1, is, however, "not nearly so rigid" (Maslow, 1954, p. 51). Maslow was very aware of an existing “reversal of the hierarchy” (Maslow, 1954, p. 52). He stresses various cases to demonstrate the reversal of the hierarchy. There are some people in whom, for instance, self-esteem seems to be less important than love. More in the context of this study, there are other apparently innately creative people in whom the drive to creativeness seems to be of highest importance. Maslow stresses that “their creativeness might appear not as self-actualization released by basic satisfaction, but in spite of lack of basic satisfaction” (Maslow, 1954, p. 52).
Maslow’s overarching human need and motivational driver of self-actualisation is supported by various scientists who prioritise self-determination and self-autonomy as the highest motivation of humans (e.g. Deci and Ryan, 1985; Butler, 2000; Fillis, 2006; Martin and Hill, 2013; Allison et al., 2015). Thus, it is insightful to know whether artists are seeking self-actualisation and self-autonomy or other needs.

3.1.2 Fine Artists’ Motivations for Making Art

The literature is scarce regarding fine artists’ specific key motivations for making art. Valid and reliable scientific literature findings are hardly existent, which is why posts and blogs of fine artists on the Internet are also valuable sources for a first indication of their primary driving forces.

Smith and Marsh (2008), Glassman (2011) or Rice (2016), all of whom are fine artists as well as Fillis (2006) and Wong-on-Wing et al. (2010), stress several reasons why fine artists make art. In their opinions, some artists are impressed by the skill it takes to depict some object in a realistic manner and want to do it themselves, while others want fame, money, and public attention. Some find it simply relaxing to create something aesthetical, while others have a need to give form and visibility to the things in them that they cannot express in words but yet need to see and ponder. The latter motivation is representative of artists’ highest motivation for self-expression, self-determination, artistic freedom, and individualism (e.g. Wilde, 1915; Harland et al., 2000; Jackson et al., 2003; Fillis, 2006; Hickman, 2010a; Glassman, 2011; Gangi, 2014; Allison’s et al., 2015; Rice, 2016). Glassman (2011, blog) stresses in this context that “true art originates almost only from the last motivation [self-expression].” Poet and novelist Oscar Wilde (1915, p. 29) stresses that only art for art’s sake “is the most intense mode of Individualism that the world has known.” In his view, an artist who “tries to supply the demand ceases to be an artist, and becomes a dull or an amusing craftsman, an honest or a dishonest tradesman. He has no further claim to be considered as an artist” (Wilde, 1915, p. 29). Wilde’s perspective represents the deep discussion and “clash” (Fillis, 2010, p. 38) between the two philosophies and poles of motivations for making art: art for art’s sake versus art for business’s sake, or between intrinsic self-oriented art and extrinsic market-driven art (e.g. Hirschman, 1983; Fillis, 2006, 2010; Wong-on-Wing et al., 2010; Grant and Berry, 2011; de Jesus et al., 2013; Allison et al., 2015; Rice, 2016).
By analysing the career data of self-employed creative individuals, studies have found evidence that they are primarily intrinsically driven by self-autonomy, self-expression and the pursuit of perfection (artistic quality), while accepting an increasing tendency of social isolation over time, economic insecurity, and less leisure time (e.g. Caves, 2000; Feldman and Bolino, 2000; Osterloh and Frey, 2000; Towse, 2001a, 2001b, 2011; Jackson et al., 2003; Bridgstock, 2005; Eickhof and Haunschild, 2006; Hong et al., 2012). Conversely, extrinsic or commercial motivations are expected to generally reduce the quality of the art created due to a certain loss of creative freedom, artistic autonomy and individualism, while focusing on responding to market demand (Wilde, 1915; Hirschman, 1983; Klamer and Petrova, 2007; Grant and Berry, 2011).

3.1.3 Types of Fine Artists by Commercial Motivations

The presence of different motivations for making art consequently means, as far as research related to the phenomenon is concerned, that when practising fine artists hardly make a living in the arts, it is first and foremost important to recall their different motivations and to distinguish between them with regard to their different professional self-understandings and commercial motives for making art. The differentiation between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for making art is not appropriate for this research due to its gross simplification. Although different commercially oriented types of fine artists are implicitly described in the literature (e.g. Becker, 1976, 1982; Bain, 2005; Eikhof and Haunschild, 2006; Abreu et al., 2012; Moureau and Sagot-Duvaouroux, 2012; Balzarini and Calcagno, 2016) and again by artists on Internet blogs and postings (e.g. Wider, 2008; Taylor, 2009; de Wal, 2011; Rogers, 2013; Tutnauer, 2014; Berardini, 2016; Horejs, 2016), an appropriate approach to classify fine artists’ professional and commercial objectives is still missing. Consequently, this classification has to be developed first as working typology in the context of this research. The different types of commercially motivated artists are illustrated in Figure 3.1-2 and described next.
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Chapter 3 Literature Review

3.1.3.1 Amateur Fine Artists

The root of the word *amateur* is the Latin “*amare*”, meaning “to love” (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2016a). The scientific literature on the specifications of amateur fine artists is rare. This type of fine artist is mostly discussed by artists on Internet blogs, comparing the main differences to professional fine artists (e.g. Taylor, 2009; de Wal, 2011; Rogers, 2013; Tutnauer, 2014). The working typology of this research uses the terms *amateur* and *hobby* artists interchangeably. With regard to the abovementioned origin of the term and in accordance with the working typology of this research, it can be said that amateur fine artists are intrinsically driven by their love and passion for making art. They mostly have a profession outside the arts earning them a living. Amateur fine artists may sell work and derive income from their art, but that is not their primary motivation. It does not matter if their work does not sell (Rogers, 2013). They are not in business and they are only weakly connected to the art world and art economy, if even at all (Becker, 1976).

3.1.3.2 ‘Bohemian’ Fine Artists

The term *bohemian* artist has come to be very commonly accepted as the description of an artist “who, consciously or unconsciously, secedes from conventionality in life and in art” (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2016b). Eikhof and Haunschild (2006) describe this specific type of understanding of the fine arts as a “lifestyle, which is characterized by a
devotion to art for art’s sake” (Eikhof and Haunschild, 2006, p. 234). The bohemian lifestyle has been alive since the nineteenth century and differs significantly from other lifestyles by its clear focus on egocentrism and a deliberate contradiction of economic “bourgeois norms and values” (Eikhof and Haunschild, 2006, p. 236; Becker, 1976; Brooks, 2000) that are in modern times represented by the social middle and upper classes. The bohemian lifestyle is marked by its strong feeling of belonging to a social milieu, trying to live the freedom and principles of enjoying life from day to day without any fixed (working) schedules, spontaneity, sporadic employment, lack of income, and permanent improvisation. This attitude of “no longer willing to conform to social conventions” turns these artists into “mavericks” (Becker, 1976, p. 708). Work in particular is “not regarded as a means to earn one’s living but as a vehicle for self-fulfilment” (Eikhof and Haunschild, 2006, p. 236). The bohemian lifestyle ‘forbids, abhors and condemns’ the commercial aspects of making art. Commercially successful art seems to be considered in the bohemian understanding as a kind of not being ‘true art’, as a ‘betrayal of the art’. Conversely, the failure to make a living by having commercial success even seems to be taken by these artists “as a marker of artistic success” that rationalises “their own economic fragility” (McRobbie, 1998, p. 6; Taylor and Littleton, 2008). This lifestyle therefore challenges the commercially driven art industry, as it is illustrated in section 2.2. These fine artists usually finance the time and resources involved in making art by holding (several) jobs inside or outside the art industry as well as by sponsorship, patronage, or by obtaining donations and subsidies (Taylor and Littleton, 2008; Steem and Steem, 2015).

3.1.3.3 Salary- or Wage-Based Fine Art Employees
This category comprises those fine artists who are permanently employed in or receive fixed salaries for their (artistic) work from any kind of company, organisation, or institution inside the art industry. Examples of employers in the art industry include galleries, museums, art magazines and journals, art start-ups, auction houses, art agencies, and art consulting companies. These fine artists earn a living in the art industry mainly through their professional status of being a salaried employee but not from making and commercialising their own artwork. Obviously, fine artists also get jobs outside the art industry where their creativity may be paid well, e.g. in advertising agencies. However,
the research at hand is related to the social phenomenon that many practising fine artists find it difficult to make a living in the arts.

The percentage of permanently employed fine artists in the arts varies depending on the different statistic sources. According to the labour market statistics of Service Canada (2016), for instance, approximately 30% of fine artists work full-time and full-year in the art industry every year. These statistics normally consider the fact that fine artists must very often hold down several jobs at once (inside and outside the art industry, e.g. in the education sector) to earn a living (Prospects.ac.uk, 2016; Service Canada, 2016).

3.1.3.4 Business Fine Artists

The precondition for making a living as a practising artist is the generation of income by matching the supply of produced art with an existing market demand. In light of this, this final category comprises all those artists who definitely aim to make and market their own art for the sake of generating income by responding to market demand. This type of artist experiences a specific form of ‘identification hybridisation’ with the economic world (Bakhashi and Throsby, 2010; Balzarini and Calcagno, 2016). These artists consider art as creative work and business. They directly distribute and sell or seek to find distributing and selling partners such as galleries to commercialise their works. Consequently, all gallery artists can be considered business artists, since bohemian fine artists are not interested in selling their works directly or with the help of selling partners. However, it is worth noting in this context that being financially and business-oriented does not automatically mean primarily focusing on profit maximisation (Allard, 2003; Darmer, 2008). Business fine artists do have the aim of earning a living by making and selling art but not necessarily of making art purely for money’s sake.

The number of business artists is increasing, particularly among emerging artists (Taylor and Littleton, 2008; Darsø, 2009; Bakhashi and Throsby, 2010; Scherdin and Zander, 2011; Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012), regularly driven by economic uncertainties and the chronic absence of public funds (Balzarini and Calcagno, 2016). This type of fine artist aims to bring integrity and creativity to the work. They want to approach their daily business as part of creative problem-solving and a skill-building endeavour that brings them artistic, personal, and economic growth (Balzarini and Calcagno, 2016). Nevertheless, within this category of business fine artists, three different approaches or
sub-categories of making art businesses can be distinguished: ‘contract and me-too artists’, ‘off the market’-artists, and ‘arts entrepreneurs’.

3.1.3.4.1 ‘Contract and me-too’ Business Artists

The first sub-category of business artists includes all those fine artists who make and sell contract works for art buyers and/or imitate artworks and styles of established and trendy artists. This type of fine artist has attracted only little attention in literature. Fillis (2010, p. 32) stresses the key characteristic of these artists in “following the market” and “fitting in with the mainstream and fewer risks” than more innovative business artists. Although the works of ‘contract and me-too’ artists may show elements of originality, the given levels of uniqueness, innovation, and creativity are limited; their works are more or less similar to other artists’ works (‘me-too’ products) or created in guidance and under control of other people (contract work). In this context, refer to section 3.2.2.5.3 below for legal details with regard to contract work. Moureau and Sagot-Duvaurox (2012) as well as Conner (2015) also call those artists “artisans”, artists who create or paint on commission or devise ways to translate their creativity into products saleable en masse. These business artists produce art for an already existent demand (contract work) or for an expected demand because of their ‘copy’ character of already sold works of other artists in the past. Due to the given or expected demand, the income flow of these artists is expected to be stable, depending on their quality, productivity and public presence. However, due to their works’ lower levels of uniqueness and creativity, the consumption value, as defined in Appendix A, and hence the market price of their work is also expected to be relatively lower than for original, creative, and innovative works (Newman and Bloom, 2011). Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that artists of this sub-category responding to existent market demand should be more or less able to make a living in the arts with this kind of business concept.

3.1.3.4.2 ‘Off the Market’-Business Artists

The second sub-category includes particularly those fine artists who primarily aim to sell original and creative work, but without market orientation. Artists of this sub-category mainly make art with a pure internal focus driven by their own artistic emotions and expressions. The internal focus excludes the consideration of the demand side, so that
this type of business fine artist does not respond to any concrete demand and also does not create it (Jackson et al., 2003). These artists usually produce ‘art for stocks’. They hardly know potential art buyers; they are ‘off the market’; and their business concept is primarily based on hope and luck to find more or less regularly casual buyers or even galleries to place their work onto the market.

‘Off the market’ business artists are expected to suffer from irregular income flows and difficulties in earning a living with their art. Their ‘business concept’ is mainly based on talent, hard work ethics, willpower, and ambition as well as on luck and hope to experience an artistic and finally economic breakthrough. It is not uncommon in practice that artists of the first two sub-categories show an overlap.

3.1.3.4.3 Fine Arts Entrepreneurs

No unique definition of arts entrepreneurship exists, since scholarly literature in this field has been quite scarce (e.g. Smith, 2008; Chang and Wyszomirksi, 2015; Hausmann and Heinze, 2016). Essig (2016) defines arts entrepreneurship in this context as “a way of making artistic work that connects that work with its audience independent of the organizational form surrounding the production of that work” (Essig, 2016, p. 9). She explicitly emphasises the need to respond to already given or even created market demand with the help of a production system (see Appendix A for further details). Considering this, the third sub-category of business artists comprises all those fine artists who take the risk and opportunity to create demand rather than following the market (Caves, 2000; Eikhof and Haunschild, 2006; Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012). The spontaneous process of creativity needs to become the critical element of a structured and market-oriented production process (Phillips, 2010; Scherdin and Zander, 2011; Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012; Chang and Wyszomirski, 2015; Balzarin and Calcagno, 2016).

According to Menger (1999), those fine artists who are able to integrate the two identities of being both a creative artist and an organised builder of structured processes of creative work production can be considered arts entrepreneurs. To specify the abstract term of production process, an appropriate example could be as follows: A fine arts entrepreneur produces both creative and unique artworks for sale as underlying works for specific and extensive art series in form of limited or open editions, prints, and other works that help to market and merchandise his or her own creative work for a wider
market demand by responding to different available financial art budgets on the demand side. The sale of original work is usually combined with spectacular sales-promotional and marketing activities to create public perception and demand that in turn should help to place the follow-up series, produced and promoted after the successful sale of the original work. Examples of very successful and famous fine arts entrepreneurs are Damien Hirst, Romero Britto, and Andy Warhol (Artinfo, 2010; Enhuber, 2014).

Arts entrepreneurs do not consider talent, hard work ethics, willpower, ambition or luck as the only decisive factors for their professional success. They additionally concentrate on developing entrepreneurial skills, a scalable business model and effective marketing machinery to reduce their risk-taking as well as on a system of production to create market demand and to respond to it in ways that break through barriers in the art market to make a living. They assume the risk of an uncertain demand and market need for their artwork (Menger, 1999; Darmer, 2008; Pang, 2009; Phillips, 2010). It is therefore up to them to find or create the ideal audience in order to create market attraction. This situation is quite similar to all entrepreneurs in different industries with innovative business concepts and market ideas (e.g. Schumpeter, 1965; Drucker, 1970; Hisrich, 1990; Bolton and Thompson, 2000; Jacobson, 2003; Alexopoulos et al., 2004; Jackson and Tomlinson, 2009; McGregor and Gibson, 2009; Grant and Berry, 2011). Becker (1976, p. 705) speaks of “integrated professionals” in this context. These artists are able to become integrated in the organised and commercial art market system, where the artists as well as customers, suppliers, galleries, collectors and other market institutions “fit into the available spaces and into people’s ability to respond appropriately” (Becker, 1976, p. 706). This implicitly means that successful arts entrepreneurs are – in contrast to bohemian artists or ‘off the market’ business artists – more or less at eye level with other commercial art market participants; they are likely an integrated and recognised element of the system and less exploited than other types of fine artists who do not respond to market demand in productive ways (see section 3.2.2.3.2 for artists’ social value in society).

By reviewing entrepreneurs’ varied motivations, it can be concluded in this context that entrepreneurs are not necessarily driven by monetary rewards and profits, but rather by creating a larger experience of risk-taking and ultimately the satisfaction of providing quality work to others (Allard, 2003; Darmer, 2008; Smith, 2008; Chang and Wyszomirski,
2015). While it is acknowledged that fine art entrepreneurs certainly hope to make a living based on their creativity and production process, Elfving (2008) and Balzarin and Calcagno (2016) stress as result of their findings, however, that these artists mostly refuse being labelled an entrepreneur, feeling a trade-off between the two identities of their existence, as mentioned by Menger (1999) above. They do not accept losing control of their artistic identity, as they primarily still consider themselves artists (Pollard and Wilson, 2013; Bazarin and Calcagno, 2016).

3.1.3.5 Conclusion

When scientists, practitioners, or politicians stress the social phenomenon that many practising fine artists have difficulties in making a living in the arts, artists’ different professional self-understandings and commercial motivations should first be considered for a better specification of the dimension of this phenomenon. The working typology of fine artists’ commercial motives in making art shows that only practising business fine artists want and primarily aim to make a living by selling and commercialising their art, while other types of fine artists are more focused on and motivated in making art for art’s sake or for recreational reasons. Considering this and the fact that emerging fine artists are excluded from but on the threshold to the visible gallery market and therefore required to manage their chances of professional success and income on their own, as illustrated in section 2.2.2.2 of Chapter 2, the core of this research needs to be redefined more precisely: emerging fine artists who aim to make a living as practising artists, the so-called business fine artists, are the key subject of this research.

When considering business fine artists as a mainly commercially motivated type of fine artist, it needs to be additionally considered that these artists pursue different approaches to make a living. While arts entrepreneurs as well as ‘contract and me-too’ artists pursue a business concept of making art for an existent or specifically created market demand, which may enable both types a living, ‘off the market’ artists face the highest risk of professional failure. This type of business artist does not pursue a market-oriented business concept by making art very often without responding to market demand or creating it. ‘Off the market’ business artists are therefore expected to particularly suffer from financial and economic constraints. A lacking or implausible business concept is always a prominent reason for professional failure.
To conclude at this point, a rejection of commercial success as well as a poor art business strategy or concept without responding to market opportunities and market demand are definitely further key reasons for business failure. To put it in other words, **not wanting and/or being incapable of generating income are key reasons for practising fine artists’ not making a living in the arts.**

Whether and, if so, what other internal reasons may exist for business fine artists not to make a living in the arts will be further discussed in the following sections.

### 3.1.4 Fine Artists’ Typical Personality Pattern

Personality traits and thinking styles of artists and how they relate to their work have been subject of several studies for decades. Jung (1962), for example, believed that the orientation to the world (external versus internal orientation) was a foundational aspect of human personality. By carrying out and analysing various tests, he observed an idea-oriented and inward-turning preference in artists. That means that their energy moves toward the inner world of thoughts and ideas. By using different personality tests, Bachthold (1973, 1976) observed a clear tendency to a liberal orientation among artists. She tested more than 1,000 artists, scientists, and psychologists. Artists were observed to be more adventurous, open to new experiences, and less conservative than the other sample groups. This was confirmed by a range of studies (e.g. Cross et al., 1967; Feist 1998; Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008). Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi (1976) surveyed 179 art students and found that the highest creativity appraisals were associated with personality traits of curiosity and openness to new ideas, lack of conformity to social norms, aloofness, introspection, low emotional stability, sensitivity, self-sufficiency, and low conscientiousness. Götz and Götz (1979) found evidence, by surveying more than 257 practising artists and 300 non-artists, that artists were lower on extraversion and social behaviour and significantly higher on neuroticism, pessimism, aggressiveness, and psychoticism. These findings were confirmed through several tests and surveys in more recent studies (e.g. Roy, 1996; Booker et al.; 2001; Furnham et al., 2006; Goncalo et al., 2010; Haller et al., 2010; Portier, 2012; Sandhu and Kaur, 2015). Gridley’s studies (2006, 2007) were focused on artists’ thinking styles. He examined samples of 128 and 71 professional artists from different disciplines, compared them to engineers (Gridley, 2007), and found that artists preferred thinking styles that involved inventing and
developing new ideas of their own significantly more than barely implementing pre-existing ideas. They also preferred change more than the status quo. Artists also preferred devising their own plans and less external input in their work than engineers preferred (Gridley, 2007). There were no significant gender differences in mean scores among the artists.

Further findings have revealed that highly creative artists show tendencies of being, for instance, more imaginative, anxious, and emotionally or mentally unbalanced (e.g. Schulz, 1967; Andreasen and Canter, 1974; Andreasen, 1987; Jamison, 1989; Winner and Casey, 1992; Ludwig, 1995; Post, 1996; Roy, 1996; Feist, 1998; Booker et al., 2001; Wolfradt and Pretz, 2001; Nelson, 2005; Batey and Furnham, 2006; Burch et al., 2006; Rihmer et al., 2006; Rawlings and Locarnini, 2007; Zibarras et al., 2008; Haller and Courvoisier, 2010; Haller et al., 2010; Galvez et al., 2011; Kyaga et al., 2011). The different studies’ findings on tendencies of typical personality traits and thinking styles of artists are summarised and illustrated in Appendix M.

While the studies show no moderating effect for gender, some findings suggest that artists behave consistently over time and situation (e.g. Cross et al., 1967; Mansfield and Busse, 1981; Eysenck, 1993, 1995; Roy, 1996; Janka, 2004). Feist (1998), however, suggested that some trait effect sizes were related to artists’ age, meaning that older artists become more conventional and less radical than their younger peers (Feist, 1998).

An explanation for some of artists’ key personality traits as illustrated in Appendix M is provided by Storr (1988) and Feist (1998). They argue that artists’ tendency to question social norms and to prefer their independency from social group influence is highly related to their key motivation and goal of being creative, original, and independent (see section 3.1.2 for artists’ motivations). Highly creative people need time and space to be alone and away from others’ influence. Although social interaction and openness, defined as having a flexible cognitive and thinking style when approaching challenges (McCrae, 1987; Feist, 1998), may be an impetus for creative ideas and problem-solving strategies, the creative process and the carrying out thereof itself require solitude. Socialising would be counterproductive in this decisive phase of the process (Feist, 1998). Consequently, Feist (1998) emphasises artists’ stronger than usual need to focus their attention and energies inward, separating themselves from their external environment. It could therefore be concluded that the arts seem to provide a working environment that allows
the isolation when needed and wanted more than other creative professions. This seems to be the reason for the high incidence of creative and highly sensitive people seeking social isolation in the arts. They often seek to block out overwhelming stimuli because they find it effortful to associate with their environment. Anyone who disturbs or questions the process of inner withdrawal may be treated with a higher level of aggressiveness and hostility as artists would then ‘defend’ their creations and needed time and space. Another reason for artists’ lower levels of socialisation is closely related to originality or uniqueness as crucial elements of being creative and different to others that in turn characterises artists’ being and self-understanding (Feist, 1998). The argument is that it is much easier for an artist to be unique, original, and different when one’s own individual perspective is developed alone. According to Feist (1998), the desire for being independent and for spending time alone and excluded from social influence could also be related to carrying out artwork free of doubt and scepticism from others.

In this context, Feist (1998) stresses artists’ above-average intrinsic motivation, willpower, and ambition as preconditions to work and do well. Artists’ pursuit of excellence could represent the aim to produce their work as it already exists in their imagination. This very strong willpower and ambition, however, often leads artists to turn their aggressiveness, rage, and hostility against themselves and their works when the expected level of artistic perfection could not be achieved. The great dissatisfaction regarding their own imperfection could make them also turn their rage, arrogance, and aggressiveness against other artists who were indeed able to achieve the artistic rewards they still lack in themselves.

Nevertheless, it is still unclear whether this schematically illustrated typical behaviour has an impact on practising fine artists’ professional success and income. Consequently, the literature is to be further reviewed with relation to possible connections between artists’ personality and creativity as factors for their success.

3.1.4.1 The Connection between Artists’ Personalities, Creativity, Mental Health, and Learning Difficulties

Throughout history, some of the most famous and creative artists have been linked to mental illness. The legend of the “tortured artist” (Sussman, 2007, p. 21), that the artistic
genius creates brilliant artwork despite or because of mental illness, is widespread in peoples’ minds. This image has caused research to verify or disprove it.

According to the Mental Health Association in Forsyth County (Mental Health Association, 2016, What is mental illness?), mental illness or disorder is defined as

“a disease of the brain that causes mild to severe disturbances in thought and/or behavior, resulting in an inability to cope with life’s ordinary demands and routines.”

There are more than 200 classified forms of mental illness. Some of the more common extreme disorders are: clinical depression, bipolar disorder, dementia, schizophrenia, and anxiety disorders. Symptoms may include changes in mood, personality, personal habits and/or social withdrawal. Between 20 and 25% of adults - here defined as aged 18 to 65 – have a mental illness in any given year in the U.S. and Europe (Kessler, et al., 2005; Hankir, 2011; Mental Health Association, 2016; NAMI, 2016; NIMH, 2016; WHO, 2016). This means mental illness is pretty common, but creative geniuses and famous people in the arts and other creative professions with mental difficulties are much rarer (Sederer, cited by Klein, 2014).

Folley (2006, p.119) considers creativity as “one of the highest forms of human metacognition”, while asking “the role schizophrenia may have played in establishing creativity as an important element in human cognition.” There have been several scientific studies presumed to support the idea that there is a direct connection between artistic creativity and mental illness (e.g. Cross et al., 1967; Andreasen and Canter, 1974; Andreasen, 1987; Jamison, 1989; Ludwig, 1995; Post, 1996; Barker, 1998; Nettle, 2001, 2005; Heilman et al., 2003; Lauronen et al., 2004; Janka, 2004; Flaherty, 2005; Rihmer et al., 2006). The connection between artistic creativity and sensitivity and brain disorder seems to be a strong one, as, for example, three successful artists from different art disciplines once stressed: the American novelist and recipient of the Pulitzer Prize and the Nobel Prize Pearl S. Buck said: “The truly creative mind in any field is no more than this: A human creature born abnormally, inhumanly sensitive” (cited by Iglesias, 2001, p. 4). The King of Pop, Michael Jackson, characterised his personal life once by crippling sensitivity, loneliness, and struggle, saying “it hurts to be me” (cited by Gregoire, 2015).
Also, the Norwegian painter Edvard Munch is supposed to have said that his mental troubles “are part of me and my art. They are indistinguishable from me, and it [treatment] would destroy my art” (cited by Sussman, 2007, p. 24).

These claims reasonably lead to further, more specific questions to understand more about artists’ creativity, personality, and their working environment:

- Does evidence exist that mental disorders are a crucial or unconditional factor for (outstanding) creativity and/or success in creative professions?
- And as a digression to learning difficulties: What is the situation with dyslexia?

### 3.1.4.2 Does Evidence Exist that Mental Health/Illness is a Crucial or Unconditional Factor for Career Success in Creative Professions?

The main difference between creativity and mental illness is considered in their different contextual environments. Creativity is per definition a purposeful, task-related, and relatively structured process of rational thinking and producing (Business Dictionary.com, 2016; Creativity at Work, 2016; The American Psychological Association, 2016). The traditional dictionary defines creativity as

> “the ability to transcend traditional ideas, rules, patterns, relationships, or the like, and to create meaningful new ideas, forms, methods, interpretations, etc.”

(Dictionary.com, 2016, Creativity).

Interesting in this definition is the use of the term “meaningful”. To create something meaningful is clearly related to a specific purpose but also to the process of producing something new in a socially understandable, useful, and accepted manner so that a new meaning can be achieved or understood by others. The structured and rational element is highly related to the cognitive processes of understanding the current environment and of developing ideas to change the environment or solve problems. In contrast, mental illness is more disruptive than constructive, less rational and structured and tends to block creative problem-solving (Sussman, 2007). Schizophrenia is, for instance, characterised by disturbances in thought, emotions, and activity. Although some schizophrenics are able to communicate their ‘exceptional thoughts’ in phases of extreme mood shifts, the artistic outcome is often “strikingly alien” (Sussman, 2007, p. 23) and therefore mostly not socially understandable, which is per definition a prerequisite for
being creative. However, in the specific context of the arts one might argue that art must not necessarily be purposeful, goal-oriented or socially understandable. That is certainly true because the well-known proverb has it that art is evaluated in the eye of the beholder. Art is very subjective and interpretable (Dickie, 1974).

In light of this, there is no clear evidence proving that mental illness is a crucial or unconditional factor for career success in creative professions. Some findings indicate a close relationship between creativity and mental illness as the foundation for professional success in creative professions (e.g. Jamison, 1989, 1993; Eysenck, 1993, 1995; Saklofske, 1998; Nettle, 2001, 2005; Heilman et al., 2003; Flaherty, 2005; Nelson, 2005; Zibarras et al., 2008; Acar and Runco, 2012). However, there is also a lot of research exhibiting evidence that mental disorders are not crucial for creative success (e.g. Folstein et al., 1985; Andreasen, 1987, 2008; Waddell, 1998; Akinola and Mendes, 2009; Silvia and Kimbrel, 2010; Sawyer, 2011; Klein, 2014). All these studies, nevertheless, are mostly limited in their scope and lack of reliable and valid measurements, owing to the mere fact that the terms creativity and creative outcome are by definition quite vague.

The longitudinal research by Sutin et al. (2009) shows evidence that neuroticism is negatively connected to career success and income, while extraversion and social behaviour show positive correlations. Translated to fine artists who exhibit more introversion as well as a higher tendency of mental illness, this finding indicates less beneficial personality characteristics for their career success and income.

In addition, although a handful of studies have found evidence that some few famous artists and scientists, such as Vincent van Gogh, Francisco de Goya y Lucientes, Joan Miro, Rembrandt, Salvador Dalí, and Edvard Munch, suffered from extreme to moderate forms of mental disorders, there likewise exists evidence that most famous and creative artists were or are not mentally ill (Winner et al., 2001). As Carson correctly stresses, “it stands to reason that some of those people [350 million people living with depression worldwide] are going to be creative” (cited by Klein, 2014). According to Sederer, medical director of the New York State Office of Mental Health, most people suffering from mental illness are neither successful creative artists nor geniuses in other creative professions (Sederer, cited by Klein, 2014). Sometimes both traits are combined or even facilitate each other to some extent, but they do not mutually define each other.
3.1.4.3 Excursus to Learning Difficulties: Dyslexia

3.1.4.3.1 What is Dyslexia?

Dyslexia is a complex neurodevelopmental disorder (Huc-Chabrolle et al., 2010), defined as an inheritable genetic learning difficulty (e.g. National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities, 1991; Pumfrey and Reason, 1991; Reid and Kirk, 2001; Galaburda et al., 2006; Moody, 2006; de Beer et al., 2014) that affects one’s reading and writing development (de Beer et al. 2014; Burns, 2015; McLoughlin, 2015; Mishra and Mohan, 2016) and is usually associated with impairments in phonological processing, verbal processing speed, and verbal short-term memory (Hari et al., 2001; Leinonen et al., 2001; Ramus et al., 2003; Department of Education & Skills (Ireland), 2004; Singleton et al., 2009; Snowling, 1996, 2009; Moody, 2010; de Beer et al., 2014; International Dyslexia Association, 2016). Dyslexic people need much more time to process and transmit information clearly and succinctly to others in speech or writing than non-dyslexic people (Hari et al., 2001; Moody, 2010). Dyslexia seldom appears isolated and dyslexic people are very likely to present other kinds of learning difficulties or psychiatric disorders (Huc-Chabrolle et al., 2010).

3.1.4.3.2 What are Typical Traits and Behaviours of Dyslexic People?

Research indicates that dyslexia has no relationship to intelligence. Individuals with dyslexia are neither more nor less intelligent than the general population (Shaywitz and Shaywitz, 2005; Moody, 2010; Leather et al., 2011; Burns, 2015). While there is no cure for dyslexia and individuals with this disorder must learn strategies to adapt and cope with it (Reid and Kirk, 2001; Moody, 2006; de Beer et al., 2014), children with dyslexia often experience a negative spiral of emotions. According to Glazzard (2010) and Al-Lamki (2012), they can become so frustrated with words, sentences, meanings and recall that they remain anxious throughout school age and into adulthood. They can thus often develop a severe anxiety disorder, which is the most frequent emotional symptom that dyslexic children experience (Glazzard, 2010; Al-Lamki, 2012) and this adverse disposition can be lifelong. Another emotional symptom from which dyslexic children often suffer is anger arising from their frustrations in school. Social scientists point out that the greater the frustration the more it breeds anger (Glazzard, 2010). Poor self-image is another problem for such individuals despite their often superior intellectual
capacity. Such a poor self-image can lead to low self-esteem, which in turn is characterised by negative thoughts which tend to worsen one’s self-image and can lead to clinical depression (Glazzard, 2010; Al-Lamki, 2012).

Typical difficulties among adults with dyslexia are related to persistent communicational difficulties and weaknesses in reading and writing (Leather et al., 2011). These difficulties can lead to associated problems at work (e.g. van Dijk et al., 1990; Reid and Kirk, 2001; Moody, 2006). Dyslexic employees report difficulties with complex tasks that cause much workload (work content) (Morgan and Klein, 2000; Moody, 2006) and the dependence on social support from colleagues that intensify or temper the nature of the problems (relationships at work) (McLoughlin et al., 1994) and/or from family members at home (Reid and Kirk, 2001). The physical working environment can also cause difficulties when the employee feels distracted by noises or colleagues (Morgan and Klein, 2000). Consequently, dyslexic people often report anxiety, frustration, and anger (Fitzgibbon and O’Connor, 2002; Singleton et al., 2009; Moody, 2006, 2010). The studies stress that dyslexic employees feel anxious about whether they will be able to cope with distractions (Leather et al., 2011) and to manage their workload (Bell, 2002; Carroll, 2006). They also feel frustrated that they cannot always show their true abilities, and they feel anger that they contend discrimination and ridicule (Burchardt, 2005; Morris, 2006) because “they are seen by others as being ‘stupid’ or ‘slackers’” (Moody, 2010, p.4).

According to the findings by Davis (1994, 2010), people with dyslexia share various mental functions that help them to adapt and cope with their difficulties; for example, they mainly think visually in pictures instead of words, have vivid imaginations, are highly aware of their environment or are innovative in problem-solving and alter and create perceptions (Davis, 1994, 2010; von Károlyi, 2001; O’Keefe, 2008; Grant, 2010). According to Gerber et al. (1992) and Goldberg et al. (2003), various external factors and internal resources can contribute to the success of dyslexic people in the workplace. More precisely, in an environment suitable for their advantageous creative and visual abilities, dyslexic people can work as effectively at the highest occupational levels as non-dyslexic people (Reid et al., 2008; Burns, 2015). In particular, self-efficacy and resilience have been found to be significant internal resources to the employment
success of dyslexic people (Day et al., 2006; Day, 2008; Leather et al., 2011; Canrinus et al., 2012; Gu and Day, 2013).

3.1.4.3.3 In what Professions is Dyslexia Prevalent?

Research has shown that dyscalculia and reading difficulties in children affect their transition to secondary and tertiary education (Hakkarainen et al., 2013) and later occupational career choices. Young people with dyslexia tend to choose academically less demanding educational programmes than their peers in secondary education (Savolainen et al., 2008).

Other studies indicate that adults with dyslexia are employed in lower-skill positions than non-dyslexic individuals (Stein et al., 2011; Quaye et al., 2012) and that they suffer lower rates of employment and wage gaps (Dickinson and Verbeek, 2002; Vogel et al., 2007). It has also been demonstrated that dyslexic adults are less likely than non-dyslexic people to be involved in professions that require plenty of reading, writing, and calculation skills as is the case in science, computing, management, law, and finance (Taylor, 2003; Taylor and Walter, 2003; Stein et al., 2011; Quaye et al., 2012). Compared to their non-dyslexic peers, they have instead been found to choose more practically oriented and less performance-controlled professions, e.g. in the fields of caring, nursing, sales, or arts (Taylor and Walter, 2003). An explanation can be found in the research of Fitzgibbon and O’Connor (2002), Logan (2009), and Logan and Martin (2010). They all suggest that a corporate working environment is very stressful for dyslexic employees because of its structured working methods with multiple tasks that require the fast treatment, transformation, and processing of a wealth of information. Additionally, dyslexics are more expected to experience discrimination in some cases at work by their employers and colleagues (TUC, 2013). Considering these factors, dyslexic people more likely prefer working environments in which they themselves can control their working speed, outcome, and performance. They therefore are more likely to be involved in the abovementioned people- and practically oriented, non-academic professions or involved in their own businesses with lower literacy barriers (Gottfredson et al., 1984; Leather et al., 2011; Franks and Frederick, 2011; Bacon and Bennett, 2013; de Beer et al., 2014; Burns, 2015) since some dyslexic people have become well-known entrepreneurs (Logan, 2009).
While approximately 10% of the population is estimated at having difficulties in learning to read and write (Hari et al., 2001; Bond et al., 2010; Landerl and Moll, 2010; Burns, 2015; British Dyslexia Association, 2016), the rate of artists with dyslexia, for example, is estimated to be much higher in a range between 18% (Riddell and Weedon, 2014; Burns, 2015) and 30% (Wolff and Lundberg, 2002; Rankin et al., 2007; West, 2009; Davis and Braun, 2010). The determination of the exact proportion of dyslexic people and artists is difficult due to difficulties in the diagnosis and depending upon the definition and criteria used (de Beer, 2014). It is unclear in this context whether this incidence is a result of avoiding subjects or professions with higher literacy barriers (von Károlyi and Winner, 2004) or whether it reflects a tendency for dyslexics to be particularly skilled in the arts (Cryer, 2013).

Bacon and Bennett (2013) delivered an interesting answer to this question. They asked dyslexic art students about their reasons for studying art. The researchers found that most of them had actively chosen this subject because they had always loved making art. A few art students confirmed that they also had the option of studying more academic subjects but finally decided on the arts. None of them had chosen art because of experienced negative influence at school. Their decision had been mainly influenced by the support they received from family members and other mentors (Bacon and Bennett, 2013). Both scientists suggest in this context that the academic culture in HE art departments as well as the specific practical and familiar working environment help dyslexic students to develop a “positive sense of self” (Bacon and Bennett, 2013, p.12) that in turn may have an important role for choosing this subject to study. Art departments at HEIs would therefore be able to assist dyslexic students to develop and achieve their personal and academic potential (Bacon and Bennett, 2013).

Dyslexics are also overrepresented in other creative professions outside the arts. Logan (2001, 2009) shows evidence that there is a significantly higher incidence of dyslexia in entrepreneurs than in corporate managers and general populations. By investigating personality characteristics of entrepreneurs and corporate managers in different industries in the U.S. and UK, she discovered that 35% of U.S. entrepreneurs and less than 1% of U.S. corporate managers surveyed had shown dyslexic traits, while nearly 15% of the U.S. population was reported to be dyslexic (Logan, 2009). Her findings in the UK study show different rates, with a dyslexia rate of 19% among UK
entrepreneurs, 3% among UK corporate managers, and approximately 10% among the UK general population (Logan, 2001; ONS, 2012). She explained this discrepancy between both surveys by noting the different research methods used and the different strategies between both countries in identifying dyslexia in schools and teaching dyslexic children and students in developing efficient adaptation and coping strategies. In this context Logan (2001, 2009), Mackay (2007), and NHS (2016) also found that dyslexic entrepreneurs were more likely to rate themselves as ‘very good’ than non-dyslexic entrepreneurs and corporate managers at delegating tasks and communicating orally (Logan, 2001, 2009; Logan and Martin, 2010; Halfpenny and Halfpenny, 2012; NHS, 2016). Dyslexic entrepreneurs were also found to be more able to observe patterns in markets not recognised by others (Mackay, 2007) as well as to exhibit the ability to think differently and trust their intuition when making business decisions (Logan, 2010). Logan (2001, 2009, 2010) suggests that dyslexic entrepreneurs may have developed stronger leadership skills, including the abilities to delegate and communicate, than non-dyslexic entrepreneurs and corporate managers as a coping strategy to compensate for their dyslexia (Nicholson and Fawcett, 1999; Logan, 2009, 2010). These abilities are considered crucial for starting and running businesses (Moody, 1999; Reid and Kirk, 2001; Logan and Martin, 2010), which is why being dyslexic is also seen as advantageous to a certain extent (Eide and Eide, 2011; Cryer, 2013).

3.1.4.3.4 The Impact of Dyslexia on Success in Creative Professions or Entrepreneurship

No evidence exists that the observed preference of dyslexics for arts or entrepreneurship might be the result of specific visual abilities as assumed by several scientists (e.g. Snowling, 1996; Tweedly, 2007; West, 2009; McManus et al., 2010; Marazzi, 2011; Quaye et al., 2012; de Beer et al., 2014; Hessels et al., 2014; Duranovic et al., 2015). With regard to the arts, studies show mixed results regarding a possible connection between dyslexia and visual-spatial skills or creativity (Winner et al., 2000; Cryer, 2013; Duranovic et al., 2015). Some findings show that dyslexic people often have outstanding, special visual skills (Snowling, 1996; Tweedly, 2007; West, 2009; de Beer et al., 2014) that are helpful in thinking differently so as to solve problems (Ramus et al., 2003; Snowling, 2009; Eide and Eide, 2011). These probably arise as a result of compensating
for weaker phonological skills over their lifespan (de Beer et al., 2014). Research by von Károlyi (2001) found dyslexics to be significantly faster (than a control group of nondyslexics) in identifying three-dimensional figures that do not exist in reality. This finding was confirmed later by von Károlyi et al. (2003), suggesting that dyslexics are superior at global visual-spatial processing or in identifying the “big picture” (Cryer, 2013, p. 6). Murphy (2011) reported that some dyslexic students felt they had advantages over other students in terms of spatial awareness and at image processing. However, recent research could not find evidence for any correlation between dyslexia and visual-spatial awareness or drawing ability (e.g. Winner et al., 2001; Riley et al., 2009; Brunswick et al., 2010; McManus et al., 2010; Quaye et al., 2012; Hessels et al., 2014; Morgues et al., 2014). These scientists tested a variety of visual-spatial abilities. Dyslexics and non-dyslexic control participants were compared on performance on these tests, but no significant differences were found between the groups. Dyslexics did not perform better than their control peers (Winner et al., 2000; McManus et al., 2010; Duranovic et al., 2015), and in various cases they performed even worse (Winner et al., 2001). The latter finding was confirmed by Ritchie et al. (2013), who found that higher scores on creativity measures were associated with higher reading scores, suggesting that creative thinking is facilitated by highly developed reading skills. This finding is in absolute contrast to the assumption that dyslexia and its compensation strategies facilitate creativity.

It seems obvious that some dyslexics have higher visual-spatial and creative skills than other dyslexics. Dyslexics may select spatial occupations and creative professions to avoid verbal fields in which they have even greater deficits or where they would perform worse. As Winner et al. (2000) correctly concluded in this context, averagely skilled dyslexics may choose creative fields by default, as the ‘lesser of two evils,’ while more creative dyslexics are expected to choose creative professions to show their potential the best possible way.

3.1.4.4 Conclusion

With regard to career success and income, findings assume that extraversion and social behaviour have a positive connection. Conversely, this implicitly means that introverted and socially controversial and mentally ill fine artists could face more difficulties in making a living in the arts. Extroverted and socially integrated personalities are more open and
emotionally balanced and in this context better marketable and present in the public awareness, all of which definitely help to increase their chances of professional success and income. They are better able to spectacularly present themselves on a regular basis to their audiences in order to create perception and demand. In this context, they are also better able to explore the socially accepted framework of behaviour and arts in order to attract awareness. Thus, their extroverted personality allows them to build very strong connections between them and their audience, since marketing and entertainment seem relevant in modern society. Mentally ill artists as well as introverted artists are however less visible, meaning they are less ‘available’ and ‘noticeable’ to their audience. They likely need external partners capable of establishing this connection between them and society via communicative persuasiveness. However, mentally ill artists seem more difficult to be managed by galleries, for example, in keeping promises in the context of art production for scheduled exhibitions. This is why mental disorder can reasonably be assumed not to be a success factor from the commercial perspective of galleries.

Additionally, findings illustrate that the strong association assumed between artists’ creativity and mental disorders is currently not reliable. A great deal of the work in this field suffers from inadequate methodologies and definitions of both creativity and mental disorders. On the contrary, evidence is particularly present in history and also research findings that mentally healthy fine artists also achieved high levels of artistic quality. In terms of career success and economic income, this reasonably means that, given the same quality, mental health’s impact on artists’ social behaviour and contact-building is considered relevant.

Finally, it can therefore adequately be concluded that mental illness in any form might be in some cases and to some extent a facilitating but clearly not a crucial nor unconditional factor for artistic quality and professional success. On the contrary, mental illness may be a contraproductive factor for artists’ ability to build up relationships to audiences and other people required for commercial career success and income.

3.1.5 Fine Artists' Talent and Skills

The terms talent, ability, and skill are often employed interchangeably, but there are some key differences between them, as explained in detail in Appendix A.
While some personality traits such as talent are genetically manifested (Winner, 1996), skills can be taught and developed as basic elements of an individual's human capital (e.g. Raffo et al., 2000; Fischer and Bidell, 2005; Roodhouse, 2009; Phillips, 2010). In this section, the literature is therefore reviewed to firstly discuss the importance of artistic talent and secondly to identify the abilities and skills needed by business fine artists for their professional success as a precondition to making a living.

3.1.5.1 The Role of Talent for Career Success

Roe's (1953) study on the reasons for outstanding scientific achievements is a widely cited one. He found that the capacity for endurance, concentration, and particularly the commitment to hard work were the driving factors for performance. Winner (1996) took this opportunity to show that high achievement and performance is based on more than pure talent. She wanted to analyse the role of talent and its relation to work ethic or discipline of visual artists in achieving high levels of artistic performance. Winner (1996, p. 271) defines talent as an “innate ability or proclivity to learn in a particular domain.” She argues that different levels of talent as well as motivation or work ethic basically exist among artists. By analysing levels of artistic performance, she firstly confirmed Roe’s findings that hard work ethic, usually expressed in disciplinarily deliberate practice, leads to increasing levels of achievement. Regular practice increases artists’ skills to master specific tasks and to achieve artistic performance. This positive impact of training and deliberate practice in achieving higher performance levels is additionally confirmed in several other studies (e.g. Bloom, 1985, Ericsson et al., 1993). However, Winner (1996) secondly found new evidence that talent trumps a hard work ethic. Talented artists achieved higher levels of outcome and artistic performance with the same amount of work than less talented artists. She argues that talent rather than a hard work ethic is the decisive internal influencing factor helping to shorten practice time to achieve specific levels of achievement. In this context, Anderson (1982) stresses the aspect of time to develop the required skills to achieve specific levels of performance. In his opinion, “it requires at least 100 hours of learning and practice to acquire any significant cognitive skill to a reasonable degree of proficiency” (Anderson, 1982, p. 369), while Ericsson et al. (1993) estimate the time required to develop a new skill to a level of expert quality at several thousands of hours. They developed the 10,000-hour rule which states that to
reach expert status 10,000 hours of study are needed. In other words, less talented artists need much more practice time to compensate for their lack of talent in order to reach similar levels of achievement. However, there is a natural boundary of possible achievements and performance levels for less talented artists compared to talented ones, given the fact that hard work is simply not sufficient to achieve the highest performance levels (Winner, 1996). Due to missing abilities (i.e. talent), less talented artists are incapable of achieving the same levels of artistic performance exhibited by talented artists when these combine their talent with a hard work ethic (Meinz and Hambrick, 2010). This combination leads to the highest artistic performance levels, as Winner (1996) was able to show as her third key finding. Winner's results are confirmed by several studies in other art disciplines and research fields, such as sciences or athletics (e.g. Gobet and Campitelli, 2007; Howard, 2009; Meinz and Hambrick, 2010).

To sum up the key findings with regard to the role of talent and a hard work ethic, it can be stated at this point that these factors are decisive internal influencing factors for artists' professional success, while talent comes before a hard work ethic. Business fine artists capable of combining both factors are expected to have relatively high chances of professional performance and to make a living in the arts by achieving high levels of artistic quality. Less talented business artists need to compensate for their lack as far as possible by ambition and hard work to achieve their individually highest levels. Fine artists who neither show particular talent nor hard work ethic could consequently be expected to hardly make a living. It can therefore be concluded that talent and/or work ethic are required for achieving professional success. This conclusion is closely related to practising fine artists' willingness and capability for professional success (see section 3.1.3.5).

Since talent and hard work ethic are, however, not sufficient for business artists' career success and income (Aronson, 1991; Perkins, 2010), the career success of an individual is strongly based on personality and professional situation (Jacobsen, 2003). Translated to business fine artists, this means that they need to deal with their professional situation in an appropriate manner. That requires the development of business and/or entrepreneurial skills.
In the next section, the literature is reviewed to identify the skills needed for fine artists to make a living in the arts and taught in the context of tertiary education at higher education institutions.

3.1.5.2 Fine Artists’ Education: The Role of Higher Education Institutions

There are essentially two opportunities to acquire and deepen knowledge and develop skills available to fine artists: on the one hand via organised and supervised programmes, e.g. certified degree and training programmes at higher education institutions (HEIs) or training programmes of external education providers, and on the other hand more autodidactically via learning by doing in everyday life as a practising artist.

Fine art degree programmes at HEIs can therefore be seen as a primary source of supervised arts education. Considering this, the literature review focuses on these organised, supervised, and certified fine art degree programmes at university level\(^1\) for undergraduates at HEIs in Europe and abroad.

3.1.5.2.1 The General Role of Higher Education Institutions in Europe

To understand the current role of higher education institutions for developing fine art students in particular and students in all other subjects in general, brief explanations of the recent historical developments in higher education and different significant policy frameworks on European-level are recommendable. In saying this, the traditional image of higher education is, according to Bathmaker (2003) and Sheikhneshin (2008), of an elitist sector for a minority of academically successful people. This image is based on social class inequalities with origins reaching back to the Renaissance (Bathmaker, 2003). The perceived roles of higher education in the traditional way meant a mutual recognition of the members of the ‘academic guild’ and a common language (Barnett, 2000) as well as teaching and searching for truth (Smith and Webster, 1997). The purpose was to expose students to the best thinking and knowledge in the world, to

\(^1\) In accordance with the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF), the national credit transfer system for education qualification in England, Northern Ireland, and Wales since 2011, “university level” in UK is given at level 4 and higher (The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), 2013). Scotland has its own system, the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework.
develop them to understand their world in a critical way, and in promoting active debate about social values (Coffield and Williamson, 1997). However, according to Ashton and Green (1996), this traditional multi-purpose image has faced strong challenges due to the changing economic context with an increasing level of knowledge-driven economies in a more and more globalised environment. The need increased for an “educational upgrading of societies” (Sheikhneshin, 2008, p. 194) and for educating the large majority of the workforce into a highly skilled labour force as the “central lever of economic growth” and global competitiveness (Ashton and Green, 1996, p. 1; Vogel, 2012). Changes to the nature of work mean that employers seek new skills and qualities in graduates to successfully respond to market needs (Castells, 2001; Bathmaker, 2003).

In this context, students are expected to experience significant personal and financial benefits from participating in higher education due to an access to (better) career progression opportunities in the labour market (DfES, 2003). Consequently, policy makers of some countries such as the UK give students a greater share of the responsibility for their education by bearing significantly more costs towards their participation in higher education, for example, in bearing higher tuition and other fees (DfES, 2003, 2004; Greenaway and Haynes, 2003). “Higher education is therefore seen to be a shared investment between the individual graduates and the state, with both clearly benefiting from continued expansion.” (Tomlinson, 2008, p. 50). The financing of educational systems in Europe and abroad differ from one another in this context. For example, while tuition fees of up to 9,000 British pounds per academic year are charged for studying a bachelor’s degree at a UK institution, German institutions charge only a few hundred Euros in total for the degree. The German higher education sector still benefits from high public funding.

Due to this, the consequences of “massification” (Altbach et al., 2009, p. vi), meaning the expansion of student numbers in higher education, are significantly different in Europe and abroad. Findings by Voss et al. (2007) and Tomlinson (2008) clearly show in the context of massification that students perceive their academic qualifications (degree) as not enough to successfully compete in the labour market because too many qualified and certified people compete for too few job opportunities. The students therefore claim to be equipped with additional skills to successfully meet the challenging market
requirements (Freedman and Stuhr, 2004) and to gain the expected financial benefits in the labour market (Shephard, 2008; Tomlinson, 2008).

This massification places enormous financial pressure on the higher education sector of those countries where students financially bear large parts of their education. With restructuring the “'social contract' between higher education and society” (Altbach et al., 2009, p. xii), higher education has become more and more a private good in these countries. Declined public funding has forced the higher education sector to generate larger percentages of their own revenue and to develop new strategies for saving costs and new sources of funding, e.g. by increasing class sizes and teaching loads, while simultaneously reducing teaching quality (Altbach et al., 2009, p. xiii).

Considering this, the impact of the “'consumers' of education” (Altbach et al., 2009, p. xi), the educational stakeholders, such as students, parents, academic staff, employers, and governments, on higher education content and quality has significantly increased. Evans (1999) and Harvey (2000) stress the real challenge of HEIs to manage the shift of the traditional balance of power, which saw them as educational providers in the driving seat to ones participating in the learning experience as key stakeholders and educational demanders. Thus, higher education went from searching and teaching for truth and developing critically thinking knowledge carriers to professional education with graduates equipped with skills employers and themselves need for sustainable growth in challenging market environments (Grubb and Lazerson, 2005; Sheikhneshin, 2008; Vogel, 2012).

The political frameworks that significantly influence this change and hence the new role of higher education across Europe and abroad include two recent policy developments: firstly, the European Union’s strategy for jobs and growth (Lisbon Strategy), initiated in the year 2000 in Lisbon, and secondly the higher education reforms, initiated by the Bologna Process in the years 1999 and 2005 (Keeling, 2006).

The Lisbon strategy for jobs and growth is based on the European Union’s aim to make the EU the leading knowledge-based economy on earth (Lisbon European Council, 2000). To achieve this ambitious policy objective, the critical role of the higher education sector was highlighted (European Commission, 2005; Keeling, 2006; Vogel, 2012). Parallel to the Lisbon strategy, an intergovernmental agreement among European state
members called the Bologna Process was reached to achieve two major outcomes of higher education: firstly, higher education attainment and completion, and secondly the employability of graduates (Bologna Working Group, 2005; Adam, 2008; Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015; European Commission, 2015). The Bologna Process understands employability as “the ability to gain initial meaningful employment, or to become self-employed, to maintain employment, and to be able to move around within the labour market” (Working Group on Employability, 2009, p. 5). In this context, the current key role of higher education is “to equip students with the knowledge, skills and competencies that they need in the workplace and that employers require; and to ensure that people have more opportunities to maintain or renew those skills and attributes throughout their working lives.” (Working Group on Employability, 2009, p. 5). This definition and understanding of the key role of higher education clearly defines degrees at universities within the Bologna Process as vocational education and trainings (e.g. NCIHE, 1997; CVCP, DfEE and HEQE, 1998; Grubb and Lazerson, 2005; Polin and Rich, 2007; Adam, 2008; Cappellari and Lucifora, 2008; Fry et al., 2009, Working Group on Employability, 2009; Allman et al., 2011; Powell et al., 2012; Baum et al., 2013; Goddard and Vallance, 2013; Holland et al., 2013; Universities UK, 2014; QAA, 2016a).

Translated into the context of this study, this consequently means that students studying for a bachelor's degree in fine arts may expect, per strategy objective of the Bologna programme, to be equipped with the skills required by employers as well as required for a professional career as practising artists and finally for also being able to make a living in this profession (Polin and Rich, 2007). This educational objective is valid for all fine art students, regardless of their (current) professional self-understanding and commercial motives for making art.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to ask the question of what skills are relevant for fine artists’ professional preparation at HEIs in the context of the Bologna Process.

3.1.5.2.2 The Identification of Crucial Professional Skills for Practising Fine Artists

The existent literature in the fields of arts, arts education or enterprise, and entrepreneurship education has hardly been focused on fine artists’ professional preparation at HEIs and the skills needed to make a living as practising artists. As a
consequence, few findings exist that may help to identify crucial skills for commercially oriented business fine artists. Therefore, the critical review of literature in the fields of enterprise, entrepreneurship, and business management in other (non-cultural) industries and with focus on other professional and/or research groups may provide valuable input for this study. The reason for reviewing literature with focus on other industries is simple: As mentioned above in section 1.2 (see research background), practising fine artists are mostly organised as one-person ‘businesses’ (e.g. Statistisches Bundesamt, 2010; Arts Council England (ACE), 2009, 2011; Artists Interaction and Representation (AIR), 2011; Bundesverband Bildender Künstlerinnen und Künstler, 2011; Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR), 2013; Ellmeier, 2015). In addition, the working typology in section 3.1.1 identifies business fine artists as the primary group of fine artists particularly interested in earning a living in the arts by commercialising their own artwork. In consideration of this, business fine artists are highly expected to face challenges similar to those of small business owners and entrepreneurs and are assumed to operate like them to make a living in the arts (e.g. Menger, 1999, 2006; Bridge et al., 2003; Swedberg, 2006; Bridgstock, 2011a; Essig, 2016).

The literature review is based on a two-pronged approach: first, the identification of the crucial skills for professional success (“direct” approach) and second, the identification of key reasons for professional failure of small businesses and entrepreneurs (“indirect” approach). In the literature, “failure” is defined as a bankruptcy with losses to entrepreneur, small business owner, and creditors (Perry, 2001; Thornhill and Amit, 2003). Identifying the core reasons for failure can help to indirectly identify the crucial skills needed to prevent it. The argument in this case is if the lack of specific skills will be identified in studies as a reason for failure, these skills can then be considered as important for business survival and success. In contrast, the direct approach represents the more common way of reviewing the literature that is related to studies and theories that try to directly identify the crucial skills for business success.

3.1.5.2.2.1 Reasons for Failure of Entrepreneurs and Small Business Owners in Non-Arts and Non-Cultural Industries

The majority of literature findings evidence the following:
• Mistakes by the entrepreneur and small business owner are main reasons for business failure. Entrepreneurs’ mistakes are primarily based on the lack of skills and competences and shortcomings in skills can be considered as key reason for business failure (Borden and Rajekci, 2000; Dowling, 2003; Zimmerer and Scarborough, 2005; Metzeger, 2006; Kutzhanova et al., 2009; Mason, 2009; Hunt et al., 2010; Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2013; Freiling and Laudien, 2013; Sikomwe et al., 2014);

• The mistakes of entrepreneurs and small business owners are alike. The review of causes of small business failures shows no significant differences between these two groups.

But what mistakes do they usually make and what skills do entrepreneurs and small business owners lack? Duchesneau and Gartner (1990) analysed the differences between thirteen successful and thirteen failed distribution businesses in the market of fresh juices in the U.S. in the late 1980s. They found that failed entrepreneurs and business owners had a lower level of business management skills in particular in finance, sales, and planning. Lussier (1996) supports this finding. He surveyed one hundred failed entrepreneurs and small business owners across different industries and shows that the lack of finance skills in particular was the key reason for their failure.

Lussier and Pfeifer (2000) tested fifteen success-versus-failure variables. They show that successful entrepreneurs had greater management experience, developed more detailed planning, made greater use of professional advice, included more partnerships, and had better timing in selling products than failed entrepreneurs. The importance of planning skills for entrepreneurial success is also supported by Perry (2001). He shows that successful businesses made more formal and detailed planning than failed businesses.

Thornhill and Amit (2003) analysed data from 339 Canadian business bankruptcies and find that the failure of younger businesses is closely linked with deficiencies in business management skills in general and financial skills in particular. These findings are supported by van Scheers and Radipere (2007) who surveyed entrepreneurial failures in South Africa. They show that failed entrepreneurs lacked finance, marketing, and sales skills. These findings are supported by Hanage et al. (2016). Egeln et al.
(2010) also stress the lack of finance skills in their business failure report for the German Ministry of Economics and Technology. They show that more than one third of all German business failures between the years 2000 and 2008 were due to shortcomings in entrepreneurs’ finance skills.

Cardon et al. (2011) analysed 389 accounts of business and entrepreneurial failures, collected by U.S. newspaper reports from 1999 to 2001. They found that the majority of entrepreneurial failures were caused by mistakes of the entrepreneurs and business owners. These mistakes are primarily based on lack of skills and competencies. They specifically identified lacks in planning, finance, strategic thinking, opportunity recognition, and leadership skills as main reasons for the entrepreneurial failure.

The negative impacts on business success brought about by a lack of strategic thinking, finance, and opportunity recognition skills are also stressed by Nobel (2011). With the help of longitudinal case studies and interviews, Freiling and Laudien (2013) additionally show that failed entrepreneurs have shortcomings in business management skills, market knowledge, and networking skills.

In summary, most studies in non-arts and non-cultural sectors and industries identify in particular the lack of business management skills in general and the disciplines of finance/cash management, sales, marketing, planning, opportunity recognition and realisation, strategic thinking, and networking in particular as main reasons for business failure (Table 3.1-1).

Table 3.1-1: Findings from Literature Review on Key Reasons for Business Failure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Duchesneau & Gartner   | 1990 | Comparative examination of characteristics and behaviors of entrepreneurs; 13 successful and failed businesses in the U.S. fresh juice distribution industry | + Lack of idea, planning, finance, and selling skills  
+ Less use of professional advice                                     |
| Lussier & Corman       | 1995 | Quantitative analysis of 15 literature variables in order to reveal the differences between successful and failed businesses; sample of 216 businesses | + Failed businesses made significantly much less use of professional advisors                |
| Lussier                | 1996 | Examination of 100 failed small businesses; 10 most common reasons are identified | + Lack of finance skills (undercapitalisation and high fixed costs, tax problems, slow accounts receivable)  
+ Lack of sales / promotion skills (engaging with customers)          |
| Lussier & Pfeifer      | 2000 | Quantitative analysis of 15 success versus failure variables; comparative analysis of U.S. and Croatian entrepreneurs | + Lack of management skills  
+ Lack of planning skills  
+ Failed businesses made much less use of professional advice  
+ Lack of networking skills (included partnerships)                    |
| Perry                  | 2001 | Quantitative examination of planning on U.S. small business failures; sampling frame was the dataset of Dun&Bradstreet with more than 10 million listed companies | + Failed businesses developed less formal planning  
+ Formal planning has no effect on success for businesses with less than 8 employees! |
| Thornhill & Amit       | 2003 | Analysis of 339 Canadian corporate bankruptcies                                   | + Lack of finance skills in particular and business management skills in general among younger firms  
+ Lack of strategic thinking and opportunity skills among older firms (inflexibility to adapt to environmental change) |
| van Schoors & Radipere | 2007 | Analysis of 100 business failures in South Africa                                 | + Lack of finance skills (>80% of failures)  
+ Lack of marketing / sales skills                                    |
| Egeln et al.           | 2010 | Analysis of business failures in Germany between 2000 and 2008                     | + Lack of sales skills (engaging with customers)  
+ Lack of finance skills (high fixed costs; funding problems)  
+ Lack of planning/controlling skills  
+ Lack of strategic thinking skills (adaptation to environmental change; product development)  
+ Lack of opportunity skills (market timing; recruiting staff)  
+ Lack of leadership skills (problems with staff, partners)            |
| Cardon et al.          | 2011 | Analysis of 389 business failures in the U.S. between 1999 and 2001               | + Lack of strategic thinking skills  
+ Lack of finance / cash management skills (high costs)  
+ Lack of planning skills  
+ Lack of opportunity skills (market timing; recruiting staff)  
+ Lack of leadership skills (problems with staff, partners)            |
| Nobel                  | 2011 | Analysis of business failures in the U.S.                                         | + Lack of strategic thinking skills  
+ Lack of finance / cash management skills (high costs)  
+ Lack of planning skills  
+ Lack of opportunity skills (market timing; recruiting staff)  
+ Lack of leadership skills (problems with staff, partners)            |
| Department for Business Innovation & Skills | 2013 | Small Business Survey 2012 UK                                                    | + Lack of strategic thinking skills (adaptation to environmental change)  
+ Lack of finance / cash management skills (high costs; Tax; funding problems)  
+ Lack of opportunity skills (market timing; recruiting staff)  
+ Lack of leadership skills (problems with staff, partners)            |
| Freiling & Laudien     | 2013 | Case study analysis of 3 failed businesses                                         | + Lack of strategic thinking skills  
+ Lack of business management skills  
+ Lack of market knowledge  
+ Lack of collaborative skills (problems with investors)                |
| Sikomwe et al.         | 2014 | Analysis of 25 failed businesses in Zimbabwe                                      | + Lack of strategic thinking skills  
+ Lack of business management skills  
+ Lack of market knowledge                                             |
| Hanage et al.          | 2016 | Longitudinal analysis (6 years) of 7 digital creative businesses in the UK        | + Lack of marketing / sales skills  
+ Lack of networking and business management skills                    |
3.1.5.2.2 Reasons for Success of Entrepreneurs and Small Business Owners in Non-Arts and Non-Cultural Industries

Churchill and Lewis (1983) mention the entrepreneur’s capabilities to basically master all entrepreneurial requirements as key success factor. However, the successful entrepreneur must have in their opinion in particular special abilities and skills opportunity recognition, networking, idea, marketing, and finance. The question, ‘What does one ‘need to know’ in order to become a successful entrepreneur?’ was also investigated by Hood and Young (1993, p. 115) in the early 1990s. They asked this question of one hundred leading entrepreneurs and chief executive officers in U.S. American fastest growing entrepreneurial organizations. As a result, they identify finance/cash management, accounting, leadership, marketing, and sales skills of the highest relevance besides professional engineering skills.

The entrepreneurship model by Stokes and Wilson (2010) emphasises a mixture of various skills, behaviours and attributes an entrepreneur should have in order to succeed. In their opinion the successful entrepreneur must have special abilities and skills in the areas of opportunity identification, creativity, resource leveraging, networking, marketing, and finance.

By analysing the careers of Stanford alumni, Lazear (2004, 2005) found that individuals who have varied work and educational experiences and therefore a balanced set of various skills become more likely business owners and entrepreneurs and made better business progress than those who have focused on one work or subject at HEIs. As a consequence, small business owners and entrepreneurs must be, in his opinion, “jack-of-all-trades” (Lazear, 2004, p. 1).

Stuetzer et al. (2012) analysed longitudinal data on innovative business ventures. In their finding, a balanced set of business management and strategic thinking skills, including planning skills and skills for environmental scanning (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2015), is an important determinant of entrepreneurial success.

Smith and Perks (2006) analysed the entrepreneurial activity and levels of developed skills of black micro-entrepreneurs, mainly operating in the manufacturing and service sectors in South Africa. They identified strategic planning, organising, leading, and controlling skills alongside professional and employability skills as most important for their business success.
Gibb (1998) highlights entrepreneurial skills in the fields of strategic thinking, selling, negotiating, and creative problem solving as crucial for business success of self-employed individuals. Baines and Kennedy (2010) investigated the professional environment of freelance journalists to formulate recommendations for their education at HEIs. According to their findings, journalists should urgently develop an entrepreneurial mindset, including an entrepreneurial attitude and behaviour in order to find and create new ways to engage with audiences. Freelancing journalists have to compete with everybody for producing and selling stories and news in the age of the Internet and digital media; they are not the exclusive producer of news any more. The skills of creativity or ideation, marketing, self-promotion, and selling stories have, in Baines and Kennedy’s opinion, become additionally important as a result of enormous structural changes in the communication and news industry in the last decades. Since this professional group faces similar challenges in creating market demand and audiences to self-employed or freelancing business fine artists, Baines and Kennedy’s recommendations are directly transferable to this study’s subject group.

The particular needs of artists in building a professional artistic career are illustrated in an interdisciplinary general guide by Cobb et al. (2011). They stress an entrepreneurial mindset as essential aspect of arts entrepreneurship education. The entrepreneurial mindset is defined to include the abilities to think creatively, strategically, analytically, and reflectively as well as to show the appropriate attitude, and behaviour (Pollard and Wilson, 2013). This understanding of entrepreneurial mindset is also confirmed, among others, by Essig (2013), White (2013), and Welsh et al. (2014). Through strategic planning, the artist is required to define his or her mission and vision, their reason for being an artist. The mission helps to set goals and objectives and answers the question of the artistic approach, which is the core of the art-related business concept. Besides strategic planning, Cobb et al. also stress finance topics as crucial for an artist’s career. The importance of both topics is also supported by Jusoh et al. (2011) and Pollard and Wilson (2013). Some of these findings, such as developing entrepreneurial mindset are also supported by Welsh et al. (2014), who surveyed 119 artists from various art disciplines at an Entrepreneurship in the Arts conference in 2014. Their findings show that skills to building up close network contacts are important for their success.
Landwehr (2005) provides an organisational context. He analysed the different types of skills needed for innovative business formation by dividing the start-up process into four sub-phases and considering their phase-specific requirements and problems. Landwehr (2005) stresses in particular ideation, opportunity recognition, and strategic thinking or planning skills as crucial in the early stages of business formation, while business management skills are more required in the later stages to run the business. Developed networking skills, alongside skills of opportunity recognition and creation, creativity, problem solving, leadership, communication, and innovation are considered by Colbert (2003), Liňán (2008), and Brandenburg et al. (2016) as crucial for successful entrepreneurship.

More recent studies considering the importance of networking skills in particular and the clustering of entrepreneurial skills in general are provided by de Wolf and Schoorlemmer (2007), McElwee (2008), Rudmann (2008), Vesala and Pyysiäinen (2008), de Klerk and Saayman (2012), and Kahan (2012). These scientists investigated farmers and analysed the agriculture industry in Europe. The incentive for their entrepreneurial studies is based on the global oversupply of agricultural products urging farmers to operate in a rapidly changing environment with a strong price competition. Due to the fact that the entrepreneurial challenges and business risks of this professional group are quite similar to the basic challenges of professional working business fine artists, the findings are of relevance for this study. According to Kahan (2012), farmer entrepreneurs farm exclusively for the market - as business fine artists in general and arts entrepreneurs in particular make artwork exclusively for the (created) market. Farmer entrepreneurs see their farms as a business, as a means of earning profits. They are passionate about their farm business and are willing to take calculated risks to make their farms profitable and their businesses grow. As “price takers,” farmer entrepreneurs need to developed outstanding abilities to make the most of their resources: they can look for better ways to organise their farms; they can try new food crops and cultivars, better animals, and alternative technologies to increase productivity and diversify production. As a result, they need to become absolutely market-oriented and have to learn to take calculated risks to open or create new markets for their products in order to increase their profits to earn a living in farming. In contrast, non-entrepreneurial farmers focus on maintaining their traditional way of life, characterised by farming mainly for home
consumption. Their production decisions are based on what they need rather than on what is possible. For farmers to become entrepreneurs they need to be innovative and forward-looking. They need to manage their businesses as long-term ventures with a view to making them sustainable. They need to be able to identify opportunities and seize them. In this context, farmer entrepreneurs are similar to arts entrepreneurs; both professional groups face quite similar challenges and business risks in dynamic markets with a considerable oversupply of products. About twenty entrepreneurship and agriculture experts as well as almost 150 farmers in six different countries were asked of what skills farmers need nowadays in order to succeed in business (Wolf and Schoorlemmer, 2007; Rudmann, 2008; Vesala and Pyysiäinen, 2008). As a result, five categories of skill sets with various underlying skills were mentioned by the experts and farmers, as illustrated in Table 3.1-2 below.

### Table 3.1-2: Skill Sets for Farmer Entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Skill Set</th>
<th>Underlying Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Skills</td>
<td>Plant or animal production skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management Skills</td>
<td>Financial management and administration skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General planning skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Opportunity Skills</td>
<td>Recognising business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market and customer orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategic Skills</td>
<td>Skills to receive and make use of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic planning skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic decision making skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Co-operation/ Networking Skills</td>
<td>Skills related to co-operating with other farmers and companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team working skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adapted from Wolf and Schoorlemmer (2007), Rudmann (2008), and Vesala and Pyysiäinen (2008)
Categories 3, 4, and 5 in the table above are considered as real entrepreneurial skills by several experts in agriculture because these skills are considered as more complex and relevant to developing and maintaining a profit-making business (de Wolf and Schoorlemmer, 2007; Rudmann, 2008; Vesala and Pyysiäinen, 2008). These three sets of entrepreneurial skills are therefore also understood as “higher level skills,” while industry specific professional skills and management skills (categories 1 and 2) are considered as “lower level skills” and basic requirements mainly to ensure the daily running of the business (Rudmann, 2008, p. 88; Morgan et al., 2010).

According to this hierarchical concept of entrepreneurial skills, the researchers consider the recognition, creation, and realisation of business opportunities as the most important entrepreneurial skill. This statement is supported by DeTienne and Chandler (2004), McElwee (2008), and Hunter (2012), who see opportunity identification as a crucial content area in entrepreneurship education. Opportunity skills are the prerequisite for any entrepreneurial success and profitable business (Gagliò and Katz, 2001; Ardichvili et al., 2003). These skills are followed on the one hand by strategic skills that enable a target-oriented exploitation, optimisation, and planning of required and/or outsourced resources and on the other hand by networking skills that are needed to ensure access to valuable resources in order to realise the recognised or created opportunities. As a result, Rudmann presents in her final report of the research project a “Pyramid of Skills” as illustrated in Figure 3.1-3.

Figure 3.1-3: Pyramid of Skills
Source: Rudmann (2008, p. 88)
Faltin (2001, 2007, 2008) considers the entrepreneur basically as a composer. He critically questions the need for being multi-skilled and developed in all business fields. In his approach, the entrepreneur has the primary aim to develop and redefine the business concept systematically until a sustained unique selling proposition is created. Then, the entrepreneur is required to control and coordinate the different external components needed for daily business challenges, for example, marketing, finance, logistics, tax, etc. like a composer. The fundamental precondition for being a composer in Faltin’s opinion is a developed entrepreneurial mindset that encompasses an entrepreneurial attitude, thinking, understanding, and behaviour as well as some specific skills. Due to the above described tasks, Faltin’s approach of defining the crucial entrepreneurial skills includes, at least the following four core skills: idea development, leadership, networking, and strategic thinking.

In summary, the review of academic literature on crucial skills for entrepreneurial success has not provided a “Golden Road” to a clear definition. The reason for this may be the lack of a unified definition of entrepreneurial skills in the extant literature as well as the complexity of reasons for business or entrepreneurial success and failure. However, the findings of the literature review are grounded on some similar skills for business success, as outlined in Table 3.1-3.
### Table 3.1-3: Findings from Literature Review on Key Reasons for Business and Entrepreneurial Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churchill &amp; Lewis</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Survey of small business owners</td>
<td>+ Small business owners need capability to master all requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hood & Young               | 1993 | Survey of 100 leading entrepreneurs and CEOs of the fastest growing U.S. organisations | + Mixture of various skills, behaviours, and attributes  
+ Most important skills: finance, marketing/sales, planning |
| Gibb                       | 1998 | Approach to propose various key areas of entrepreneurial skills, capacities and attributes for management development | + Strategic thinking, leadership, networking, sales, business management process, learning, and IT skills |
| Lazer                      | 2004 | The development of the "Jack-of-all-Trades" theory; work histories and university transcriptions of Standford MBA alumni | + Entrepreneurs with balanced set of skills perform significantly better in different challenges than "one-skill specialists" |
| Landwehr                   | 2005 | Analysis of different types of know-how needed for an innovative business venturing | + Creativity, opportunity identification & creation, strategic thinking, marketing/sales, finance |
| Gibb                       | 2006 | Analysis of the entrepreneurial activity and levels of developed skills of black micro entrepreneurs in South Africa | + Strategic thinking, leadership, networking, sales, business management process, learning, and IT skills |
| Faltin                     | 2001 | Self-Case Study: Founder of "Teekampagne", in the meantime one of the worldwide leading online tea distribution companies; explicit use of external skills depending on requirements as integral part of the business model | + Entrepreneurial mindset; idea/creativity, strategic thinking (planning), leadership, and networking |
| Liňán                      | 2008 | Testing intention to become an entrepreneur with a sample of 249 university students. The development of specific skills increases students' intention. | + Opportunity recognition  
+ Creativity and innovation  
+ Networking  
+ Leadership |
| Oberschachtsiek            | 2008 | Investigation how founder's experience and professional background affect the duration of periods of self-employment and to what extent the duration is affected by balanced set of skills | + Balanced skill set is not sufficient to prolong the duration of self-employment / entrepreneurial success |
| de Wolf & Schoorlemmer; Rudmann; Vesala & Pyysilainen | 2007-2008 | Investigation and survey of 160 farmers and 20 agriculture experts in six EU countries between 2005 and 2008 in the context of the EU funded project "Developing Entrepreneurial Skills for Farmers" | + "Higher level skills": opportunity, strategic thinking, networking  
Supporting skills are:  
+ "Lower level skills": business management skills and professional skills |
| Baines & Kennedy           | 2010 | Analysis of professional environment of freelancing journalists                | + Entrepreneurial mindset; idea, opportunity, marketing/promotion                              |
| Stokes & Wilson            | 2010 | The development of the "Model of Entrepreneurship"                             | + Mixture of various skills, behaviours, and attributes  
+ Most important skills: opportunity, networking, marketing/sales, finance |
| Cobb et al.                | 2011 | Analysis of important tasks artists need to successfully fulfill for professional success ("The Artist's Roadmap") | + Entrepreneurial mindset; strategic planning, finance, legal, promoting, selling, and funding |
| Welsh et al.               | 2014 | Survey of 119 artists from various disciplines at an "Entrepreneurship in the Arts" conference | + Entrepreneurial mindset and networking |
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The literature review has shown that the development of an entrepreneurial mindset, defined as an entrepreneurial attitude, understanding or thinking, and behaviour is important for self-employed professionals in competitive markets with an oversupply to achieve business success. Additionally, in order to successfully operate like an entrepreneur and small business owner, the following seven skills have emerged in the literature as crucial for the business success, independent of industry, size, culture, and organisational structure (Table 3.1-4):  

**Table 3.1-5: Crucial Skills of the Entrepreneurial Success**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crucial Entrepreneurial Skills</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea/Creativity</td>
<td>Ability to think creatively or innovatively that leads to new insights, novel approaches and (business) concepts, fresh perspectives, whole new ways of understanding and conceiving things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking (Planning)</td>
<td>Ability to set goals and develop (long-range) plans in a variety of areas, to anticipate the unexpected, to analyse the business environment, and to cooperate with people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity recognition and realisation</td>
<td>Ability to recognise, create, assess, and realise business opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Ability to develop and use contacts for (business) purposes beyond the reason for the initial contact. Networking skills comprise in particular the abilities to 1) target activities strategically, 2) systematically plan networking, 3) engage others effectively, 4) showcase the own expertise, 5) assess opportunities, and 6) deliver value to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Ability to develop a &quot;Art/Business Vision&quot; of where one wants to be and to inspire people (external experts) to help achieving this vision. Leadership skills are particularly important for one-person and small businesses as they often need external help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Ability to plan, fund, direct, monitor, organise, and control the monetary resources of the business artist or business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (Sales)</td>
<td>Ability to reach the market (its potential customers, including decision-makers) and to achieve a high degree of visibility and awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author’s own illustration*

The first five skills named in the Table 3.1-4 can be considered, according to de Wolf and Schoorlemmer (2007, p. 19), as “real entrepreneurial skills”, particularly important for entrepreneurs, including the sub-type of arts entrepreneurs. They have explicitly and primarily to do with the creating of a successful business or self-employment career, while the last two mentioned skills in finance and sales enable the successful running of
the business or entrepreneurial career, which is of high relevance for all sub-types of business fine artists (see section 3.1.1 as well as Appendix K). This classification leads to a new explanatory model, which will be called in this study the **working model of the “crucial ‘five plus two’ skills for business fine artists”**.

Next, the literature is further reviewed with a focus on how the entrepreneurial mindset and seven entrepreneurial and business-related skills identified in the literature should be taught best, for instance, in the regular fine arts curriculum at HEIs.

### 3.1.5.2.3 Learning Environment and Teaching Methods

The literature on entrepreneurship argues that a quality learning environment is crucial to efficiently support the development of entrepreneurial skills (Gibb, 2002, 2010; Pittaway, 2004; Gardner, 2008; Education International, 2012). Teaching methods in particular are required that encourage experiential learning through an action-oriented and problem-based approach (Rae, 2000, 2005; Lyons, 2002; Aronsson, 2004; Honig, 2004; Tan and Frank, 2005; Hanke et al., 2005; Mueller et al., 2006; Morland and Thompson, 2010; Moustaghfir and Širca, 2010).

#### 3.1.5.2.3.1 Learning Environment

The learning environment refers to everything outside the learner including the nature of the skill, the situation it is practised in, the teaching quality, the facility characteristics, current learning partnerships, learning materials used, practice methods, and feedback (Hampton, 2002; Gibbs, 2010, 2012; Monks and Schmidt, 2010).

Jones and English (2004) designed a framework for a new programme in Entrepreneurship at the University of Tasmania, Australia. Within this programme, the students have the autonomy over how, when, and where they learn. They call this autonomous approach ‘student-centred learning’. The expected benefit for the student is seen in a deeper learning experience that includes in particular collaborative activities, goal-driven tasks, intellectual discovery, activities that heighten strategic, tactical and practical thinking, and activities that provide practice in learning skills (Robinson et al., 2016). The main precondition of this ‘entrepreneurial’ teaching strategy is, however, a learning environment in which students are encouraged to actively engage with this process. This learning environment is characterised by replacing conventional lectures.
and tutorials with web-based, small-group workshops, preparing, presenting, and discussing various case studies on the specific topics and tasks under examination. The web-based approach is used as an interactive platform for online working, e.g. chat rooms or discussion boards. Working online and successfully studying cases in close collaboration with others creates an intense atmosphere of learning that is designed to enable students to exercise a significant degree of flexibility over how they learn and to make the learning process as creative and innovative as the subject matter itself. The performance assessment takes place on the basis of feedback in the form of internal and external peer evaluations. The internal peer evaluation focuses on both the individual’s contribution and performance within the working group and skill development, whereas the external peer evaluation focuses on the group performance during the workshop presentations. Jones and English (2004) as well as Robinson et al. (2016) present evidence that, with the help of this student-centred learning and assessment focus, the students’ skill development and belief in their ability to take control of their future were positively affected. In this context, Tell (2008) likewise stresses the importance of learning networks to foster knowledge building and skill development by a process of feedback, discussion and knowledge exchange.

To sum up, approaches to describe a promising entrepreneurial learning environment (e.g. Reuber and Fisher, 1993; Rae, 2000, 2005, 2009, 2012; Lyons, 2002; Aronsson, 2004; Honig, 2004; Tan and Frank, 2005; Hanke et al., 2005; Mueller et al., 2006; Carey and Matlay, 2007; Gardner, 2008; Morland and Thompson, 2010; Moustaghfir and Širca, 2010; Gibb and Price, 2014) highlight the following elements:

- **action-oriented learning**: developing skills requires practical experience and therefore practical exercises. In this context, the learning should be both goal-oriented and experiential to create room for failures and retries.

- **trained teaching staff**: Only with the help of entrepreneurially trained teaching staff are target-oriented feedback and personal on-site coaching/mentoring during the practical exercise stages possible.

- **on-site coaching**: experiential learning is most efficient when the learner receives guidance in action and immediate feedback after the exercises. The easiest way to
implement such an intense learning environment with close contact to teachers and peers is to form small learning groups.

- **collaborative learning**: Learning with peers creates an open communication flow that enables knowledge sharing and the creation of new ideas in solving problems. In addition, the learners experience other ways of thinking. They can therefore broaden and widen their own mind. Furthermore, learning with peers allows immediate feedback, irrespective of teaching staff. This feedback is of highest value in relation to the development of skills – and personality.

- **responsibility**: Learners should have the responsibility over their learning. They know their way of learning best and are therefore able to decide how, when, where, and with whom to learn. In addition, responsibility improves the development of decision making, risk taking, and strategic and tactical thinking skills.

**3.1.5.2.3.2 Teaching Methods**

According to Gibb and Price (2014, p. 17), “entrepreneurial teaching is designed to maximise the potential for stimulating entrepreneurial attributes and insight and equipping participants for action.” In this context, teaching methods in entrepreneurship education can more or less be classified into the categories of passive and active methods (Dale, 1946, 1954, 1969; Carrier, 2007; Hindle, 2007; Fayolle, 2007; Fu et al., 2009; Lonappan and Deravaj, 2011; Gibb and Price, 2014). The first category comprises in particular formal lectures and frontal workshops and seminars with a tendentially passive engagement of learners. These methods are also called hands-off methods, while the second category includes action learning or hands-on methods where learners are challenged to apply this new knowledge, such as group projects, study visits, project work, role-playing games, guest speakers, simulations, and e-learning games.

Honig (2004) stresses that traditional ‘hands-off’ approaches are still widely used teaching methods in higher education in Europe. According to Bennett (2006), the three most used teaching methods in entrepreneurship education are: lectures, case studies, and group discussions. He shows evidence that these methods are also used in other business-related courses and that they are relatively traditional and less effective in influencing entrepreneurial attributes.
In the context of entrepreneurship education, Arast et al. (2012, p. 2) stress that “there is no universal pedagogical recipe to teach entrepreneurship and the choice of techniques and modalities depends mainly on the objectives, contents and constraints.” According to Hytti and O’Gorman (2004), the selection of an appropriate method depends in particular on the objectives of the education. In their opinion, the most effective way to accomplish the objective is to increase the understanding of what entrepreneurship is about and to provide information through traditional methods such as teacher-centred lectures or seminars. Yet if the objective is to equip students with entrepreneurial mindsets and skills, the best way is said to be by providing real-life training opportunities that enable them to be directly involved in the entrepreneurial process, such as work placements (e.g. Miettinen, 2006; Carey and Matlay, 2007; Plumly et al., 2008; Fry et al., 2009; Mwasalwiba, 2010; Clark, 2012; O’Neil et al., 2013). Levy et al. (2009) show evidence that a combination of college/university-based training and work placements provide the highest level of opportunity perception and entrepreneurial skills. Kirby (2004a) criticises that entrepreneurship educators very often end up teaching about entrepreneurship due to the use of false techniques, in particular formal lessons. In order to teach entrepreneurship as a career, he also recommends the use of some kind of apprenticeship. Similar findings are shown by other researchers in recent years. Stueter et al. (2013) show evidence that work placements are crucial for entrepreneurial learning and later success. They analysed the dataset of more than five hundred interviewed new venture founders. They found that varied work experience positively relates to entrepreneurial skills.

Developing an entrepreneurial mindset – which encompasses entrepreneurial thinking, attitude and behaviour as well as entrepreneurial skills – is best accomplished by means of mentorship, collaborative and interdisciplinary team projects, and experiential learning in real-life projects or simulation games (e.g. Ivanitskaya et al., 2002; Paulus and Nijstad, 2003; Meisiek and Haefliger, 2011; Essig, 2013; Mäkimurto-Koivumaa and Puhakka, 2013; Doyle et al., 2014). The permanent exchange of knowledge and perspectives among learners and guiding mentors produces multiple minds or habits of mind in relation to showing entrepreneurial behaviour, producing novel ideas, and recognising opportunities (Essig, 2013).
An interesting project in this context was carried out by Löbler et al. (2005). They designed an innovative entrepreneurship programme in 2001 whereby students supported real entrepreneurs in the start-up phase at the University of Leipzig for two years. The main goal of the programme was not to transform students into entrepreneurs but to develop their entrepreneurial mindset in cooperation with others without actually starting their own business activities. The findings expose that real-life learning, when guided by mentors, leads to significant changes in students’ perceptions of their entrepreneurial spirit and in developing entrepreneurial skills, enthusiasm, and even delight over time. In any domain of human skill, when it comes to cultivating expertise it helps to have guidelines from experts themselves. As an old Zen saying puts it in this context, “If you want to get to the top of the mountain, ask someone who goes up and down the path to the summit.” (Goleman, 2008, foreword). This is supported by the findings of Pittaway and Cope (2006, 2007) as well as Chang and Rieple (2013). Mentoring by experts is widely acknowledged in entrepreneurship and business management as a key success factor of professional and, therefore, entrepreneurial development (Aronsson, 2004; Bozeman and Feeney, 2007; Boden and Nedeya, 2010; Colvin and Ashman, 2010; Fox et al., 2010; NBIA, 2010; Dawson, 2014; Leidenfrost et al., 2014).

Guest lecturers and mentors are themselves ‘teaching methods’ of particular interest since they are already a regularly part of HEIs’ teaching process. Inviting experienced, external (industry) experts such as artists and arts entrepreneurs as guest lecturers into the classroom could be an invaluable part of fine art students’ (entrepreneurial) education. Although guest lecturers alone are not an adequate ‘teaching method’ to develop entrepreneurial skills, because skills can hardly be developed by storytelling, guest lecturers can, though, transfer factual and practical relevant knowledge. Having deep discussions with motivational and inspiring practitioners and people with entrepreneurial mindsets, skills, and work ethics could help fine art students discover new ways of (entrepreneurial) thinking and to stimulate the development of their entrepreneurial mindsets. Motivational and authentic speakers can boost students’ optimism and create an overall feeling of confidence in terms of Bandura’s self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1995, 2001). In short, self-efficacy describes a psychological phenomenon of subjective conviction to overcome difficult challenges and problems of
living only by relying on one’s own competencies. Self-efficacy can therefore be seen as the crucial ability to show that by overcoming considerable obstacles it’s possible to make it through anything. This conviction may be visible in an optimistic view of life and great powers of endurance.

To conclude, the literature findings point out that, due to the fact that people learn in different ways, there exists no single method to effectively teach enterprising or entrepreneurial skills. Key to a successful entrepreneurship education seems to be the combination of adequate teaching methods, applied and guided by qualified teaching mentors, which match the educational objectives or students’ needs of entrepreneurial skills with the learning environment in the most effective way.

### 3.1.5.2.4 The Status of Arts Entrepreneurship Education at Higher Education Institutions

Fayolle (2008) and Pollard and Wilson (2013) define the three main economic and social objectives of entrepreneurship education: i) to train students and professionals in entrepreneurship (skills), ii) to develop entrepreneurial individuals (mindset), and iii) to develop entrepreneurial lecturers and researchers (theories). Having said this and considering the fact that bachelor’s degrees at HEIs are vocational preparation programmes and that crucial skills for self-employed professionals, small business owners and entrepreneurs in different industries were identified, the literature is further reviewed with focus on the state of teaching the entrepreneurial mindset and the identified ‘five plus two’ skills in the regular fine art curriculum. The literature review focuses on the curriculum at HEIs in Europe with a particular focus on the UK and Germany and abroad. The UK and Germany were chosen for this study as European representatives of art markets with different international reputations, sizes, and norms in collegiate education. It is of relevance to know whether fine art graduates will vocationally be prepared and equipped with these skills along with artistic skills to successfully make a living as practising artists.

Basically, higher education institutions with their teaching staff can be seen as competence centres and key agents in the educational infrastructure (Koch, 2003; Freedman and Stuhr, 2004; European Commission, 2013; Penaluna et al., 2015). In this
context, the National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE, 2016a) is one of the key driving institutions of education policy in the UK. NCEE’s focus lies on embedding entrepreneurship into existing curricula and thus developing enterprise and entrepreneurship in all students across the different subjects and disciplines at HEIs (NCEE, 2016a). Since being entrepreneurial can be taught (Raffo et al., 2000; Henry et al., 2005; Blenker et al., 2006; Roodhouse, 2009; Phillips, 2010; Nilsson, 2012; Solesvik et al., 2013), NCEE aims to encourage, among other things, experiential learning approaches, real-life projects, and the progressive integration of entrepreneurial educators in HE curricula (NCEE, 2016b), e.g. industrial and entrepreneurial experienced professionals (Carey and Matlay, 2011). However, entrepreneurship education is not simply about learning how to run a business – it is not even business studies; instead, it includes all forms of learning and education that aim to foster entrepreneurial mindsets, attitudes, and skills in the specific professional and situational contexts of recognising, creating, and realising opportunities, generating business activities as well as promoting creativity and self-employment (Heinonen and Poikkijoki, 2006; Fayolle, 2009; Niras Consultants, 2009; World Economic Forum, 2009; European Commission, 2012a, 2013; Jones et al., 2012; QAA, 2012).

Carey and Naudin (2006) argue that enterprise and entrepreneurial education in the arts could easily be embedded into the curricula of creative industry subjects. This could be done due to the fact that lecturers in art subjects are mostly experienced practitioners (Freedman and Stuhr, 2004; Carey and Naudin, 2006; Carey and Matlay, 2007, 2011) and course work already based on elements of experiential, student-centred learning (Carey and Naudin, 2006; ADM-HEA and NESTA, 2007).

Despite these given opportunities, though, it was assumed that arts entrepreneurship education at HEIs had conceptually been underdeveloped and not embedded into HE curriculum (Matlay and Carey, 2007; Carey and Naudin, 2006; Carey and Matlay, 2007; Bridgstock et al., 2015; Essig, 2016) and that art students lack essential professional skills and an understanding of the industry they are entering after graduation (Ball, 2002), both on account of various reasons explained below. This circumstance prompted the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in 2006 to state that “graduates leave university unprepared for the realities of working in the [creative] sector, and those that are already employed find it difficult to supplement their skills and knowledge gaps with appropriate
training.” (DCMS, 2006, p. 6). This situation is particularly astonishing when one considers that, according to HEIs’ course descriptions and handbooks, the bachelor degree programmes in Fine Art and its single subjects are clearly claimed to be vocational preparations for students and graduates (Bennett and Bridgstock, 2015), including the entrepreneurial career path of self-employment and freelance work after graduation.

Yet it is noteworthy to stress at this juncture that the literature still lacks concrete findings in regards to whether, how, and to what extent arts entrepreneurship or education in arts business management has been provided and embedded in HEIs (fine art) curriculum. Due to this, literature findings are still only able to ‘assume’ a poor state of arts entrepreneurship education at HEIs.

According to the literature, the reasons remain diverse for the assumed poor embeddedness of arts entrepreneurship education in HEIs’ curriculum. They are due less to subject- or faculty-specific findings but rather due to circumstances in the general understanding and interpretation of entrepreneurship education, as specified in the following:

First, the major reason for the poor embeddedness of arts entrepreneurship education at HEIs could be given in the current confusion and controversy among arts educators and practitioners over exactly what arts entrepreneurship or business management education for art students is, not to mention what skill sets it should involve (DCMS, 2006; Beckman, 2007, 2011; Hong and Bridgstock, 2011; Hong et al., 2012; Roberts, 2013; Bridgstock, 2013a; Maritz et al., 2015). There does not even exist a clear definition of the terms (arts) entrepreneurship and (arts) entrepreneur (e.g. Jacobson, 2003; Roberts, 2013; Beckman, 2014; Gartner 2015; Korzen, 2015; Taylor, 2015; White, 2015; Essig, 2016; Hausmann and Heinze, 2016). Essig (2016) stresses in this context the differences between the European/Australian and U.S. understanding of arts entrepreneurship in higher education. While the European/Australian understanding of arts entrepreneurship highlights the organisational approach (venture or business creation), the U.S. approach focuses on individual artists behaving entrepreneurially. This lack of common understanding coupled with cultural tensions on purposes of educational degree programmes – between utility and creative expression – could be considered the
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The key reason why arts entrepreneurship education in particular still remains in its infancy in practice in higher education institutions and in the field of study (Essig, 2016).

In this context, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA, 2016b) provides, describes, and defines with its subject benchmark statements the clear nature and characteristics of bachelor’s degree programmes in a specific subject or subject area, such as Art and Design (QAA, 2008a, 2016b). This subject benchmark statement is also relevant for the fine arts since QAA does not provide a fine art specific benchmark statement. The statement for Art and Design is:

“The principle aim of undergraduate education in art and design is to facilitate acquisition of appropriate knowledge and understanding, development of the necessary personal attributes, and application of the essential skills which will equip and prepare students for continuing personal development and professional practice.” (QAA, 2008a, p.7, 2016b, p.12), which clearly includes also to “be resourceful and entrepreneurial.” (QAA, 2008a, p. 7, 2016b, p. 17).

The “essential skills” mentioned will first be further defined as subject-specific knowledge and understanding, attributes and skills, including the skills to generate and develop ideas and concepts, employ critical thinking as well as material, market and context knowledge. As a second category, generic knowledge and transferable skills are mentioned, including skills in self-management, critical engagement, teamwork, communication and presentation, research and information as well as personal qualities the likes of enthusiasm and motivation. Albeit, the benchmark statement is not clear on what it means to be “entrepreneurial” and what skills are exactly needed to be entrepreneurial.

A second reason, which might be the logical consequence of the first reason, is provided by recent studies on entrepreneurship education at HEIs. Among others, Levie (1999), Hannon et al. (2006), Matlay and Carey (2007), Sailer and Weber (2013), and Maritz et al. (2015) were able to illustrate that the vast majority of HEIs in the UK, Germany, Europe, and Australia provided entrepreneurship education primarily across various departments in business schools. Hannon et al. (2006), for example, show evidence that
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• business schools are the predominant leading schools or faculties of entrepreneurship provision in England (64%), followed by the faculties of Engineering (9%) and Art & Design (8%);

• entrepreneurship education targets students specifically from the business faculty (44%) and at an undergraduate level (21%); the share of students at the postgraduate level was 11%;

• the primary top three learning outcomes of entrepreneurship provision in the programmes/modules were i) ‘to raise awareness, knowledge and understanding about enterprise/entrepreneurship concept and practice’ (27%), ii) ‘to develop individual enterprising/entrepreneurial skills, behaviours and attitudes’ (15%), and iii) ‘to exploit institutionally owned intellectual property (10%).

The different studies all present convincing evidence that entrepreneurship education in England, and highly likely in all of the UK, is dominated by business and engineering faculties and thus by HEIs’ understanding and interpretation that entrepreneurship is closely connected with business issues, such as business planning and venturing. This situation, including the dominance of entrepreneurship education through the HEIs' business faculties and enterprise centres, has not considerably changed since then, according to recent reports and surveys relating to the state of the entrepreneurial higher education (HE) sector in the UK (Kirby, 2006; ADM-HEA and NESTA, 2007; La Porte et al., 2008; Arnaut, 2010; Morawetz and Culkin, 2010; NCGE and ISBE, 2010; The Russel Group, 2010; Carey and Matlay, 2011; NCEE, 2013; QAA, 2012). Bryan and Harris (2015) highlight in this context the disparities between the arts and business schools that are assumed to be fundamentally. Consequently, Phillips (2010) stresses that most formal arts entrepreneurship education programmes in the U.S. exist outside of established degree plans due to given budget and governing structures of universities. These university structures and budgets tend to limit the possibilities of an efficient arts entrepreneurship education. Cherwitz and Beckman (2006) take this to argue that arts departments in the U.S. are among the most creative and often under-utilised resources in universities and in society.
In contrast, a recent study by Essig (2016) shows a different picture that there is a strong tendency for arts entrepreneurship curriculum in the U.S. to be offered through arts units rather than through business management programmes as common in Europe. By surveying 167 U.S. higher education institutions she found evidence that only about 10% have arts entrepreneurship located primarily within a business school or department.

Unfortunately, similar studies from authorities or scientists on the current or planned status of entrepreneurship education at German HEIs hardly exist. In Germany, there is still a heated debate raging as to the purpose of entrepreneurship education in HEIs. This is related to the fact that German HEIs still consider entrepreneurship education equal to business venturing (Mahrdt, 2002) and successful businesses as the result of an entrepreneur’s talent and luck (Sailer and Weber, 2013). When it comes to entrepreneurship education, the focus is primarily on teaching knowledge about business venturing, start-up life cycles, business planning, corporate finance and funding opportunities as well as investigating case studies of successful businesses (Mahrdt, 2002). This situation has not changed considerably in the recent past (FGF, 2005, 2008; Sailer and Weber, 2013). At German HEIs, students are basically taught more about entrepreneurship and less for it and that exclusively through the business faculties and entrepreneurship or incubation centres (FGF, 2008). Teaching about entrepreneurship comprises primarily the transfer of knowledge why entrepreneurship is important for economic and social wellbeing, while teaching for entrepreneurship aims to develop entrepreneurs. According to Sailer and Weber (2013), specialised entrepreneurship faculties have been established at some leading universities in Germany during the last decade because of an increasing political demand to foster entrepreneurship. In 2008, 58 out of 294 institutions in Germany established professorships in entrepreneurship. More than 70% of these professorships remained an integrated part of business faculties. The target students were undergraduates of the business faculty (68%). An interdisciplinary approach to address art students or students from other non-business and non-technology subjects was not established (Sailer and Weber, 2013). In addition, entrepreneurship education was mainly considered as an ‘add on’ to the regular curriculum, most commonly only available in the later stages of the compulsory phase of education (FGF, 2008). A picture very similar to Germany is presented by Niras
Consultants (2009) and European Commission (2012a) for the status of entrepreneurship education at HEIs in the rest of Europe. Both reports define various key areas for action. More precisely, they demand in particular a shift away from entrepreneurship education as an ‘add on’ to the curriculum to it being an integral part of the curriculum – at all levels. Another important area is developing an effective learning environment. In this context, the quality of teachers has been viewed as the critical success factor in (entrepreneurship) education (Freedman and Stuhr, 2004; European Commission, 2012a, 2013; QAA, 2012; OECD, 2014, 2015).

The latter aspect of teaching quality is a further important reason for the relatively low embeddedness of entrepreneurship education in the arts and other non-business subjects at HEIs in Europe and abroad (e.g. Gibb, 2005; Carrier, 2007; European Commission, 2006, 2012b, 2013; Voss et al., 2007; Rae, 2012; Bryan and Harris, 2015; Maritz et al., 2015; Bridgstock and Cunningham, 2016). As Levie (1999) in early years had already highlighted, teachers and lecturers in entrepreneurial courses very often used the wrong methods to teach their students about entrepreneurship. The most frequent methods focusing on teaching ‘about entrepreneurship' with significantly less practical exercises and a higher proportion of formal lessons were used. In light of this, Levie (1999, p. 4) concluded “a need for greater professionalism in entrepreneurship teaching”, particularly including more full-time teachers “with a teaching and research focus in entrepreneurship.” This is supported by the Davies Review (DfES, 2002), the Wilson Report (Wilson, 2012), and Penaluna et al. (2015).

Probably closely linked to the previously mentioned reasons, Rae et al. (2012) were able to discover evidence of another reason. They surveyed the enterprise and entrepreneurship orientation in English higher education in 2010. They were able to show students’ low involvement in entrepreneurship education. Although 93% of the surveyed 116 HEIs in England supported student enterprise and graduate entrepreneurship by providing entrepreneurship modules, the rate of student engagement in enterprise and entrepreneurship was low at 16% and considerably below the European average of 24% (Niras Consultants, 2009; Rae et al., 2012). Examples of such modules include extracurricular trainings, incubation services for new venture creation, and credit-bearing awards, Rae et al. (2012) stress in this context that “only 9% of students were involved in enterprise skills development and 16% in enterprise activities overall, demonstrating that
the significant majority of students were not participating in enterprise in a recognised way, either within or outside the curriculum” (Rae et al., 2012, p. 8). As mentioned above in section 3.1.1, entrepreneurially and business-oriented fine art students very often refuse being labelled an entrepreneur or business artist (Pollard and Wilson, 2013; Balzarin and Calcagno, 2016), feeling instead to be creative individuals (Patten, 2016). They do not like to be restrained in this traditional, conceptual frame, which is why they also refuse to attend additional training programmes for up-and-coming entrepreneurs (White, 2013). In this context, Fenton et al. (2013) provide another possible answer for the low student engagement in entrepreneurship education. They show evidence that neither students nor graduate entrepreneurs really believed to be prepared for self-employment at HEIs due to three reasons: i) HEIs were focused on preparing students for (salaried) employment, ii) the academic nature of entrepreneurship education, particularly characterised by a traditional focus on teaching about entrepreneurship rather than for it (Kirby, 2004a), and iii) a unified, standardised, one-size-fits-all approach to entrepreneurship education that likely fails to recognise the heterogeneity of students’ needs and demands (Fenton et al., 2013; Patten, 2016). This may be obvious when considering the different types of professional objectives and commercial motives among fine art students (see section 3.1.3 for the typology of fine artists). In this context the research by the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP, 2015) gives credence to the idea that in particular art students with a commercial interest want more arts entrepreneurship training as part of their arts education, since they lack essential professional skills as well as an understanding of structure and market forces of the contemporary art market (Grubb and Lazerson, 2005). These different personal and professional understandings, needs, and demands among art students and lecturers could convince many fine art students and practising fine art lecturers to possibly refuse to make use of entrepreneurship education offerings, as they are strongly recommended, for example by Eickhof and Haunschild (2006), Beckman (2007, 2011), Iannone (2011), or Roberts (2013). Thus it could be reasonably assumed that art students and also art lecturers primarily had little natural propensity for or interest in entrepreneurship in the sense of business venturing and running money making art businesses (Richards, 2005). It is, however, important to note at this point that arts entrepreneurship often has a social and cultural background and even not a monetary one. Yet even when art is commercial,
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compromising one’s own artistic objectives does not need to be part of this equation (Hong et al., 2012; Balzarini and Calcagno, 2016). Consequently, HEIs and lecturers are required to build arts entrepreneurship education programmes upon a paradigm shift from thinking “money is evil for art” (Beckman, 2007, p. 103) and “financial success devalues art” (Phillips, 2010, p. 297; Montgomery, 2007) to “money enables art” (Beckman, 2007, p. 103; Taylor and Littleton, 2008; Phillips, 2010). This could be achieved when arts entrepreneurship education at HEIs is primarily focused on developing art students’ entrepreneurial mindset, including open-minded thinking and a positive attitude towards extrinsic, monetary rewards (Brown, 2007; Montgomery, 2007; Phillips, 2010), which does not automatically mean to become a profit-oriented business person. This paradigm shift should be ‘accessible’ for all art students with all their different objectives and not only for those art students with a professional focus to become a business artist after graduation, at least for the reason of showing possible career paths and options in the arts.

HEIs and lecturers of arts need to embrace the idea that their art graduates can become art entrepreneurs, if they so wish (Hong et al., 2012; Roberts, 2013). The prerequisite is, though, that lecturers of arts who try to embed entrepreneurial thinking, attitude, behaviour, and skills within their teaching must themselves either be business-oriented or entrepreneurial in thought and action or able to create a strong professional identity that combines the two roles of recognising and teaching the arts intellectually in the sense of art for art’s sake and entrepreneurially in the sense of preparing careerists (Sweat, 2006; Miller, 2007; Beckman and Cherwitz, 2009; Fry et al., 2009; Hickman, 2010b; Rabkin et al., 2011; Määttä and Uusiautti, 2013; Schlemmer, 2014), if they are to create an business-related and entrepreneurial learning environment, including the collaboration with various stakeholders and real-life teaching scenarios (Hong et al., 2012; Anderson et al., 2013; Roberts, 2013). This ability is closely linked to the aforementioned teaching quality. However, Q-Art (2013) and Dominguez (2016) show that teaching artists often struggle to develop the ability to adopt these two roles due to insecurity as a teaching professional.

Carey and Matlay (2007) call this environment created by experienced business fine artists and entrepreneurial art teachers “implicit enterprise education” (Carey and Matlay, 2007, p. 440). Such lecturers of arts could better argue the specific needs of more explicit
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Arts entrepreneurship and enterprise education, since the evaluation of arts entrepreneurship education in the UK by the Art Design Media Subject Centre – The Higher Education Academy and National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (ADM-HEA and NESTA, 2007, p. 15) – found that “entrepreneurship is inherent to successful creative practice and needs to be explicit in the curriculum.”

Koellinger et al. (2007) as well as Gibb and Haskins (2014) strongly recommend in this context to better enlighten students about the importance of entrepreneurship education for their professional career to increase their engagement with entrepreneurship and to increase their self-efficacy, perceptions, and entrepreneurial motivation. Carey et al. (2009), Hong et al. (2012), and Roberts (2013), the latter experienced as programme coordinator in developing a process for designing modules, recommend experiential learning of entrepreneurial objectives in multi-disciplinary courses and projects supported by lesson plans that adopt entrepreneurial mindsets and skills into discipline-specific language and semantics. Roberts (2013, p. 58) calls this approach “infusing entrepreneurship”. In his opinion, such modules are considered “ideal to get students thinking about entrepreneurship as a process rather than an event.” (Roberts, 2013, p. 59). Considering these arguments, Carey and Naudin (2006) show the results of a workshop discussion that suggested developing students’ and graduates’ entrepreneurial mindsets and behaviour within the HEIs, while the development of entrepreneurial skills could be provided by external organisations with specialised resources. This suggestion is supported by Kirby (2004a), Phillips (2010), and Bridgstock (2013a, 2013b), too, who stress the development of an entrepreneurial identity as a key objective of HE entrepreneurial education.

A further reason, at least with regard to the poor arts entrepreneurship education at UK and Australian HEIs, could be identified in their publicly funded pressures. As highlighted above by Fenton et al. (2013) as well as by Q-Art (2016), UK HEIs show a trend in being more focused on graduate employability than on enterprise and entrepreneurship education. For example, in the UK graduates’ first-destination employment status a few months after course completion is used as the primary graduate employability performance indicator (Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), 2016; HESA, 2016). Such performance indicators may inevitably lead HEIs to invest their resources in finding full-time, salaried employment opportunities for their
graduates quickly (Bridgstock, 2009). With ongoing funding pressure, HEIs are required to calculate costs and benefits in providing degree programmes for subjects with a relatively low graduate employability. In this context, Bridgstock (2009) recommends a broader and more holistic definition of employability, getting away from making graduates attractive to potential employers and towards being able to compete effectively in the job market and to move between occupations as necessary, which would implicitly include self-employment and freelance work. Bridgstock (2009, 2011b, 2013a, 2013b), Bennett (2009), and Clark (2012) stress therefore that arts entrepreneurship education at any HEI should involve teaching self-management as well as career building skills and self-efficacy expectation alongside the development of an entrepreneurial mindset, since art graduates seem hardly know their career opportunities and perspectives (Bridgstock et al. 2015).

Recent surveys relating to the general state of (arts) entrepreneurship and enterprising education at HEIs in the UK (Kirby, 2006; ADM-HEA and NESTA, 2007; Matlay and Carey, 2007; La Porte et al., 2008; Carey et al., 2009; Arnaut, 2010; Morawetz and Culkin, 2010; NCGE and ISBE, 2010; The Russel Group, 2010; Carey and Matlay, 2011; NCEE, 2013; QAA, 2012; Rae, 2012; Clarke and Hulbert, 2016) were able to identify further barriers to HEIs’ transformation from a traditional to an entrepreneurial education, as follows:

- the lack of active involvement with entrepreneurship education among HE top management,

- the increasing pressure since the 1980s, faced by art schools integrated into universities to meet the institutional demands of being in a university. The changed status may reduce creativity and entrepreneurship.

- the conflict between the time dimension for embedding entrepreneurship into HE curriculum and the need for immediate results due to governmental policy expectations and HEIs’ increased funding pressure,

- the lack of incentives for institutions and teaching staff to focus on entrepreneurship,
• the lack of relevant and sustainable learning opportunities both within and outside the degree programmes due to uninformed teaching staff,

• the lack of high-quality teaching through regularly trained teaching staff across all faculties,

• the lack of more and stronger links between the HEIs and small- and medium-sized enterprises,

• the lack of informal, or so-called ‘soft’, systems for supporting the building of peer networks and contacts to teachers and external practitioners, as well as

• the lack of investments in research and teaching in entrepreneurship to assure the long-term quality and competitiveness of the UK’s leading HEIs.

3.1.5.2.5 Conclusion
To conclude at this point, the key findings in the literature are reason to assume a poor status of arts entrepreneurship in higher education. Although entrepreneurship education at HEIs is basically available to a large extent, it is obviously not considered relevant by art students since they do not consider themselves business people or entrepreneurs in the traditional, more innovative and monetary sense. This is a serious concern, since the lack of skills required to be able to make a living as practising artists is another key reason for the absence of professional success and income. In light of this, entrepreneurship programmes at HEIs themselves need to be innovative, attractive, and seek to overcome existing barriers in students’ conceptualised understandings and perceptions, while similarly focusing on art students’ specific professional needs.

3.1.6 Fine Artists’ Attitude – The Individual Luck Factor
Luck or good fortune always plays a vital role in all aspects of life including business life (Wiseman, 2004). It was Bandura (1982) who discussed the impact of chance encounters and luck on people’s personal lives. His investigations show evidence that luck has the power to transform the unthinkable and improbable into the possible or, to put it more in the context of this study, to make the difference between professional success and failure.
Although the vast majority of the population believes in the power of superstition as a way of improving one's fortune (Wiseman, 2004), it shows absolutely no correlation to the individual level of luck, since superstition is based on outdated and incorrect thinking (Wiseman, 2004). Wiseman (2004), a psychologist, conducted more scientific investigations into the concept of luck. He examined why some people seem to be consistently lucky while others encounter little but bad luck. By conducting interviews, personality tests, experiments, and storytelling with more than 400 participants, his findings have revealed that luck is not a magical ability or the result of random chance. Luck is also not an inherent phenomenon. On the contrary, he was able to show that people’s thoughts and behaviors are instead primarily responsible for much of their fortune. More specifically, Wiseman’s findings show evidence that lucky people generate their own good fortune and that it is possible to enhance the amount of luck that people experience in their lives. Four basic principles are responsible for this. Lucky people

- are skilled in creating and recognizing chance opportunities,
- make lucky decisions by listening to their intuition,
- create self-fulfilling prophecies via positive expectations, and foremost
- adopt a resilient positive attitude that help to transform negative events and bad luck into the positive and good (Wiseman, 2004).

In this context, Wiseman (2004) also revealed the reasons for lucky people encountering an enhanced amount of good fortune. They are significantly more open-minded and able to consistently recognize chance opportunities as compared to unlucky people. Unlucky people are generally much more tense, anxious, and stressed than lucky people (Kamen and Seligman, 1987; Wiseman, 2004). Wiseman’s research has further shown in this specific context that stress and anxiety disrupt people’s ability to recognize the unexpected, since anxious and tense people are so narrowed in their environmental focus and perception that they miss chance opportunities while looking for something special (with a significantly higher likelihood than more relaxed people). Unlucky people additionally tend to view problems as internal, unchangeable, and pervasive, whereas more lucky people are the opposite: they react to problems, such as serious health problems, with a sense of confidence and high personality ability of change and problem-solving (e.g. Kamen and Seligman, 1987; Taylor et al., 1992; Carver et al., 1993; Lucas et al., 1996). Lucky people are more relaxed and open to the unexpected, and therefore see
what life is presenting rather than just what they are looking for (Wiseman, 2004). In particular, new or even random experiences introduce potential for new opportunities. However, Wiseman (2004) additionally stresses another important principle revolving around the way in which lucky and unlucky people deal with bad luck and negative events in their lives. He shows evidence that lucky people are able to imagine what might have happened far worse as result of negative events, rather than what actually did happen. Psychologists refer to this ability as counter-factual thinking (Wiseman, 2004), positive life attitude or optimism (Seligman, 2006). Counter-factual thinking and positive life attitude or optimism soften the emotional impact of the experienced ill fortune (Wiseman, 2004; Seligman, 2006). Lucky people are therefore considerably more able to view scenarios of bad luck as being far luckier. This positive attitude and self-efficacy expectation allow them to feel much better about themselves and their lives. This in turn helps to keep their expectations about the future high, and increases the likelihood of them continuing their lives luckier and successfully. Lucky and optimistic people are better able to cope with disappointment by attending to positive aspects of the setback. This positive attitude and interpersonal energy attracts other people’s interest and attention and additionally helps lucky and optimistic people to encounter and experience much more social support, valuable contact building (networking), or new (business) opportunities that in turn help enhance the chances of personal performance and success (e.g. Aspinwall and Taylor, 1992; Caprara et al., 2006) – and in the context of this study, income as well.

These findings are of high relevance for this study. An optimistically open mind and positive thoughts as well as a positive life attitude seem to have the power to enhance the amount of luck that fine artists could encounter in their private and professional lives. Luck seems not just about being at the right place at the right time anymore, but about being open to and ready for new opportunities. Luck becomes less magical but more manageable. This is of relevance because the literature review has revealed that fine artists on average show higher levels of depressive behaviour, anxiety, and tense as part of their typical personality pattern (see Appendix M for details). Artists’ typical personality seems to be counterproductive to self-esteem, optimism, positive attitude, interpersonal energy, and social support, and thus for recognising, creating, encountering, and
experiencing new chance opportunities, luck and implicitly for achieving professional success as well. However, there may be cause for hope since Wiseman (2004) also showed evidence that optimism, open-minded and counter-factual thinking as well as positive life attitude are learnable. Whether and how positive attitude and luck affect fine artists’ chances of professional success and income in the arts has not yet been investigated. The presented findings lead one to assume a correlation between these factors, though this assumption lacks scientific evidence and needs to be further investigated, primarily as part of psychological research. Due to this study’s research focus and economic background, it cannot be the object of this thesis.

3.1.7 Conclusion on Fine Artists’ Internal Factors

First, it can basically be concluded that fine artists’ chances of making a living in the arts are dependent on and determined by their internal factors to a great extent. Jacobsen (2003, p. 241) stresses therefore the personality of an individual as “the central role” for success.

Second, it is the individual working artist or art student who must decide whether to make a living in the arts as a professional working artist and therefore must decide whether to be a business artist who pursues a living in producing and commercialising one’s own artwork. The literature findings as well as the derived working typology of fine artists’ commercial motivations assume that business fine artists in particular may be interested in increasing and exploiting their chances of making a living in the arts. Showing no willingness to make a living can be considered a key reason for professional failure. This professional motivation and decision is, however, definitely not the responsibility of higher education institutions, even though these institutions should provide information and develop art students’ knowledge and skills required for the decision making.

Third, fine artists’ chances are considered fair when commercial interest, artistic talent or quality, hard work ethic or ambition, extroversion, positive life attitude, and in particular seven entrepreneurial and business-related skills required to create and run a promising ‘art business concept’ are existent. These internal factors seem to particularly support and facilitate business fine artists’ chances of professional success.
Fourth, artists' typical personality pattern as well as the current status of artists' professional preparation at higher education institutions seem, however, to be counterproductive for their professional success. On the one hand, artists' typical personality is characterised by an introverted focus and higher levels of anxiety, tense, stress, and mental disability that complicate the development of an optimistic, open-minded thinking, positive life attitude, and interpersonal energy required to encounter and experience social support, new chance opportunities, and luck to enhance the individual chances of professional success and income. On the other hand, fine artists seem to suffer from poor professional preparation in higher education.

To close the circle, the fifth basic conclusion is associated with fine artists' key role for their own professional success and income by stressing that the skills, motivations, and ambition required for success are particularly amenable to change, while most of their personality traits, abilities, and talent are relatively stable and difficult to modify. Skills as well as a positive attitude to life, setbacks, and luck can be taught and developed, e.g. by studying fine arts at HEIs. It is the primary duty of every business fine artist to actively develop the human capital required for achieving individual professional objectives. Being incapable of generating income is another key reason for professional failure.

In this context, the literature review reveals two basic gaps in research, which need to be addressed in this study by the following two research questions:

- **Research Question 1**: _What skills are crucial for practising fine artists to make a living in the arts?_

  The literature findings lack evidence that the identified ‘five plus two’ skills and entrepreneurial mindset, both of which are considered crucial in the literature for the success of self-employed professionals outside the arts industry, are also relevant for practising business fine artists.

- **Research Question 2**: _Are and, if so, how and to what extent are fine art students educated on successfully making a living in the arts during their studies at HEIs?_

  The literature leads to the assumption that there is poor vocational preparation of fine artists in studying for a bachelor’s degree in fine arts at higher education institutions in Europe and abroad. This second research question aims at addressing the issue by investigating (probably for the first time) whether, how, and to what extent particularly fine art undergraduates and post-graduates in
higher education are equipped with the skills identified with the first research question. The answers to both research questions will contribute to the existent body of knowledge in the fields of business artists’ professional preparation and arts entrepreneurship education.

3.2 External Factors (Practising Fine Artists’ Business Environment)

Business fine artists’ working and business environment is presumably subject to many risks and uncertainties for their career success and income. To gain relevant information and knowledge about this complex environment and its various factors, the literature review needs a focus that is structurally determined by two widely acknowledged business management tools, namely Porter’s Five Forces and the PESTLE analysis. Both management tools take into account the relevant factors having an impact on professional individuals’ and organisations’ business success in competitive markets. This orientation of reviewing the literature is therefore expected to provide the desired overview of fine artists’ external factors influencing their career chances and income.

In this context, it is notable that the different factors will be reviewed separately for better readability and understanding, although they often determine each other, cross-linked and mutually influencing.

3.2.1 Fine Artists’ Micro Environment: An Industry Review

In practice, there are many features of an industry that determine the intensity of competition and the level of profitability. Translated into the context of this study, industry profitability could also mean artists’ chances of making a professional career and a living in the arts. Porter’s framework (Porter, 1980, 2000, 2008a, 2008b) views the profitability of an industry – or artists’ chances of making a living in the contemporary art market – as determined by five forces of competitive pressure. The literature review focuses therefore on these forces of fine artists’ micro environment, as illustrated in Figure 3.2-1.
The basic idea of considering substitutes as threats for fine artists’ chances of earning a living is the following: The potential for a fine artist to make a living in the arts is determined by the prices that art buyers and consumers in the broadest sense are willing to pay for the created artworks. This depends primarily on their individually perceived or expected consumption values, as defined in Appendix A, as well as on the availability and consumption values of substitutes. It can basically be assumed that the higher the consumption value of original artworks and the lower the availability of substitute products the lower the overall threat to substitute these artworks will be. In this context, it can further be assumed that the consumption value of original artworks is significantly higher than the value of duplicates (Newman and Bloom, 2011). Where there are no or only few substitutes for the offered artworks, art buyers are usually comparatively insensitive to price. Stated in more economic terms, art buyers’ demand is inelastic with respect to price. In contrast, if there are close substitutes for artworks, then attempts by fine artists to raise prices cause potential art buyers to switch to substitutes. In this case, demand is elastic with respect to price (e.g. Porter, 1980, 2000, 2008a, 2008b; Heilbrun and Gray, 2001; Abbing, 2002; Prendergast, 2014; Ardizzone and Zorloni, 2014).
3.2.1.1.2 Key Characteristics of Artworks

Resch (2011) examines the key characteristics of artworks by comparing them with the specifications of the highly standardised and regulated products on the international stock markets in order to show their uniqueness.

Original artworks, such as paintings, drawings, sculptures, and photographs, exhibit specific characteristics different from other goods like stocks. In principal, every artwork is the unique output of an artist's individual creativity (Gérard-Varet, 1995; Codignola, 2003). This output is definitely limited, particularly for artists who have passed away. The uniqueness and relatively small amount of artworks per artist is one of the key differences to commodities like stocks (Resch, 2011). From a production point of view, the artwork of every individual artist could therefore be considered an asset with a tendency of increasing prices over time when demand could be concentrated on this limited output (Codignola, 2003). While commodities like stocks are standardised products whose quality is known and can be assessed during a purchase and easily substituted, unique artworks of the same theme by the same artist are and remain unique, not standardised works and basically unable to be substituted in their originality (Gérard-Varet, 1995; Codignola, 2003). Considering this specific characteristic, it can be concluded that unique artworks are not substituted in terms of their originality by other products and artworks, especially not for art buyers who are either primarily motivated in purchasing the unique output of a particular artist (collectors) or in finding aesthetically and/or emotionally appealing art quality.

However, according to Boll (2011) the quality and value of unknown artists’ works can be fairly evaluated neither before nor even after the purchase without any specialists, which is why Boll (2011, p. 35) classifies them as “credence goods”. He claims that only brand building, meaning developing a market reputation, can be helpful for artists establishing identity, value, and trust in their work and in the whole system. Brands create a reliable quality that is evaluable by art buyers before the purchase. Brands also help to ‘transform’ artworks from credence goods to so-called experience goods (Pine II and Gilmore, 1999, 2011; Dewey, 2005; Boll, 2011). To achieve this, Boll (2011) and Codignola (2003) stress that opinions and evaluations from specialists, like galleries and reputable collectors, are definitely needed (Boll, 2011; Abbing, 2002). In turn, already
established artists with high-quality brands benefit from high prices paid by collectors and buyers who consider art also to be investments (Boll, 2011; Deloitte and ArtTactic, 2016).

To sum up at this point, artworks of unknown artists usually suffer from a missing evaluation of their quality. The consumption value of these artworks is therefore expected to be considerably lower than for artworks of established and (well-)known artists with developed brands. The threat to substitute artworks of unknown artists seems to be therefore relatively high.

Specialists Bénédicte (2007) and Tamar (2010) conclude in this context that the qualification of artists and their work is highly dependent on artists’ active participation in the marketplace (Tamar, 2010), for example, by passing specific artistic tests, such as access to exhibitions, securing grants, and the sale of artwork (Bénédicte, 2007). Once the artistic tests have been passed, the artist’s works are considered of higher quality, less substitutable and therefore appropriate for being visible on the market (Bénédicte, 2007). This means that artworks of more established and more famous artists with higher market reputations and consumption values are expected to be more protected against the threat of substitution, at least by less established artists with lower developed brands and consumption values. However, artworks of artists with a similar market reputation and consumption value are also easily substitutable. It only depends on the consumers’ individual and subjective tastes.

Frey and Pommerehne (1988) see another difference between artworks and other products like stocks in their importance for humans’ cultural development which makes artworks products of public interest in their view. Some researchers classify artworks as a mixture of consumer goods, cultural goods, and financial assets (among others, Stein, 1977, Grampp, 1989; Herchenröder, 1999; Codignola, 2003; Bernhard, 2005; di Torcello, 2009; Bocart and Hafner, 2011). In Bernhard’s view, artworks provide not only consumption benefits to their buyers through their emotional influence in loving to collect and own art, but also artworks are beneficial for the cultural development and entertainment of a society (see section 3.2.2.3) as well as a hedge against inflation (Throsby, 1994) and crises on the international capital markets (Thurnhofer, 2014). Thurnhofer particularly confirms well-known artworks’ function of artists of the Olympus, art market’s top segment, as value-guaranteed investments as well as a specific
"segment of the financial market" that, however, is less volatile compared to the international stock market (Thurnhofer, 2014, p. 50).

3.2.1.1.3 Conclusion

To sum up the economically applicable rules, the extent to which the threat of substitutes constrains fine artists’ income depends on at least four factors:

1. *The price-performance characteristics (consumption value) of substitutes.* The willingness of art buyers to switch between substitutes in response to price changes depends upon their relative performance or benefit in relation to price (consumption value).

2. *The specific characteristics of artworks.* Artworks show very specific functions and various price-performance characteristics (consumption values) for art buyers and art consumers in the broadest sense.

3. *The propensity of art buyers to substitute.* The critical issue is the willingness to substitute: even though substitutes exist, art buyers may be unresponsive to changes in relative prices.

4. *The availability of substitute products.* The threat to substitute fine artworks also depends on the availability and consumption values of alternative products.

Consequently, it can be summarised and concluded that the threat to substitute original artworks is basically relatively high for emerging artists due a high availability of substitute products that have similar and higher consumption values than their works. In this context, emerging artists in particular face the additional threat that their original artworks are substituted by daily-life, non-arts products, since artworks of unknown, not yet established artists “do not contribute to providing the basic sustenance of life” (Phillips, 2010, p. 261). The willingness to buy art instead of daily-life products of first-time or casual art buyers depends on their given financial art budgets (Throsby, 1994). Potential art buyers with relatively low art budgets are assumed to be more reluctant to invest in art when the need of other products is relatively high or, to put it in other words, when the consumption value of daily-life products is considered higher compared to artworks. Artists’ real protection against substitution is only given in their specific market reputation and developed consumption value, experienced or expected by art buyers.
The higher the expected or experienced consumption value the lower the threat of substitution.

Considering these two additional characteristics of artworks, it can further be assumed that the impact of works of established artists have an important cultural influence on society’s development. As part of society’s culture, fine artworks can also be substituted by other mediums of art such as performing arts, literature, movies, or music. Although they may not be direct substitutes for fine arts, they may provide similar consumption values in culturally developing and entertaining society. In this context, it can be assumed that the prices of contemporary fine artworks of established and famous artists are set higher than those for music, movies, literature, or performing arts. Thus, it can also be assumed that the threat to substitute fine arts by other art mediums for the cultural development and entertainment of a society is at a mid to high level.

Additionally, fine artworks in the asset and investment class basically compete with other asset classes and are therefore relatively substitutable. However, the threat to substitute artworks of a particular artist who developed a very high market reputation and consumption value as an asset and investment is relatively low due to its originality and low availability.

3.2.1.2 The Threat of New Artists

The next force in determining emerging fine artists’ basic chances of sustaining a living in the arts is the threat of new entrants – more precisely, the entry of new fine artists into the contemporary art market segments of emerging and established artists (see section 2.2.2.2 and Appendix L for more details with regard to market barriers). The extent of this threat depends upon barriers to entry or the ease of entering the competitive sphere (Porter, 1980, 2000, 2008a, 2008b). Porter’s key idea is, translated into the context of the art industry, the harder it is to enter the market the better for the artists who are already operating in their segment. Fewer entrants to the market segment of emerging artists mean that emerging artists in this segment individually have a greater chance at success and income. In contrast, no barriers to entry mean a contestable market where individual prices and income will remain at the fully competitive level.

Fundamentally, there are no formal requirements such as certificates needed “to practice art or to call oneself an artist” (Abbing, 2002, p. 278). The barriers for entering
the art market segment of emerging artists, as shown with Thurnhofer’s (2014) art market pyramid in section 2.2.2, are relatively low (see Appendix L for more details). From an artistic point of view, the ‘open market access’ is necessary in order to protect the arts’ “autonomous imago” (Abbing, 2002, p. 278). In this context, there are basically two ways to enter the art market segment of emerging artists: First, fine art graduates usually enter this segment directly due to their arts education and motivation to work in the arts. Second, ‘artists of all kinds’ operating at the lowest market segment are able to enter the market segment of emerging artists by having acknowledged and outstanding success in their segment, for example, through attracting attention and demand on fairgrounds or Christmas markets that trend in social media. This attention leads to the market barriers to the segment of emerging artists and they are, though, relatively high for artists with limited resources, small and powerless networks, and unappealing artwork (Thurnhofer, 2014). Emerging artists’ chances to enter the visible gallery-market segments is, however, much higher. The network structures of commercial galleries and art dealers are considered very strong (Velthuis, 2003; Currid, 2007, Byrnes, 2009; Foster et al., 2011; van Overdam, 2011; Siltala, 2012).

One way for emerging artists to achieve the gallery segments could be regular attendance at local, national, and international exhibitions to show presence and product quality. However, every art exhibition is an individual market barrier for artists, since each exhibition has its own standing in the art world and thus access requirements. The costs for attending middle class exhibitions are within a middle four-digit US Dollar range including standing costs, shipping, insurance, and accommodation (Thurnhofer, 2014). However, emerging fine artists can hardly cover these costs. The higher the standing of art exhibitions in the international art world, the higher therefore the access barriers for artists.

It can be concluded that the principal sources of barriers to entering the art market segments of emerging artists are exclusively informal and relatively low. While no certificates or other legal regularities determine the threat to entry, product differentiation (meaning the quality of artwork) mainly influences fine artists’ access to this market segment. In contrast, emerging artists’ access to the higher gallery-market segments is much more restricted. These segments are controlled and managed by powerful
networks as well as by reputable exhibitions that usually require financial expenses which emerging artists are hardly able to raise. In terms of professional development and success, this means that emerging fine artists face a high threat of new artists while similarly hardly being able to progress to the higher and visible gallery-market segments which would provide higher protection against new entrants and thus higher chances of making a living.

### 3.2.1.3 Bargaining Power of Suppliers

According to Porter (1980, 2000) the key idea of considering the bargaining power of suppliers as an industry force on producers’ profitability is the following: The less bargaining power that suppliers of raw materials, semi-finished products or components have against the producers of goods, the higher producers’ monetary purchasing advantages and in turn the higher their profitability are – and vice versa. Translated into the context of the art market industry, this means that fine artists may face an economic threat when suppliers of materials for the production of artworks show a relatively higher power than the artists as producers of art.

In the literature, this relation has not been subject of in-depth research and consideration, which is why an argumentative derivation of facts is needed. A coherent line of argumentation could be that the vast majority of practising fine artists are excluded from the market, as illustrated in section 2.2.2.2., which leads one to reasonably assume that they do not have sufficient financial resources and market reputation to meet suppliers at eye level. Additionally, practising fine artists are mostly organised as ‘lone fighters’ (e.g. Towse, 1996, 2006, 2011; Hill Strategies Research, 2004; European Parliament, 2006a; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2010; Arts Council England (ACE), 2009, 2011; Artists Interaction and Representation (AIR), 2011; Bundesverband Bildender Künstlerinnen und Künstler, 2011; Centre for Economics and Business Research, 2013) and likely not involved as active members in collaborative purchasing networks. Considering these characteristics, one may conclude that fine artists usually order material required for making art only for themselves and therefore in relatively small order sizes when needed. This may be particularly true for special and more costly materials (Abbing, 2002). In contrast, the number of registered art material retailers and suppliers around the globe with financial strengths is relatively large according to surveys of
IBISWorld (2016) for the Australian market or the International Art Materials Trade Association (NAMTA, 2016). Not taken into account, however, are the countless numbers of non-registered art material retailers and suppliers and of suppliers of materials and services with business focus on other industries outside the creative sectors (Datafox.com, 2016; IBISWorld, 2016; NAMTA, 2016), e.g. real estate and studio providers.

Consequently, fine artists’ business presence as ‘lone fighters’ usually associated with their small order sizes, limited financial resources, low market reputation, and their certain amount of dependence on these materials, leads one to generally expect their individual bargaining power vis-à-vis suppliers of materials and services to be quite low. By increasing their financial strength and market reputation, practising fine artists may be able to also increase their bargaining power. Nevertheless, their status of ‘lone fighters’ and relatively small order sizes may mean a natural limitation of bargaining power in the end.

3.2.1.4 Bargaining Power of Intermediaries and Art Buyers

Analysing the determinants of relative power between producers in an industry and their customers is widely analogous to the analysis of the relationship between producers and their suppliers (see previous section 3.2.1.3). Translated into the art market context, Porter’s (1980, 2000) key idea is that the more control artists have over the prices of their works, the better.

According to the given overview of market participants (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.1), fine artists face two different types of commercially oriented ‘buyers’: the final art buyer (e.g. collectors and occasional art buyers) and intermediaries (e.g. galleries and art dealers).

3.2.1.4.1 Art Buyers’ Level of Market Power

At the starting level of their career, artists usually operate in the lower market segments of Thurnhofer’s (2014) art market pyramid (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.2), excluded from the gallery-market segments. Emerging artists lack reputation, price history, and brand and are hardly able “to exert any supply-side power in this market” (Throsby, 1994, p. 7). Without history and brand, unknown artists’ quality cannot be evaluated and proven by
people (Boll, 2011). This is the key reason why emerging fine artists usually suffer from low consumption values and market prices (see section 3.2.1.1) of their works (Abbing, 2002; Boll, 2011). Prendergast (2014) as well as Ardizzone and Zorloni (2014) stress that relatively unknown artists are required to produce a critical mass of artworks or collections in order to be able to provide information about themselves to networks of art collectors and galleries. In this context, Prendergast claims that “an artist’s career tends to take off when a critical mass of such collectors talk about that artist’s work” (Prendergast, 2014, p. 32). Collectors and galleries would therefore become aware of unknown artists when their works show quality and become regularly present, debated, advocated, and finally endorsed by people (Wang, 2009; Ardizzone and Zorloni, 2014; Prendergast, 2014). McIntyre (2004, p. 5) and Buck (2004, p. 14) call collectors a vital element of this “art eco-system”. This situation clearly shows that collectors and galleries have significantly higher bargaining power against fine artists at the beginning of their career and/or operating in the lower art market segments. Collectors and galleries completely control the prices of works of unknown artists.

With further progression up the career ladder, Throsby (1994) claims that artists develop more market power against collectors and galleries with the help of their own brand and history. However, when considering Thurnhofer’s art market pyramid, the market power of bigger commercial galleries and established art collectors and auction houses as gatekeepers to higher market segments with significant public attention also rises. Big galleries, art collectors, and museums hold a market share with oligarchic tendencies depending on their own market reputation. These gatekeeping institutions are then deliberately controlling the market access and art supply in order to control the price development and thus their own financial profit.

Only artists in the Olympus may have significantly stronger market power than gatekeeping galleries and collectors. International star artist Damien Hirst has shown, for the first time in art history in September 2008, that an artist is able to organise and conduct his own auction at Sotheby’s without any galleries. He produced more than 200 artworks for this specific auction and directly sold them all to collectors. He also showed great market power years later when the Tate Gallery gave him the setting for his own exhibition in 2012 where he deliberately decided to forego the services of both galleries and curators (ZeitOnline, 2015).
3.2.1.4.2 The Foundation of Intermediaries’ and Art Buyers’ Market Power

After experiencing galleries’ and collectors’ status of market power against fine artists, it is of further interest to know the principal foundation of that market power.

According to Abbing (2002, p. 47),

“the value system in the arts is two-faced and asymmetrical. Although in general the market is oriented towards money and profit, the arts cannot openly reveal this kind of orientation when they operate in the market. This approach would certainly harm artistic careers and therefore, long-term incomes as well.”

Abbing (2002, p. 47) adds that money and “profit motives are not absent, they are merely veiled, and publicly the economic aspect of art is denied.” This statement clearly indicates the dilemma of the art market: its creative freedom and artistic independence while being equally dependent on monetary resources. This ‘inner conflict’ associated with the aforementioned difficulties in determining fair value and market prices of artworks as well as in distributing the market demand among all market segments demonstrates the art market’s inefficacy. According to its definition (Investopedia.com, 2016), “market efficiency is the degree to which stock prices reflect all available, relevant information.” Transferred to the art market that means market efficacy is given when all relevant information relating to market, supply, demand, artists, and artwork are available for all market participants. Due to its structure with different market segments and high market power of gatekeeping intermediaries and art buyers, the information on the market is highly asymmetric and inefficient (Louargand, 1991; Wilke, 1999; Abbing, 2002; Codignola, 2003; Czotscher, 2006; Maneker, 2009; Nikodijević, 2010; van Overdam, 2011; Arora and Vermeylen, 2013; David et al., 2013; Schrager, 2013; Baur, 2014; Day, 2014; Prendergast, 2014; Turnhofer, 2014; Alpagu, 2015; Aye et al., 2016). Artists frequently have no deeper information of their (potential) buyers and target audience. The gatekeeping art buyers have built their business models around this asymmetric information flow and implicitly justify their existence with it. Wilke (1999) and Czotscher (2006) stress in this context that not even experts on the market have all the relevant information because no central point has ever existed where all market data could come together and be visible for all market participants.
In comparison to the international stock market where the stock and trading prices are public information and therefore documented and visible to all market participants, the prices for artworks are normally known only by those who are involved in the transactions. The art market is too fragmented with countless numbers of operating participants. Transactions of art dealers, galleries, collectors, and other art buyers are usually not public or available. Public price information is only limited to public auctions. Furthermore, the art market is significantly less regulated in comparison to the stock market where manipulating price activities, such as insider trading, is strictly forbidden. On the art market, asymmetric information is mainly welcome as a foundation for trading activities of commercial galleries, collectors, and art dealers as their main source for profit (Herchenröder, 2003). At auctions, these participants aim to push the prices in order to establish higher price levels for their works in coming auctions.

Another market inefficacy remains its embodied customer relations (Krepler, 2007; Resch, 2011; Thurnhofer, 2014). In particular, Krepler (2007) was able to identify galleries’ differences in pricing with reference to their clients. He found that famous art collectors pay lower prices than normal buyers or less reputable collectors. Another key characteristic of an inefficient market could be art markets’ high transactions costs, caused by commission and transaction fees charged by commercial galleries and auction houses, insurance, shipping, and storage costs.

3.2.1.4.3 The Economic Situation of Commercial Galleries

As the most powerful key intermediaries in the art market and the dominating players on the primary trading market, commercial galleries are considered the key market barrier for emerging artists to enter the higher and visible market segments. They are basically expected to provide an organised market structure that includes required resources and services for promising artists, such as contacts with collectors and other market participants as well as access to quality exhibitions and support in promotion activities, target audience, brand building, and the match of supply and demand. Two analyses of commercial galleries highlight their current economic situations and power as market barrier (Resch, 2011; IFSE, 2013). However, both analyses are geographically focused on the German-speaking art markets in Germany (Resch, 2011; IFSE, 2013), Austria, and Switzerland (Resch, 2011).
Resch (2011) analysed 378 commercial galleries in 2008, of which 317 were located in Germany, 25 in Austria, and 36 in Switzerland. They were asked, among others, about their business hours, type of art sold, gallery location, gallery size, number of employees, number of their own exhibitions, cost structure, buyers structure, annual revenues, and profit margins (see Appendix J for details and findings of Resch (2011) and Appendix G for supporting details of this study’s research).

Resch (2011) shows that a relatively large proportion of galleries were young businesses, founded a few years before his study in 2008. His investigations were also able to reveal that a very large proportion of galleries in Germany (39%) and Austria (64%) operated at deficit with annual revenues below 500,000 Euros (or 400,000 British pounds). Key reasons for the economically tense situation are low sales activities of mainly one-person managed galleries with low market presence and weak access to audiences associated with a structure of high fixed cost, particularly for renting gallery spaces in city centres. The IFSE study (2013), including 178 galleries in Germany, confirms most of Resch’s findings. It particularly stresses that approximately 60% of commercial galleries in Germany generated revenues of less than 200,000 Euros annually, and altogether less than 6% of the total turnover on the German market. The average revenue within this revenue class was 64,000 Euros (approximately 50,000 British pounds) per year (IFSE, 2013). The next 25% of galleries had a market proportion of 13% on the total market revenue with average revenue of 335,000 Euros per gallery and year. That means that 85% of all surveyed galleries were responsible for less than 20% of market revenue. Their market standing and network quality assume a relatively weak competitive market power on the German gallery market. This phenomenon is also confirmed for the U.S. gallery market by Prinz et al. (2015) and Artnet.news (2016b). In this context, the IFSE study proves that galleries had shown a low willingness to cooperate with other (German) galleries and institutions in the art market in order to increase their own market presence and ability to access new buyer groups. They simply failed to increase the quality and power of their network structures. The cooperativeness with international galleries in the context of international fairs was slightly higher than with national partners, yet still relatively low. In contrast, 15% of the most successful galleries generated almost 81% of the total turnover of German galleries. The average revenue within this revenue segment was 3.5 million Euros (approximately 2.8 million British
pounds) per year (IFSE, 2013). These big galleries are expected to have high market power, attracting and equally being “dependent on the relevant art collectors” (IFSE, 2013, p. 37). The study found that almost 70% of the revenues were generated with internationally operating collectors and regularly buying customers with long-lasting business relationships. This intense relationship and networking might be one key reason that big galleries have shown a considerably higher willingness to enter into international cooperations with other international galleries, art institutions as well as with private and institutional art collections (IFSE, 2013). Consequently, as part of highly powerful networks these large galleries are assumed to be artists’ most powerful market barrier to entering higher art market segments and having access to the market. In this context, the IFSE study calculated that on average 16 artists were represented by each gallery, separated into emerging artists (55%) and established artists (45%) (IFSE, 2013).

In conclusion, the business models of most commercial galleries are apparently not sustainable enough because both survey findings unequivocally illustrate that a significant proportion of them suffer from economic weakness obviously due to structural and strategic failures including the lack of quality networks or weak access to art buyers expressed in small revenues and profit margins. Many galleries are relatively young businesses, probably not already established on the market, either nationally or internationally. This image very much resembles most of the artists that they represent. Many gallerists are lateral entrants, often lacking the required business and art market knowledge (IFSE, 2013), considered “the only way to really learn the ‘proper manners’” (Jyrämä and Äyväri, 2006, p. 1). Considering this, it is reasonable to question commercial galleries’ positive impact on artists’ development towards a successfully professional career. Although commercial galleries serve the important task of contributing to the cultural life of a city or region (Robertson, 2008; Thompson, 2008) by presenting and distributing art to society, it is seriously doubtful whether small and economically weak galleries are actually capable and able to successfully pull promising emerging artists over the threshold into the market. Galleries are required to be flexible and more visible on the international markets in order to acquire new wealthy audiences. As Heidenreich (2013) claims, the buyer groups have recently changed. He stresses that the middle class of buyers has left the gallery market, more and more looking instead for smaller
formats and lower-priced works of talented yet still unknown emerging artists. The critical questioning of business models of smaller and mid-sized galleries is also based on the market's increasing globalisation through the Internet. People interested in the arts are able to acquaint themselves with artists and their works online. Although most galleries already have their own websites, these are mainly limited to informational and expositional purposes (IFSE, 2013).

Heidenreich (2013) considers this situation seriously harmful especially for smaller and mid-sized galleries. They may face a prospective loss of importance. As a consequence, the gallery market will change dramatically in Heidenreich's view as only a few large and successful galleries will then serve a few selected powerful collectors. For emerging artists, that could only mean that the barrier for entering the art market and higher market segments is expected to become much higher than it already has been owing to a growing shortfall of economically healthy galleries. Therefore, artists now more than ever urgently need to develop the skills needed and required to successfully manage themselves and to substitute some of the galleries' services, like promotional activities or organising exhibitions.

To sum up, the literature findings clearly show three key facts affecting fine artists' chances of making a living with regard to intermediaries' and art buyers' market power. First, it can be said that the bargaining power of art buyers, more precisely of collectors and commercial galleries, is generally high. It is the buyers' side that controls the prices of artworks, while only top artists may be able to gain control over their prices. Second, intermediaries' market power is primarily based on a deliberately asymmetric information flow that justifies their existence and maximises their profits and social relations. This foundation of market power makes the international art market a highly inefficient one. Third, the vast majority of commercial galleries financially suffer mainly from a lack of close contacts to collectors and other art end buyers. Their weak business models are a considerable threat for emerging fine artists' career and income, as they are considered as the relevant access to the market and public attention, but they do not exhibit the capability to realise that.
3.2.1.5 Rivalry in the Contemporary Art Market

According to Porter (1980, 2000), the major determinant of the overall state of competition and the general level of industry income is the intensity of competition among fine artists within the contemporary fine art market. At least two major market factors determine the nature and intensity of fine artists' competition: market concentration, measuring the extent of sales domination by a relatively small number of fine artists in the art market, and product differentiation, referring to similarities and quality of offered works and services.

According to these market forces, fine artists face a very challenging business environment with high threats of substitution, new entry of competitors, and low market power vis-à-vis suppliers and art buyers. This situation is even worse for fine artists in the lower market segments, excluded from the gallery market. In this context, Schumann (1992) claims that fine artists have a unique role. In his view, every individual artist holds a monopolistic position owing to their uniqueness and limited output. Due to this, he further claims that there is weak competition among artists on the artistic level (Schumann, 1992). If only the artistic level is considered, his conclusion might be correct, although there always seems to be intense competition for quality in the arts. Thus it appears correct to assert that every artist competes strongly with all others for art buyers' attention. This situation may vary across the different market segments. It is Throsby (1994) who delves into more detail on this situation. According to his statements, the level of rivalry varies between the career phases of artists. At the beginning of their career, the rivalry among artists is said to be strong because their numbers are much higher than the number of potential buyers. In economic terms, this means that the market concentration of fine artists is very low; the market (segment) is not dominated by a few artists, but rather there exists an oversupply of artists in the lower segments. Only fine artists with an outstanding quality and/or personality (product differentiation) are able to attract art buyers' attention in the lower market segments (Wang, 2009; Ardizzzone and Zorloni, 2014; Prendergast, 2014). In higher market segments, the relation between art supply and demand changes more and more to the benefit of the artists (Throsby, 1994). The demand for high-quality art with rising consumption values increases relative to its availability, which is why market prices for artworks regularly rise. Similarly, the level of concentration of fine artists' sales dominating the market increases continuously in higher
market segments, as shown in section 2.2.2.2 of Chapter 2. This phenomenon is a typical characteristic of the international art markets that are considered winner-take-all markets (Frank and Cook, 1995; Ardizzone and Zorloni, 2014). A large proportion of art spending ends up in the pockets of a very small number of artists, while the majority of the fine artists earn little or nothing (Abbing, 2002).

Therefore, it can further be summarised and concluded that business rivalry among emerging fine artists regarding buyers’ attention is relatively high, particularly in the lower and relatively open market segments, while the rivalry among more established fine artists becomes lesser in higher gallery market segments due to developed market reputation, brand recognition, and higher art buyers’ loyalty because of higher consumption values. With regard to artists’ chances of making a living in the arts, it can therefore be concluded that a situation of high rivalry shows a negative influence.

### 3.2.1.6 Conclusion on Fine Artists’ Micro Environment

The review of the literature describing various industry factors in the art market according to Porter highlights different levels of threats to practising fine artists to making a living in the arts, which highly depend on the market segments they are operating in. The literature findings are summarised in Table 3.2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fine Artists (Market Segment)</th>
<th>Threat to Substitute</th>
<th>Threat of New Artists</th>
<th>Bargaining Power of Suppliers</th>
<th>Bargaining Power of Art Buyers</th>
<th>Rivalry</th>
<th>Threats to Make a Living</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Fine Artists (excluded from gallery market)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Fine Artists (gallery market)</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Fine Artists (Top 100, Olympus)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low - medium</td>
<td>low - medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author’s own illustration*

The literature review shows that particularly emerging fine artists excluded from the gallery-market segments are primarily expected to suffer economically from low market
prices due to several serious reasons. They face intense competition with other emerging fine artists easily entering their market segment due to hardly existent market entry barriers. They face high threats to substitute products due to very low consumption values of their artworks resulting from a lack of quality assessment and a still undeveloped market reputation. The missing market reputation in turn leads to very low bargaining powers with suppliers of art materials and art buyers, including galleries and collectors. All this finally results in low prices for offered artworks and in low income levels (profitability). In contrast, fine artists who are able to enter higher gallery market segments seem much more protected from these threats. The higher the achieved market segment, the lower the threat to an artist’s profitability and income. This segmental market structure explains why the art market as a whole is considered a winner-take-all market (according to Frank and Cook, 1995; Ardizzone and Zorloni, 2014), where only a few top artists are completely economically protected, while the vast majority faces serious professional and economic challenges.

The literature also illustrates that business models of commercial galleries as key art distributors and gatekeepers to the market are completely based on deliberately causing, maintaining, or even intensifying these inefficient market structures at artists’ and art buyers’ expense. They manage and control market access and use asymmetric information to justify their existence. These inefficiencies will keep emerging artists’ market power low. Especially galleries and art buyers seem to consider individual artists at the beginning of their career not to be partners at eye level, although they are the centrality of a thriving arts system (National Steering Group for Artists’ Development, 2002; Brown et al., 2012) or, metaphorically speaking, the vital blood for the profit-driven art market. Considering this, it can then be further concluded that artists’ poverty is structural in nature. The key characteristics of contemporary art market, as just illustrated in section 3.2.1, clearly highlight the structural dilemma the vast majority of artists face.

The literature findings additionally reveal evidence of a further structural dilemma in the contemporary art market. A large proportion of galleries lack the capability of turning a profit. Most galleries appear to simply fail to use their informative advantage. They seem hardly able to attract collectors’ attention and thus match their art budgets with the art products of their selected fine artists. The latter suffer from a lack of access to the market due to galleries’ missing contacts to collectors and other art end buyers. This
situation should reasonably question galleries’ powerful market position. How is it possible that intermediaries structurally suffering from financial weakness and missing contacts to collectors still have such market power to control artists’ market access? This situation might provide artists the chance of considerably overtaking galleries’ tasks for their own benefit. The economic weakness of key market players like galleries may reveal an opportunity for developing artists towards more self-management and self-responsibility for their professional careers. Considering these factors, fine artists are urgently recommended to demonstrate great initiative in developing the skills required to successfully manage market access and their professional careers on their own. This appears to be a promising protection against industry inefficiencies and threats of economic suffering. In this context, it is also expedient to recommend higher education to prepare fine art students and graduates for being able to self-manage their professional careers, as rightly stressed by Bridgstock (2011a).

3.2.2 Fine Artists’ Business Macro Environment

The contemporary fine art industry, as characterised in Chapter 2 and in more detail in the previous sections 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.5, is embedded in a macro environment including several factors that influence directly or indirectly fine artists’ chances of earning a living in the arts. These macro environmental factors are beyond artists’ control. To identify these factors within the confines of this literature review, the PESTLE analysis is an appropriate framework used as a business tool for tracking and analysing the environment of an industry (Figure 3.2-2). PESTLE is a mnemonic acronym which in its expanded form denotes P for political, E for economic, S for social, T for technological, L for legal, and E for environmental or ecological. It gives a bird’s eye view of the whole environment of an industry from many different angles. However, it is worth noting that the different environmental factors do not remain isolated – on the contrary, they are very closely connected, have a lot of overlap, and are mutually dependent.
3.2.2.1 Political Factors

These factors determine the extent to which a government may influence the contemporary art industry and the artists directly. Direct influence is given by governmental interventions in the art market. These are usually two-fold: governmental authorities often intervene on both the supply and demand side of the art industry (Heilbrun and Gray, 2001; Abbing, 2002). Possible ways of governmental interventions in the arts include direct grants for artists, tax deductions, the provision of business support services (e.g. arts incubators) and cultural spaces, and copyright law (e.g. Abbing, 2002; Culture, Creativity, and Communities (CCC) Program at the Urban Institute, 2003; Jackson et al., 2003; Brooks, 2004; Gehring, 2005; European Parliament, 2006b; Towse, 2006; Klamer and Petrova, 2007; DCMS, 2008; Styhre and Eriksson, 2008; Behnke, 2009; NEA, 2012; Government of Canada, 2016; City of Vancouver, 2016; Gilfillan and Morrow, 2014, 2016; Arts Council England (ACE), 2017). The intervention by copyright law will be discussed in more detail in section 3.2.2.5 as part of the legal factors. Subsidies, grants, and copyright are interventions on the supply side that have direct impact on artists’ doing and therefore awaken their immediate awareness. These direct
subsides and governmental interventions are intended to support creativity by enlarging artists’ autonomy and social participation (Frey, 2002; Lee, 2005). To stimulate buyers’ willingness to invest in art, tax regulations are a very common variable in cultural policy (e.g. Abbing, 2002; BVDG; 2013; BBK, 2016).

3.2.2.1.1 The Rationale and Effects of Governmental Intervention

O’Hare (2008) examines whether there is a market failure that justifies governmental interventions to support the arts. He stresses in this context that markets with artistic excellence do not need direct government support. When supporting the arts it should be clearly communicated why this industry is believed to have a greater value to society than non-subsidised industries. Otherwise the social acceptance – i.e. taxpayers’ acceptance of government action – could be very fragile and in turn might cause negative effects for the arts (O’Hare, 2008), as shown later in section 3.2.2.3 (social factors).

With this in mind, literature findings are still lacking which show clear evidence of sustainably positive effects of governmental subsidies on artists’ average income and professional career success (CCC, 2003). Quite on the contrary, while public funding of and subsidies to the arts have been growing in Europe since World War II (Abbing, 2002), “the situation of individual artists has become more vulnerable” (Segers et al., 2010, p. 58). It is in particular Abbing (2002), both an artist and economist, who strongly criticises governmental subsidies to the arts. He accuses subsidies as one key factor in causing artists’ poverty. He investigates in detail the reasons for and effects of subsidies in the arts. In this framework, he identifies two key initiators of art subsidies: on the one hand, there are various powerful lobbying groups in the arts (Fullerton, 1991; Abbing, 2002) that publicly present themselves as key voices of “general interest” (Abbing, 2002, p. 230). Lobbyists’ articulated reasons for the need of subsidising the arts are manifold, ranging from the necessity to offset market failures, to creating and protecting excellence (i.e. art has special merits and must be publicly accessible, or governments are responsible for helping poor artists), to preventing threats of artistic underproduction, and to art contributing to civic education, economic and social welfare and must therefore be supported (e.g. Fullerton, 1991; Sawers, 1993; Zimmer and Toepfer, 1999; Abbing, 2002; Belfiore, 2002, 2004; Reid, 2009; Heffer, 2011; Brown et al., 2012; Marotta, 2012; Gilfillan and Morrow, 2014, 2016). On the other hand, governments on their own initiative
subsidise the arts (Gilfillan and Morrow, 2014, 2016) because they “may very well serve the interests of a government” (Abbing, 2002, p. 231). Governments could be interested in making outstanding art accessible since the arts usually serve the cultural reputation of a region or nation (Alexander, 2007). Sawers (1993, p. 25) speaks of “national pride” in this context. International prestige is an important vehicle for emphasising its own performance capability, creative power, and international competitiveness in ‘recruiting’ talented labour force with outstanding (art) skills or to facilitate and support tourism and regional development for the sake of economic and social welfare (Sawers, 1993; Abbing, 2002).

The major critique of governmental subsidies is complex. Sawers (1993), Abbing (2002), O’Hare (2008), Marotta (2012), and Reed (2014), just to name a few question the social acceptance of subsidies. They are concerned about taxpayers’ obvious political responsibility to support professional artists who are not able to perform well enough to make a living. In this context, questions of social justice arise (e.g. Marotta, 2012; Meyer, 2014; Reed, 2014; Butcher, 2015), stressing who should pay for the arts or why hard working people with a relatively low income should finance other peoples’ hobbies. Lewis and Brooks (2005, abstract) challenge in this context the public morality since “artists and art audiences have different values than the rest of the population.” Cultural policies that promote artists’ and art audiences’ interests may offend other important segments of the population.

Abbing (2002) additionally criticises lobbyists’ more or less “rent seeking” (Abbing, 2002, p. 224) selfish interests or those of the subsidising governments. He also points out the false signalling effects of subsidies to the large amounts of already practising artists and prospective artists such as art students. While targeted project funding by governments may have a positive impact on the creative process of the funded art projects (Gilfillan and Morrow, 2014), direct subsidies (grants) regardless of their underlying political motivations are only able to distort competition and cause further market failures and inefficiencies by their key characteristic of being considered gifts for all (Sawers, 1993; Abbing, 2002; Pyykkönen et al., 2009; Walker, 2009; Reed, 2014). Subsidies that have a direct or indirect monetary effect signal protection and the certainty that the arts are a relatively ‘safe haven’ to be for everyone, signalling that the government is not willing to drop anyone in the arts and that everyone will professionally
survive in the arts, independent of the created level of artistic quality. While art of low- to medium-quality levels is supported by subsidies and thus by taxpayers’ money (Kauffman, 1990; Sarmiento, 2012), high-quality art is expected not to need any money to perform (Sawers, 1993; Heffer, 2011). The more subsidised the arts are, the more high-quality art is expected to “despair and die” (Micklethwait, 1983; Cowen and Tabarrok, 2000). In this context, Kauffman (1990, Headline) speaks of “cultivating mediocrity”. This is confirmed among others by Palmer (1998), Behnke (2009), and Steinfeld (2010). Elston (1993) too gets to the heart of subsidies’ ‘outcome-quality-dilemma’ by stressing that artists receiving grants “must proceed carefully when painting” in order not to lose their support (Elston, 1993, p. 358) and similarly worrying about subsidies possibly resulting “in hesitant artistic expression rather than bold ventures that challenge the limits of traditional artistic forms” (Elston, 1993, p. 358). Belfiore (2004, p. 26) expects with increasing public subsidies to the arts “ever-growing [quality] expectations [by society] which they [the artists] are, quite simply, unable to meet.” She is also concerned about the fact “that the arts become entirely instrumental. Degraded to the function of mere tool, arts become a matter of ‘value of money’” (Belfiore, 2002, p. 21). For art’s sake, these signalling effects can only be false. They lead to more artists of low to medium quality entering the art market in the long run, increasing furthermore the mismatch of oversupply and demand particularly in the lower market segments and therefore keep prices and average income low due to the domination of low- to medium-quality levels (Abbing, 2002). In light of this, governmental interventions particularly in forms of ‘subsidy gifts’ can reasonably be considered inefficient and even toxic to competition and income in the arts (e.g. Micklethwait, 1983; Kauffman, 1990; Fullerton, 1991; Sawers, 1993; Abbing, 2002; Pyykkönen et al., 2009; Walker, 2009; Segers et al., 2010; Heffer, 2011; Gilfillan and Morrow, 2014, 2016; Meyer, 2014; Reed, 2014).

3.2.2.1.2 Taxation of Art

According to Lash (2015), a U.S. tax lawyer, the current art taxation regularities across the European Union (EU) could be a competitive disadvantage for its art markets compared to non-EU art markets and its individual artists. Since 2014, member states of the European Union have charged higher VAT rates on the sale, rental, import, and export of artwork, especially with respect to commercial trade by galleries, art dealers,
and in the resale market. This may discourage the growth of an EU-wide commercial art market in comparison with more favourable tax regimes outside the EU (BVDG, 2013; Lash, 2015). While they have had to apply a standard VAT rate of at least 15% since 2006 (Lash, 2015; Europedia, 2016), their rates vary currently between 15% in Luxembourg to 27% in Hungary (Europedia, 2016). EU member states are, however, allowed to theoretically request reduced rates to certain goods and services of a social or cultural nature including artworks, set equal to or higher than 5% (Lash, 2015; Europedia, 2016). That is mostly applied by EU member states. The lowest VAT rate of 5% has been valid in the UK since 1999, while Hungary applies the highest rate of 27%, followed by Denmark and Croatia each with a rate of 25% (Valentin, 2013; Europedia, 2016). These differences within the EU may shape nations’ societies by defining who owns art and what art is being collected. To be more precise in this context, while nations with lower VAT on art such as the UK may stimulate both institutional and individual collectors to invest in art (McCarthy, 1983; Rhodes, 2003; Horwood, 2016), high-VAT nations like Denmark or Hungary may see more institutional collections due to preventing particularly individual investments. However, taxation of art also seems to have a direct effect on art quality. According to Tischler (2012), Cowen and Tabarrok (2000), art quality is expected to increase when taxes on art increase. They use an example of a wage tax of 100% to argue that artists “would [then] produce only to satisfy their own aesthetic demands” (Cowen and Tabarrok, 2000, p. 248) and not for the market.

When it comes to artwork, taxation itself becomes very complicated and diverse in the EU. On the one hand, VAT rates on artworks purchased directly from independent artists’ studios were considerably reduced from the standard rates in several European countries (Forbes, 2015). In France, for instance, the VAT rate on arts marked in 2015 a significant reduction from previously 10% to currently 5.5% (Forbes, 2015). The German VAT rate for independent artists is 7%, equal to their copyright fee (BVDG, 2013; BBK, 2016). The main reason for reduced VAT rates is clear: Reduced VAT rates are supposed to help attract sales of independent artists directly from their studios, which in turn is supposed to facilitate their chances of generating income to earn a living. One precondition for such a tax benefit is that the artworks are handmade and not digitally produced (BBK, 2016), which is why photographs are excluded from this regulation (Der Kunstverlag, 2013). On the other hand and in contrast to independent artists’ tax benefits, galleries and art
dealers have to pay considerably higher VAT rates, which are equal to the rates of other ordinary goods (BVDG, 2013; Der Kunstverlag, 2013; Forbes, 2015; Lash, 2015; BKK, 2016). For example, commercial galleries and art dealers located in Germany pay either VAT rates of 19% on sales of individual artworks or a calculated VAT rate of 30% on the margin between the original sale price and the purchase price of traded art bundles, where individual prices cannot precisely be mapped to individual artworks (BVDG, 2014; Lash, 2015; BBK, 2016). In the UK, the VAT margin schemes are considerably lower and much business-friendly for galleries and art dealers, using a margin scheme of 16.67% (Gov.UK, 2016). German dealers have seen this ‘expensive’ move as unfairly overlooking the particularities of the art trade, stressing that they also have to pay 5% Künstlersozialkasse on top of the purchase price from an artist, a form of social and health insurance for cultural producers in Germany, additional to that high VAT rate (BVDG, 2013; Forbes, 2015).

While this taxation of art may be acceptable for those fine artists who sell out of their own studios, it does not bode well for those who are represented by galleries.

A simple calculation example shall serve to illustrate the problematic case of art taxation in Germany (Table 3.2-2). Similar tax regulations are also valid in other European countries, for example, in the UK (Gov.UK, 2016).
Table 3.2-2: Calculation Example of German VAT on the Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Artwork is sold by independent fine artist directly from studio for 2,000.00 Euros, including VAT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price: 2,000.00 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAT (7%): 130.84 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income Artist: 1,869.16 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2a</td>
<td>Artwork is sold by gallery for 2,000.00 Euros, including VAT (50% commission fee on net price)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price: 2,000.00 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAT (19%): 319.33 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallery Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50% net price): 840.33 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Artist:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% copyright fee: 58.82 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% net price: 840.33 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income: 899.15 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2b</td>
<td>Artwork is sold by gallery for 4,000.00 Euros, including VAT (50% commission fee on net price)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price: 4,000.00 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAT (19%): 638.66 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallery Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50% net price): 1,680.67 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Artist:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% copyright fee: 117.65 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% net price: 1,680.67 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income: 1,798.32 Euros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own calculation

As the three cases in Table 3.2-2 illustrate, the taxation in Germany benefits independent fine artists in particular by reduced VAT rates compared to fine artists who are represented by galleries. Even if galleries double the market prices due to their usually charged commission fees of up to 50%, the fine artists represented by them earn less than independent artists. It is therefore not surprising that representatives of the gallery industry have cited the disparities and generally less business-friendly conditions in Europe, compared to the U.S., as a key factor in the region’s shrinking share of the global art market (e.g. Forbes, 2015; Lash, 2015). In the U.S., no VAT exists, although of course there is sales tax.

To conclude with regard to this study, the current tax policy in the EU shows a tendency to support only those fine artists who are capable of selling their works directly from their
studios to art buyers. This may basically help to increase artists’ overall income and their chances of making a living. For emerging business fine artists this seems to be an economic advantage at first sight. A precondition is, however, that these artists are able to engage with their audience directly without any intermediaries. This is a major challenge for emerging artists since they are usually unknown in the public eye, not present on the market, and have not established an audience (Skalski, 2011), which is why they need galleries for distributing, marketing, and selling their works. Also, especially galleries as key distributors of art in society are being challenged and blocked in business by the current EU- and nation-wide tax regularities. It can be concluded that there remains no direct fiscal support for galleries, despite the fact that 80% operate at or close to a loss (Resch, 2011; see also section 3.2.1.4.3 for more details).

The current taxation challenges the poor and inefficient business models of most galleries and hence the art market structure as a whole, yet not to the economic benefit of emerging business fine artists. They continue to suffer from the market’s inefficiency antagonised by intermediaries’ economic weakness. Galleries will highly likely reduce their economic risks by seeking out mainstream quality in order to commercially and professionally survive. This means they will probably avoid the innovative and risky art business concepts of emerging artists.

Maybe the other way around could have benefits for increasing emerging fine artists’ average income and their chances to make a living in the arts. If even at all, governmental authorities should probably better give sufficient fiscal support and incentives to galleries to reduce their risk aversion and willingness to increase their effort to permanently promote, develop, and invest in new emerging artists by pushing more of them into the art market like venture capital companies do with new, talented, and promising ventures. While reducing or totally cancelling direct subsidies for fine artists, this could have a positive impact on fine artists’ overall public attention as well as on society’s cultural development through a higher level of quality available, which in turn may lead to increased social acceptance and prices of not yet established artworks – and finally to an increased average income level.
3.2.2.1.3 Arts Incubators as Tools of Cultural Policy

Artists are essentially able to experience many different programmes of training and professional development to increase their chances of earning a living in the arts. These programmes can be formal or informal and they include local agencies, art organisations, museums, universities, community-based organisations, and diverse types of networks, including selected familiar, institutional, and open web-based or virtual networks (Jackson et al., 2003; Bonin-Rodriguez, 2012). With that said, two programmes stand out for a high degree of professionalism in developing artists both artistically and professionally: artist-in-residence programmes and arts incubators (Styhre and Eriksson, 2007; Essig, 2014b; Australia Council for the Arts, 2016). While arts incubation programmes are considered explicit policy tools for developing artists and communities, artist-in-residence programmes are not exclusively government-initiated. There is no single model for an artist-in-residence programme and the expectations and requirements vary greatly. Some residency programs are incorporated within larger institutions. Other organisations exist solely to support residential exchange programs. Residencies can be part of museums, universities, galleries, studio spaces, theatres, artist-run spaces, municipalities, governmental offices, and even festivals (Styhre and Eriksson, 2007). They can be seasonal, ongoing, or tied to a particular one-time event. They exist in urban spaces, rural villages, container ships, and deep in nature. Hundreds of such opportunities and organisations exist throughout the world (Styhre and Eriksson, 2007). Research on residencies conducted by the Australia Council for the Arts (2016) show evidence that artists benefit from a career boost that comes with doing a residency. Some of the benefits of residencies highlighted by artists were as follows: creative inspiration, professional sustainability, connection with other artists, building confidence and pride, and the provision of career-boosting prestige and recognition that come with being awarded a residency. Due to residencies’ missing political initiation, however, artist-in-residency programmes are not subject of further literature and empirical research in the context of this study to analyse political factors affecting artists’ chances of professional success and income.

In contrast, Allen and McCluskey (1990), Gerl (2000), Essig (2014b), and Mian et al. (2016) stress that organised arts incubators are tools of cultural policy to help develop working artists to become successful in their art businesses. Yet they are all correct in
also pointing out arts incubators’ main objective of supporting a community’s economic and social development, as Carizzozo Works (2015, “Mission and Goals”) remarked: “to improve the quality of life in Carrizozo, New Mexico, and the surrounding area through careful planning, education, and open communication so as to encourage community development, economic growth, and cultural diversity.” Such objectives may not necessarily target the working artists’ individual success but rather the total outcome of community development in a specific location. The individual artist, though, remains the subject of support services at least.

The term *incubator* has been borrowed by business sciences from the worlds of medicine and biology, where it describes an environment of hatching and growth processes. In addition, this term has been utilised in an economic context since the late 1950s to describe the growth of start-up companies and entrepreneurs during their early stages of development. However, a review of the relevant literature reveals that a unified definition of this term does not yet exist. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that different concepts of incubation are subsumed under this one term (see Appendix B for details). In the context of this research the following *working definition* of arts incubators was used to provide a basic understanding of what it should generally comprise – a programme to stimulate arts entrepreneurship and competitiveness of artists and to develop entrepreneurial personalities and business ideas in the art industry at an early stage (cf. for example, Allen and Rahman, 1995; Albert et al., 2003; Aernoudt, 2004; Al-Mubaraki and Busler, 2013; InBIA, 2015):

*Arts incubators are programmes that nurture the development of arts entrepreneurs by helping them to define, establish and grow their ideas and business activities during their early entrepreneurial stages.*

According to this working definition, arts incubators aim to develop business fine artists to successful arts entrepreneurs (see section 3.1.3.4 for artists’ commercial typology). That could also mean to transfer less successful ‘off the market’-business artists to more successful art entrepreneurs.

Essig (2014a) classifies arts incubators by their key stakeholders. More precisely, she focuses mainly on those stakeholders who are regarded as the primary target of an incubator’s stated objectives and “so is used as proxy for the objectives themselves” (Essig, 2014a, p. 173). This group of stakeholders, Kaler (2002, p. 91) calls them, are
“claimant stakeholders” who have “some kind of claim on the services of the organisation” or incubator in this case. In relation to the aforementioned working definition of arts incubators and in alignment with Essig, it can reasonably be stated that the primary objective of arts incubators is to support business artists and art-making organisations (Essig, 2014a). In this particular context, artists and claimant stakeholders are one and the same group. However, most organised arts incubators are financed with public funds, which is why their main objective is to support a community’s economic and social development (Essig, 2014a; Carizzozo Works, 2015), as mentioned above. The claimant stakeholder of those arts incubators with such community-related primary objectives is the community and not the individual artist. The case at university-based incubators is similar. Their primary objectives are to nurture the university’s reputation as a leading research and knowledge institution, to acquire new students or technology (in the case of technology incubators). As a result of her analysis based on the primary objectives and claimant stakeholders, Essig (2014a) classifies the following four different arts incubator models employed for the research in the context of this thesis:

- “**arts incubators**” in a strict sense with individual artists and arts organisations as claimant stakeholders being the target objectives,
- “**community development incubators**” with the community as claimant stakeholder and the development of the community as the main objective,
- “**student incubators**” with the university as claimant stakeholder and the university’s reputation as the primary objective, and
- “**commercial incubators**” with the owner of the privately organised incubator as claimant stakeholder and the maximisation of profit as the target objective.

How arts incubators differ from other entrepreneurial service providers, such as hubs, accelerators, technology parks, or coworking spaces, is outlined in Appendix B.

### 3.2.2.1.3.1 The Impacts of Arts Incubation on Artists’ Chances to Make a Living

Basically, an incubation programme is expected to have a positive impact on several aspects of entrepreneurial development and future chances of (economic) success for its business artists (“clients”) (Lewis et al., 2011; NESTA, 2011). The impacts range from access to resources to shared costs, reduced uncertainty, strategic input, entrepreneurial learning, permanent on-site mentoring, and feedback from clients. As an analysis of 116
incubator managers in the United States shows, however, it is the synergy among multiple practices and services that produce success for incubator clients and programmes rather than one single incubator practice, policy, or service (Lewis et al., 2011). Hence, it has been suggested that incubators provide benefits to clients along four dimensions: 1) lending credibility and liability; 2) shortening the entrepreneurial learning curve; 3) problem-solving; and 4) access to additional resources and networks (internal and external) (for example, Smilor, 1987; Ratinho et al., 2009; Scillitoe and Chakrabarti, 2010; Lewis et al., 2011; NESTA, 2011; Ratinho, 2011; Thom, 2011; Maia et al., 2012; Jørgensen, 2014).

Evidence, as to whether arts incubation programmes have a positive impact on business artists’ chances of making a living in the arts, is brought forth by Cockpit Arts (2013) and Essig (2015a, 2015b). Cockpit Arts is an arts incubator in the UK focused on craft business models. It has undertaken regular research on the impacts of its provided business support and network access on the clients’ commercial success. In accordance with its findings, the majority of clients in the incubation process reported growth rates in turnover of more than 40% and in profits of more than 25% per year, on average over the past four years. These growth rates were significantly higher than the average for the cultural industries in general and the art industry and its specific sections in particular. Furthermore, Cockpit Arts was able to identify through surveys among its clients that they increased not only income but also confidence, self-esteem, interdependence, professional behaviour, career focus, and entrepreneurial skills (Cockpit Arts, 2015).

With the help of four case studies, Essig (2015a, 2015b) shows evidence that arts incubators create value for their clients with regard to 1) lowering barriers to market entry and market sustainability by granting financial resources, 2) reducing risk by offering a protected environment of learning and professional development, and 3) increasing self-sufficiency. Thanks to the first mentioned benefits, client artists have greater capacity to take more artistic risk, to increase their cultural capital, and to improve the quality of their work. They are not required to meet market requirements as soon as they enter the incubation programme; they can focus first on building up their key competences.

Besides the aforementioned direct impacts on arts incubator clients, incubation in general also has indirect effects on the economy. A European study estimated that (business) incubation of technology firms indirectly impacts job creation on a ratio of 1 to
1.5. For one job created directly, one and half new jobs will be created indirectly as a consequence (CSES, 2002). Another study related to this issue was more conservative, revealing an estimated ratio of 1 to 0.48 and 0.84 for the number of indirectly created jobs (Markley and McNamara, 1996).

Further positive indirect impacts are expected in two ways: firstly, by learning from failure (Shepherd, 2003) because the development process of entrepreneurial skills is considered a result of experiential learning by doing; and, secondly, by increased credibility and visibility of incubation clients since the incubator can become a reputable representative of its clients (UKBI, 2009a, 2009b; NESTA, 2011).

Essig (2014c, 2014d) defines indirect outcomes of arts incubation programmes with public objectives for the economic development of communities in manifesting a creative image for the community, while also increasing its tourist and visitor traffic and artistic vitality.

3.2.2.1.3.2 Identification of Crucial Arts Incubation Services
Kahn (1995) is among the first researchers to examine the first generation of arts incubators in the United States founded in the late 1980s and early 1990s. She compares a total of six arts incubators in order to highlight their differences and similarities so as to assess their entrepreneurial value for artists and arts organisations. Her analysis shows that all six arts incubators were organised as regional, not-for-profit institutions with the primary strategic objective of developing the art scene in their communities by nurturing artists through offering working spaces (facilities), office equipment and services (infrastructure/administrative services), occasional trainings (business services), and network contacts. Adler (2013) stresses, in this context, the high demand of arts entrepreneurs for providers of business and entrepreneurial skills in the UK. With this particular focus, O’Connor et al. (2009) suggest that an incubation programme can basically be considered part of an entrepreneurship education system. De Foite et al. (2003) and van Winkelen and McKenzie (2011), in similar fashion, add that incubators provide an adequate learning environment for structured training programmes and knowledge management. The important role of incubators in the context of client learning is also stressed by Kirby (2004b). By presenting a case study of a UK university incubator, Kirby (2004b, “Summary”) calls incubators “teaching laboratories”, supporting
the development processes of clients' entrepreneurial mindset and skills. As of yet, there is no common agreement in higher education on how entrepreneurial education should be conducted. Incubators are therefore considered, in Kirby's opinion, to cover all facets and aspects of entrepreneurial learning. In particular, an incubator’s staff could be regarded here as “learning agents” in clients' knowledge creation processes (Mahmoud-Jouini, 2007, “Summary”). During the incubation process, incubator clients are taught about and for entrepreneurship through a programme of action learning and on-site coaching that deals with real-life challenges and problems. The incubation process contains no formal curriculum, which is why the education should be tailored to clients’ needs who take ownership and responsibility for their own learning. Former classroom observations, reflections, business ideas, and concepts can now be tested in an entrepreneurial learning environment, monitored and managed by the incubator staff and management, in order to gain concrete experience (Kirby, 2003, 2004a, 2004b).

Essig (2014a) surveyed a total of 43 arts incubators in the United States, representing the basic population of arts incubators there in 2013, in accordance to her developed typology by claimant stakeholders. In contrast to Kahn (1995), she identified different types of arts incubators, distinguished by their claimant stakeholders and primary strategic objectives. She additionally analysed the relationship between arts incubators’ primary strategic objectives and the actual services provided so as to identify conspicuous differences and similarities between both criteria. She was only able to find “some weak connection between the organizational form of the incubator and provision of arts business training” (Essig, 2014a, p. 178). This means that incubators with different objectives provide more or less similar business assistance services (Bakkali et al., 2014). In this context, the following service categories provided by arts incubators were identified by Essig (2014a, p. 173).

- “facilities”: Workspace and/or exhibition and performance space,
- “services”: Marketing, bookkeeping and office services,
- “training”: Training in business practices, on-site coaching and mentoring,
- “funding”: Grants, loans, or equity investments, and
- “fiscal sponsorship”.
Each incubator was classified by its claimant stakeholders, associated with an overview of provided business assistance services falling within the categories mentioned above (see Table 3.2-3).

Table 3.2-3: Provided Business Assistance of Arts Incubators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incubator (N=43)</th>
<th>Claimant Stakeholder</th>
<th>Typical Primary Objective</th>
<th>Incubator Clients</th>
<th>Business Assistance (number of mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Incubator (n=22)</td>
<td>artists/arts organisations</td>
<td>development of individual artists/arts organisations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Incubators (n=11)</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>development of a vibrant community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Incubators (n=7)</td>
<td>arts entrepreneurs/creative industries entrepreneurs</td>
<td>development of arts-oriented businesses; maximisation of profits</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Incubators (n=3)</td>
<td>student artists</td>
<td>Investment through education in student ability; increasing institution's reputation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 31 28 28 12 3

Source: Adapted from Essig (2014a, p. 173)

As per Essig’s findings, providing facilities (mentioned by 31 out of 43 incubators), business services (28 mentions), and trainings (28 mentions) were considered to be the most important services for arts incubation clients across the different incubator types. However, at least two significant differences between the various arts incubator types appeared: commercial as well as community-driven arts incubators provided facilities as their most common service. This finding is not surprising since both incubator types aim to facilitate community and art entrepreneurs’ growth by offering an adequate infrastructure. Facilities are needed and demanded mostly by artists as workspace and/or exhibition and communication space. Conversely, non-profit arts incubators and university-based incubators, which address artists’ individual creativity and work, provided business services and trainings rather than facilities.

Funding services were only provided by a minority of examined incubators and it seems that only for-profit incubators (e.g. commercial and university-based ones)
provided direct funding via equity-investment in creative art ventures and artists to push forward the development process.

Considering these facts and in order to provide the aforementioned benefits, incubators should be flexible in adapting their services to the individual needs of their clients who in turn vary over time and across regions and cultures (Rojas, 2010; NESTA, 2011).

To sum up, the literature findings offer up evidence that arts incubation programmes provide positive impacts on both business fine artists’ commercial growth or income (Cockpit Arts, 2013; Essig, 2014a) and the economic development of a region. In collaboration with professionally working arts incubators, fine art graduates explicitly pursuing commercial success and aiming for a livelihood in the arts can cross a bridge of business and entrepreneurial preparation between studies and profession.

The findings of art incubators’ services show that they are able to help business fine artists to develop crucial skills for succeeding in the arts. They are therefore a valuable option for those fine artists who are commercially motivated and similarly suffer from a lack of skills required for their professional development and success. In this context, it needs to be considered that there is no set package of support that is guaranteed to lead to improved financial performance (sales volume and income). One size does not fit all. That personalised approach may be the main difference to the standardised curriculum at HEIs. Professionally working arts incubators\(^2\) were originally designed to meet the challenges of supporting artists’ development individually. Another advantage of arts incubators is that the incubating artists are part of a network of promising, talented artists, normally sharing similar commercial motives and exchanging experiences with one another. Arts incubators therefore facilitate peer-to-peer action learning and group coaching sessions, so that valuable knowledge and skills can be shared in an informal and relaxed way. Excellent networked arts incubators also produce benefits for artists’

---

\(^2\) The emphasis on “professionally working” arts incubators is based on the fact that the majority of NBIA registered arts incubators, for example, are small in size and lack important organisational structures, processes and resources (staff and capital). They mostly provide a few non-financial services, such as market consulting; however, mentoring and individualised on-site coaching and networking partnerships are missing as services.
professional development through the transfer of market reputation. Incubators with a significant network and market reputation definitely have a higher buying, negotiation, and marketing/promotion power than individual artists have on their own – and they can use it for the benefit of their clients. Artists could use this advantage to stand out from the intense competition and finally to increase their chances of market attention.

Nevertheless, the fact that arts incubators are mainly initiated and established by specific communities leads to the assumption that only a small number of business fine artists located in those communities are able to make use of incubation business and professional support services. By regarding fine artists’ assumed poor educational preparation at HEIs for their professional career as working artists, this is mainly a concern on a macro level. It is therefore interesting to investigate and know whether arts incubators are also able to educationally prepare large numbers of commercially motivated business fine artists for their professional career. Additionally, it is insightful to find out what further professional services are needed and demanded by emerging business fine artists, since there is no standardised package of support services guaranteed to lead to professional success and income. Current literature still lacks information and findings with regard to these issues. These research gaps need to be addressed in this study and regarded together as a third research question, which is closely connected to the first two research questions concerned with fine artists’ educational preparation (see conclusion in section 3.1.6).

Consequently, the third research question is derived from a lack in the literature and is formulated as follows:

**Research Question 3**: Do arts incubators consider support services required by emerging business fine artists in their programmes and are they able to scale up their services to professionally prepare large numbers of business fine artists to make a living in the arts?

The answer to this research question has practical relevance for communities, higher education institutions, and arts incubators to design an efficient arts incubation approach with a larger spectrum of services. The answer contributes therefore to the existent body of literature in the fields of business and arts incubation and arts entrepreneurship education.
3.2.2.1.4 Conclusion

It remains questionable whether traditional subsidy strategies such as direct monetary subsidies for artists or tax subsidies on the demand side can have much of an impact on fine artists’ average income level. Traditional subsidies can be considered gifts. Although they are expected to positively effect individuals’ average income, the currently applied and more traditional subsidies seem to fail by false signalling and thus distorting the competition. They more likely seem to be social alibis rather than economically promising efforts to increase fine artists’ income. According to Abbing (2002), the key factor to address fine artists’ income levels seems not to be the income itself but rather the regulation of the total numbers. As shown in section 3.2.1, the art market industry forces by Porter highlight an oversupply of emerging artists with different quality levels, all competing with each other for buyers’ attention and market access. This intense competition automatically leads to low attention levels of potential buyers, low prices, and finally low success and income chances. All of this is mainly forced by governmental subsidisation. Abbing speaks in this context rightly of a “structural poverty” by subsidising the arts (Abbing, 2002, p. 124).

To increase artists’ average income, more liberal activities need to be done. Fewer to no direct subsidies would lead to a natural and healthy consolidation of the art market. The unavailability of subsidies would have an urgently needed effect of a market entry barrier that primarily sorts out emerging artists of low and average quality. Talented artists would then have more chances to show their skills and quality to become socially recognised. The abolition of grants and direct subsidies for every artist may increase the acceptance and value of artists in society, a prerequisite for the willingness to pay higher market prices. If actually needed for social reasons, governmental authorities could spend more money on or give more support to specific art projects (via project funding) of emerging artists, who have already illustrated their quality by publicly promoting and exhibiting their works, in place of more and more economically suffering galleries failing to provide fine artists the needed market access and visibility, as highlighted in section 3.2.1.4.3 above.

This situation could additionally be supported by more arts incubators. Arts incubators are often used as policy tools to develop artists and regions. They provide professional business support by educating and preparing artists to successfully face market
challenges. This combination of services and public support would better facilitate and protect artists’ artistic and economic development. Arts incubation programmes are in contrast to traditional subsidies not considered direct gifts to artists; instead, these programmes are much more an opportunity for a supervised professional development and self-managed career. Further research though is urgently needed in the context of this study to identify practical opportunities to make arts incubation more available and accessible to large numbers of fine artists who show the willingness and capability to educate and prepare themselves for market access and professional success.

3.2.2.2 Economic Factors

These factors are determinants of an economy’s performance that may have direct resonating effects on fine artists’ income. Noteworthy is, for example, an economy’s income effect. Per definition, the income effect represents the change in an individual's income when the economy's performance and income increase (Investopedia, 2017). The income effect additionally shows how that change of income impacts the quantity demanded of a good or service. Normally, the relationship between income and quantity demanded is positive: as income increases, so does the quantity of goods and services demanded, including art and luxury goods (Investopedia, 2017), and vice versa. However, the question in this context is whether the income effect covers the costs of living and working as an artist. Consequently, artists’ income and financial obligations are subject to further review in the following sections.

3.2.2.2.1 Artists’ Income

Using the income effect as a potential indicator for artists’ income development, the following recent data is available: Europe’s annual growth, measured in Europe’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP), has increased on average by approximately 1.5% between 2007 and 2015 (TradingEconomics, 2017), despite the ongoing negative effects of the financial crisis. Data from the OECD’s employment outlook 2016 (OECD, 2016; Allen and Elliott, 2016) reveal that real wages have increased in the same time by an average of 6.7% in OECD countries. The average income of fine artists, for example in Germany, showed an increase of up to 30% in that period. Although this increase was disproportionately high, the achieved level was and still is very low at approximately 15,000 euros per annum (Musik, 2016).
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The average earnings of professional fine artists in the arts are consistently less than other professionals with similar educational backgrounds (Towse, 1996; Hill Strategies Research, 2004; Bridgstock, 2007; Phillips, 2010), while their rates of unemployment and underemployment are much higher (Towse, 1996; Caves, 2000; Throsby and Hollister, 2003; National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), 2011; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012, 2016). According to Alper and Wassall (2006), Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (2015), and ONS (2015), professional artists face limitations in earnings of up to 50% compared to the earnings of other professions with similar educational backgrounds. More precisely, artists' low income means living on the edge of poverty. Official statistics in Germany, the UK, and other countries worldwide, reveal an annual average income before tax of the abovementioned approximately 15,000 Euros (12,000 British pounds) per professional artist (Alper et al., 1996; Robinson and Montgomery, 2000; Hill Strategies Research, 2004; Deutscher Kulturrat, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University Bonn, Vereinigte Dienstleistungsgewerkschaft ver.di, 2006; Phillips, 2010; AIR, 2011; BBK, 2011a, 2011b; Institut für Mittelstandsfororschung Bonn, 2011; Söndermann, 2012; ONS, 2015 Künstlersozialkasse, 2016). Artists’ tense economic situation is also confirmed by several research studies (e.g. Rengers, 2002; Karhunen and Rensujeff, 2003; Schiffbänker and Mayerhofer, 2003; Throsby and Hollister, 2003; Alper and Wassall, 2006; Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), 2006; Haak, 2008a; Barnett, 2010; Throsby and Zednik, 2010; BBK, 2011a, 2011b; Benhamou, 2011a; Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015). Consequently, the average working artist is hardly able to make and sustain a living in the arts.

One argument for the low income levels has to do with artists' high labour costs due to low productivity. According to Baumol and Bowen (1966) and underpinned by Abbing (2002), the arts are considered a labour-intensive sector with a low development in productivity in recent decades. Low productivity in the arts refers to a condition where artists produce artworks inefficiently. The scientists use the example of a current string quartet that is not expected to be more productive than a string quartet one hundred years ago to stress this situation. Both string quartets are expected to need the same time to play an identical composition. In sectors other than the arts, however, productivity has significantly risen in the last decades due to technical progress. Such developments
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in different sectors have led to differences in labour costs. While labour productivity has not considerably risen in the arts compared to other sectors, the income level in the arts has (Abbing, 2002), although it is presently relatively low. In Abbing's view, this misfit may threaten the arts and artists' chances of professional survival and income. Abbing (2002, p. 156) speaks in this context of a "cost disease". Cowen and Grier (1996) take a different view. They do not follow the argument of the given cost disease because in their view it does not apply to the arts since the arts in general and the fine arts in particular are not considered that labour-intensive. In addition, productivity in the arts has in their view also increased due to human creativity and the permanent pursuit of new ideas. As a result, they do not expect activities in the arts to decline nor for professional survival to be threatened by this argument.

Nevertheless, to diversify their income risk, artists therefore choose multiple job holdings (e.g. Alper et al., 1996; Karhunen, 1998; Blackwell and Harvey, 1999; Menger, 1999, 2006; Robinson and Montgomery, 2000; McAndrew, 2003; Karhunen and Rensujeff, 2003; Jackson et al., 2003; Bridgstock, 2005; Haack, 2005; Eickhof and Haunschild, 2006; European Parliament, 2006a; Bille, 2008; Oakley et al., 2008; Ball et al., 2010; Barnett, 2010; Cunningham and Higgs, 2010; BBK, 2011a, 2011b; Benhamou, 2011a; Bille et al., 2012; Bleichert, 2012; Casacuberta and Gandelman, 2012; Steiner and Schneider, 2012; White, 2013; Söndermann, 2014). Artists' labour market is reviewed later in more detail in section 3.2.2.3.5.

3.2.2.2 Artists' Financial Obligations

The primary drawbacks to this typical employment pattern reduce artists' chances of meeting their financial obligations, particularly when deciding to start families. According to findings of Jackson et al. (2003), artists often purchase property, take on other financial responsibilities, or give up their arts career to meet these obligations. This also includes the employment-related health insurance to which artists normally have difficulties of accessing on account of their irregular employment status (Jackson et al., 2003). As a consequence, artists have to insure their health themselves. According to findings of Jeffri (1997a, 1997b) and Jackson et al. (2003), more than half of U.S. artists pay for their own health insurance, compared to approximately 8% of U.S. workers. Considering the assumption that they expose themselves to working conditions that are
hazardous, unsafe, or unhealthy, e.g. by using unhealthy chemicals or other materials, artists may face relatively high financial burdens. In addition, this employment pattern and low income over long periods of an artist’s career could also be a considerable problem of looming old-age poverty (Haak, 2008a, 2008b; BBK, 2011a, 2011b). The pressure to cover financial obligations may jeopardise artists' position and chances of making a living in the arts in the long run.

To sum up at this point, the literature findings clearly show emerging fine artists’ economically challenging professional situation. Their average level of income is relatively low, while their financial burden is relatively high. Their average income reveals a life at the edge of poverty, particularly for emerging fine artists excluded from the art market and for relatively less established fine artists who, for example, suffer from professionally weak operating gallery partners. Similarly, the relative costs of life, for social protection and insurance as well as for studio rents and materials to make art have permanently increased as a result of a general increase of productivity and income in most industries (Abbing, 2002). Making art and a living seems to have become relatively more expensive for emerging artists and thus their professional survival much harder. Hence, it must be concluded that practising fine artists’ low income associated with their relatively high financial obligations are two further key reasons why they find it so difficult to make a living in the arts.

3.2.2.3 Social Factors
There is a large body of literature on the impact of arts on society. However, the available literature on the impact of society on artists’ professional development, career, and income is sparse. According to this perspective, the social factors in particular gauge determinants that may influence fine artists’ chances of making a living in the arts. Therefore, demographic data of art-buying people as well as the acceptance of art and artists in society, including the aspects of what art is for or why artists should make art and why art should be taught, are examined next.

3.2.2.3.1 Who is Buying Contemporary Art and Why?
According to ArtGallery.co.uk (2017), people in developed countries have seen a rise in their disposable income in recent years (see previous section 3.2.2.2) that then may lead
to a greater ability to buy art. In this context Nicholls (2016) and ArtGallery.co.uk (2017) perceive a tendency to buy originals rather than ‘mass-produced hanging-art’ such as editions or prints. Basically, art buyers’ motivations can be viewed on a spectrum from intrinsically buying art, to patronage of specific artists’ development, to aesthetic and artistic quality of a work, to an emotional reaction it creates, all the way to the utility an artwork has extrinsically (Nytch, 2013). In the latter context, some buy art purely for ‘hunting reasons’ with no specific interest in art, while others pursue social rewards and acceptance and some others buy art for investment purposes (e.g. Belk et al., 1988; Formanek, 2003; Hagtverdt and Patrick, 2008; Jurevičiene and Savičenko, 2011; Marshall and Forrest, 2011). Considering this, various gallery owners reveal the key characteristics of their audiences (Luhrssen and Friedman, 2015; Nicholls, 2016). They stress that

- **people are buying contemporary art over works by old masters:** the market of old masters is supposed to be relatively small and dwindling as many art buyers have moved away from the ‘veneration of the past’. It is further supposed that art buyers want to be associated with the ‘new and now’. Additionally, experts argue that a true appreciation for old masters’ works requires extensive knowledge around the arts and history of the era in which the work was created that has been less and less developed by people (Nicholls, 2016).

- **people buy contemporary art as an investment for their home:** it is additionally assumed that art buyers’ preference for contemporary art is driven by design and aesthetic issues particularly related to home interiors (Zwaans, 2015; Nicholls, 2016). Visual culture and contemporary art are said to be more engrained in daily life in its role of brightening up the everyday and making it more beautiful. Especially through media, people are supposed to be much more comfortable and confident viewing, discussing, enjoying, and interacting with contemporary art at home (Nicholls, 2016). Contemporary art as an investment for the home could therefore be considered as a sign of refined taste but also of good culture and social reputation (Zwaans, 2015).

- **people overcome their shyness to consume contemporary art through the Internet:** the Internet is playing an increasingly important role in buying art by first-time and
casual buyers of different income levels (Luhrssen and Friedman, 2015), ages, and across different regions in modern society (Artnet.news, 2014; Hiscox, 2013, 2015). See section 3.2.2.4.2 below for more details related to the online art market. However, when it comes to art collectors and investors the AXA Art’s International Collectors Survey (Artnet.news, 2014) among 1,000 collectors reveals an ongoing dominant male role with almost three quarters aged 40 to 69, while art collectors under the age of 29 made up only 3% of the collectors surveyed. Although these findings are only related to gallery art due to its higher transparency in conducted transactions, it can be assumed that art in general, meaning across different art market segments as described in Chapter 2 of this study, attracts more interest from people in modern society because it is more easily available through the Internet. Buying art no longer seems to be limited to society’s elite or specific demographic or urban population groups.

3.2.2.3.2 The Value of Artists in Modern Western Society

Although the works of fine artists inspire, celebrate, mourn, commemorate, and cause people to question aspects of contemporary life and the human condition and although people highly value art in their lives (Florida, 2002; Jackson et al., 2003), unknown, not yet established emerging artists’ societal contributions are usually not clearly articulated, typically under-recognised and their work therefore underpaid in modern Western society (as shown earlier in the previous section 3.2.2.2.1). Artists comparatively experience “per se” little attention in society, either individually or collectively (Jackson et al., 2003, p. 4; Andre et al., 1975; Jeffri, 1989, 1997a, 1997b; Sawers, 1993; Steering Group Report, 2014). Mainstream cultural institutions such as opera houses, theatres, and museums are viewed as overshadowing individual artists’ efforts and often neglecting their contributions and needs (Jackson et al., 2003). Research findings in this context show clear evidence that modern Western democratic society, in many instances, “does not value art-making as legitimate work worthy of compensation.” (Jackson et al., 2003, p. 9). On the contrary, Western society perceives making art as “frivolous or recreational.” (Jackson et al., 2003, p. 9; Sawers, 1993). These researchers additionally stress that the surveyed artists reported that people often seemed to have hardly any sense of what artists’ time or products were worth.
This social phenomenon of unknown artists’ socially low appreciation is impressively confirmed through an experiment initiated and documented by The Washington Post (Weingarten, 2007). Joshua Bell, one of the most famous and best violists in the world played six Bach masterpieces incognito for about 45 minutes in a subway station in Washington, D.C. During that time, since it was rush hour, it was calculated that thousands of people went through the station, most of them on their way to work. In the 45 minutes the musician played, only 6 people stopped and stayed for a while. About 20 people gave him money but continued to walk their normal pace. He collected all of 32 US dollars. When he finished playing and silence took over, no one noticed. No one applauded nor was there any recognition. Being not recognised was the hardest and most painful experience, Bell told later (Weingarten, 2007). Two days before playing in the subway, Joshua Bell sold out at theatre in Boston and the seats averaged 100 US dollars each.

Two major conclusions of this experimental outcome could be as follows: First, individual artists in their role as art producers are socially hardly recognised and known. Second, it is the type of presentation or environment that mainly affects consumer perceptions of high-quality art. Worded otherwise, high-quality art is obviously only noticed and appreciated in a specific setting or environment emphasising quality, such as the abovementioned mainstream cultural institutions. In the context of this study, the finding could mean that emerging fine artists’ quality will (only) be perceived in an appropriate setting, for example, at a quality exhibition or gallery presentation. People seem to need an official authority of quality explaining what high-quality is and is not. Consequently, it can also uncompromisingly be assumed that most people have difficulties in identifying high quality themselves.

This unfortunate situation for fine artists might be the result of their changing role in society over time, as illustrated in Appendix N in detail, and the fact that the image of the unproductive bohemian artist unethically using taxpayers’ money by receiving state subsidies still dominates public perception in modern Western society (Bain, 2005; Røyseng et al., 2007; Oakley, 2009; Balzarin and Calcagno, 2016).

Another example of artists’ invisibility in society’s attention is their relative absence from studies of the economic and social impact of the arts (Jackson et al., 2003).
Additionally, women artists’ relatively low value in society is highlighted by Nochlin (1988) and Hennekam and Bennett (2017). They show the very concerning evidence that women artists experience both lesser social value than their male colleagues (Nochlin, 1988, p. 176), expressed in lower income levels and lesser art-related awards due to the “institutional and intellectual weaknesses” of the industry and society as well as sexual harassment that is prevalent in the creative industries (Hennekam and Bennett, 2017). According to the Künstlersozialkasse (2016), the German social insurance for artists, women artists in Germany earn on average approximately 25% less than their male counterparts. Additionally, women artists are significantly less considered for art awards (Nochlin, 1988).

This issue is restricted not to the arts or the creative industries, but for many other sectors and industries that are heavily male-dominated. That is to say nothing of social acceptance since women artists’ quality is definitely not lower than that of their male colleagues (Nochlin, 1988). This disadvantage in professional advancement of women is definitely a social issue. The second issue, that of sexual harassment, highlights a sociocultural weakness of discriminating behaviour against women. Findings suggest that sexual harassment is prevalent, and many women consider it to be part of their occupational culture and career advancement (Hennekam and Bennett, 2017).

To sum up at this point, artists’ value in society has varied over time (see Appendix N for details). Their current status is assumed to be relatively low, possibly due to modern Western society’s key characteristic of being a meritocracy. A performance-oriented society does not socially recognise unproductive artists who seem unable to deal with life. This male- and effort-oriented social awareness would also fit to the even lower valuation of women artists’ quality. As findings show, women artists face specific discrimination and additionally challenging factors of making a living in the arts due to social tolerance and acceptance, which must urgently be abolished: discrimination of any kind is completely unacceptable and should be socially condemned, especially in developed and democratic societies.

To increase the value of individual artists in society, the following opportunities are recommended by Jackson et al. (2003) and Hennekam and Bennett (2017):
• educational work and public awareness campaigns,
• publishing artists’ societal contributions to society’s wellbeing,
• establishing events for the public to directly engage with artists,
• connecting artists to various public institutions, for example, with the help of artists’ residency programmes in corporations or hospitals,
• creating and establishing a new validation mechanism to ensure a full understanding of artists’ work, and
• valuing more art education in primary and secondary schools.

These recommendations stress the question of what art is for. This question is reviewed next.

3.2.2.3.3 What is Art For?
The significance of this simple-sounding question is complex and it is not to be swiftly answered. It has several dimensions and includes in the context of this study also the aspects of why art should be taught and why artists should make art.

According to Dissanayake (1988, 1995, preface), art is considered “a biologically evolved element in human nature” and has existed as long as humans have. From the evolutionary, ethological, and biological perspectives, art has served different functions. In most human societies, the arts are integral to many activities of life and not to be omitted. In early stages of human behaviour, art had survival functions and social value in a Darwinian sense, such as body ornamentations of warriors of indigenous people (Dissanayake, 1988). Nathan (2008) suggests that arts were created to communicate, understand emotions, and propose solutions to life’s challenges. In the modern notion of art, it has lost the survival function and serves more peoples’ pleasure and refreshment in visual beauty (Dissanayake, 1988). In a modern notion, art is still considered “as a basic human need”, as “the means by which life reflects on, transforms and indeed creates its values; human life without it would not properly be human at all.” (Gormley, 2010, foreword). Other scientists and artists take this value of being human to additionally recognise numerous socially related reasons of art and of making art. Making art is socially considered valuable to/for

• develop and express individualism (Wilde, 1915; Davis, 2016).
gaining social recognition and acceptance by peers (e.g. Dissanayake, 1988; Grant and Berry, 2011).

- creative self-reflection and expression (e.g. Dissanayake, 1988; Walling, 1997; Heath et al., 1998; Davis, 2008; ACE, 2014; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; Davis, 2016; Rice, 2016). Art is seen as a form of ‘language’ to express emotions, feelings, and messages (Grant and Writer, 2012).

- enhance creativity, innovative strength, employability skills, and nations’ economic power (e.g. Eisner, 1992; Christopherson, 1997; Ontario Arts Council, 1997; Walling, 1997; Heath et al., 1998; Fiske, 1999; Abbing, 2002; Guetzkow, 2002; Psilos, 2002; Corner, 2005; Temmerman, 2005; Sullivan, 2006; Kratochvil, 2007; Sussman, 2007; Deasy, 2008; NESTA, 2008; Oakley and Sperry, 2008; Bamford, 2009; Smith, 2009; Ewing, 2010; Hickman, 2010a; Bamford and Wimmer, 2012; ACE, 2014; Warwick Commission, 2015; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; Davis, 2016; NAEA, 2016).

- develop social skills, empathy, and emotional intelligence (e.g. Dissanayake, 1988; Christopherson, 1997; Walling, 1997; Iwai, 2003, Morris et al., 2005; Winner et al., 2013; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; Davis, 2016). Findings show that the use of visual arts “increase[s] students’ awareness and recognition of emotion - two key components of emotional intelligence” (Morris et al., 2005, p. 888).

- develop aesthetic and visual skills as well as “cultural capital” to contribute to a cultivated society (e.g. Dissanayake, 1988; Sawers, 1993; Ontario Arts Council, 1997; Walling, 1997; Psilos, 2002; Iwai, 2003; Frey, 2005; Temmerman, 2005; Belfiore and Bennett, 2007; Sussman, 2007; Bamford, 2009; Smith, 2009; Zimdars et al., 2009; Hickman, 2010a; Phillips, 2010; Lingo and Tepper, 2013; Clarke and Hulbert, 2016; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; Davis, 2016).

- understand cultural differences (e.g. Walling, 1997; Hickman, 2010a; Bamford and Wimmer, 2012; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016).

- develop imagination, cognitive skills, and human consciousness (e.g. Walling, 1997; Hickman, 1999, 2010a; Iwai, 2003; Corner, 2005; Kratochvil, 2007; Sussman, 2007; Bamford, 2009; Smith, 2009; Bamford and Wimmer, 2012; ACE, 2014; Gangi, 2014; Warwick Commission, 2015; Davis, 2016; Rice, 2016). Findings in this context reveal that students who participate in arts programs were
more likely to participate in school leadership, have better attendance, better academic achievement, and were more likely to attend art events.  

- improve individuals' health, wellbeing, and regeneration (e.g. Jermyn, 2001; Evans and Shaw, 2004; Sussman, 2007; Michalos and Kahlke, 2008; Castora-Binkley et al., 2010; NCCAH, 2012; ACE, 2014; Warwick Commission, 2015; Cann, 2016; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016).

- investments in assets (e.g. Renneboog, 2002; Worthington and Higgs, 2003; Mandel, 2009; Artinfo, 2010; Newman and Bloom, 2014).

All these various roles and impacts of art highlight its potential for individual development that in turn is assumed to also have positive impacts on society as a whole. Assumingly, people become more aware in looking at things in different ways, of recognising multiple perspectives, and in learning respect for others people’s views (Davis, 2008). An education in art is said to promote desirable outcomes in the following but not exclusive areas (Winner and Hetland, 2000; Harvey and Blackwell, 1999; Hickman, 1999, 2010a; ACE, 2014; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016):

1. **Social Utility**: This area refers to aspects of art education that may contribute to an individual’s role within society. It includes the promotion of creativity and an individual’s development of skills that have a clear vocational impact.

2. **Personal Growth**: This area refers to individual development, including self-expression, individualism, imagination as well as the therapeutic and healthy aspects of involvement with art.

3. **Visual Literacy**: This area is concerned with developing skills and promoting knowledge, including the understanding of visual forms, of one’s cultural heritage, and of the cultural heritage of others as well as developing aesthetic perception.

Considering these areas, it becomes clear why artists should make art: it is a basic human need in one’s individualism, self-esteem, self-reflection, and self-expression, while it also facilitates the development of personal identity, wellbeing, and different valuable skill sets that can promote creativity and innovation. This in turn may help ensure that human society remains dynamic, critical, open-minded to new forms and ideas, and economic competitive globally. The obstacles in higher art education are
addressed in Appendix O in detail. What careers and activities fine arts courses can lead to is reviewed in the upcoming section.

3.2.2.3.4 Art Graduates’ Destinations and Labour Market

Findings from the Higher Education Statistics Agency’s Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education surveys (DLHE) of 2,500 participating fine art graduates in 2014/15 (survey response rate of 76%) show that females are over-represented in the subject of arts by almost two thirds of respondents. The statistics additionally illustrate that 73% of fine art graduates were in employment within six months of graduation. According to the Higher Education Careers Services Unit (HECSU, 2016, p.34), the most common types of work for those in employment were as follows: working in arts, design and media professionals (28%); retail, catering, waiting, and bar staff (25%); clerical and secretarial occupations (7%); and health and education occupations (7%). Another destination after graduation was further academic studies. Six months after graduation almost 18% were carrying out further studies either full-time (12%) or part-time while working (5.5%). Teaching was a considered popular career choice, with one fifth (21%) of those pursuing further studies undertaking a qualification in education (HECSU, 2016), while 62% were studying for a master in fine arts, photography, or curatorial studies. The proportion of participating fine art graduates unemployed was 6.5%. Additional 7% did not provide detailed information about their occupational status (HECSU, 2016). These destinations did not change considerably as earlier publications reveal (Aston, 1999).

These statistics impressively show at least two key characteristics in studying fine arts: firstly, fine art graduates are educated to work in different fields, in various working environments, ranging from being artistic to being clerical, secretarial or as bar staff. Considering the primary aim of higher education institutions to ensure graduates’ employability, it can be clearly said that this aim is institutionally relatively well achieved but not individually in artists’ interests and professional expectations. This is the second discovery. These statistics indicate a very poor status of quality in higher education in fine arts. Remembering the intrinsic key motivations of artists in making art for art’s sake, for individualism, artistic autonomy, and self-expression (see section 3.1.2), the destinations demonstrate a huge dilemma in higher education and artists’ professional preparation.
Almost one third of the participating fine art graduates confirmed unemployment and work as bar and temporary staff. These types of work have absolutely nothing to do with studying fine arts. Also, these jobs do not finance the financial obligations resulting from studying fine arts at a university. Working as bar staff should be possible without investing almost 30,000 British pounds or three years of one’s life in studying. For those graduates who work, say, for advertising agencies where their fine art skills are recognised as highly valuable, studying fine art was an appropriate professional preparation because they are able to apply their developed skills and also to develop further professional skills.

Further findings show that working artists reduce their income risk by multiple job holdings, normally preferring arts-related jobs in which they are close to their original passion of making art, such as teaching (Abbing, 2002; Towse, 2006; Ball et al., 2010; Roberta et al., 2010). In this context, Oakley et al. (2008) present evidence based on a survey of over 500 fine art graduates from the University of the Arts London conducted since the 1950s. The data indicates that almost 40% hold a second job, of which 60% are outside arts-related industries. Artists who work inside the art industry mainly work as art teachers (Jackson et al., 2003; Ball et al., 2010). According to findings by Saraniero (2007), more than two thirds enjoy teaching their art form, while 26% teach arts to finance their lives. These figures have recently been confirmed by Higgs et al. (2008). By the same token, according to Skillset (2009) and Carey (2015), it is important to highlight that labour market situations among various art disciplines significantly differ. For example, almost 80% of the people working in the publishing sector are salary or wage-based employed, and only 17% self-employed.

3.2.2.3.5 Conclusion

Modern Western society is built on the concept of productivity and consumerism. Emerging fine artists’ social acceptance and role is therefore assumed to be low since the bohemian lifestyle of artists, including the expectation of emotionally unbalanced and socially controversial behaviour (see section 3.1.4), still dominates public perception. This in turn leads to the assumption that emerging fine artists’ professional career and income is negatively influenced by this perception as long as they are not able to show evidence of quality and social contribution. Emerging fine artists’ socially low value ends up in low market prices for their works, which is one reason identified as crucial to their
professional failure. Owing to their individually low recognition in society, they are only collectively present as an anonymous class of more or less unproductive professionals, although their works seem to be recognised as valuable for society’s entertainment, though with no essential role for managing people’s daily lives.

To increase artists’ social value and finally their chances of an income to ensure their professional survival, society needs to recognise their contributions to wellbeing, cultivation, and innovative strengths. Art education should remain an essential part of people’s development, and art buyers should recognise artists’ motivations for making art. Thus, consumption values need to be reevaluated to be more aware of fair prices to ensure financial support of artists’ professions (Leavell, 2016).

The social dilemma of fairly accepting artists’ value to modern Western society might result from its key characteristics of being performance-oriented. Meritocracies might perceive particularly bohemian artists as being frivolous and dominant representatives of art professionals showing attitudes of lazy work ethics, living without obligations, and living off taxpayers’ subsidies with no real value to society. If this is the case, it is therefore easy to assume that hard-working people in Western societies would spend money on arts more rapidly and in larger amounts if arts became more recognised and professionally produced, if artists worked much harder in society’s perception, and if artists’ desire for success and business thinking became more present. The feeling that someone works hard for success is rather acceptable and recognised in society and art buyers’ view than lazy working for art’s sake. This seems to be the main difference between the business-related and art-related worlds in the arts. More specifically, perceived hard-working business artists may have higher chances to succeed in a business- and performance-oriented society.

3.2.2.4 Technological Factors
The following factors pertain to innovations in technology that may affect, either favourably or unfavourably, the working environment and income chances of fine artists and the contemporary art market with its different segments.

Throughout the ages, art and technology have been closely linked. For example, the pyramid temples of Mayan culture were constructed not only on precise plans for function but also with great focus on aesthetics and forms as evident in the pyramids’ sculptural
decorations. In the context of this study the term technology encompasses primarily digital technologies “that allow information and processes to be created and stored in digital form, with the possibility of distribution over electronic networks” (Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011, p. 9), as these have by far the greatest impact on both the arts and society. Examples of well-known digital technologies and networks are the Internet, mobile applications (apps), blogs (Twitter etc.), sharing sites (YouTube etc.), podcasts, wikis (Wikipedia etc.), and social networks (Facebook etc.).

In this context, digital technologies have an impact on the fine arts and fine artists’ income from at least three different perspectives: accessibility, production and distribution, and security (Gamboa, n.d.; Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011).

3.2.2.4.1 Art Accessibility

To date, art is easily accessible to the public due to the Internet and technological progress, especially to those who do not have sufficient time and/or resources to physically consume art in galleries or museums. Examples of successful business approaches that help to make art more accessible to the public are websites and mobile applications the likes of Google Art Project, Amazon Art, and Artsy.com (Gamboa, n.d.). Besides well-established online businesses and new ventures, traditional museums increasingly hold online exhibitions, create virtual tours, and market their events and collections to Internet audiences (Gamboa, n.d.; Simon, 2010). Galleries as well as auction houses use the Internet and mobile applications for advertising their events as well as their artists and collections online, but also to distribute and sell artworks online (Trully, 2013; Deloitte and ArtTactic, 2014). Galleries also discover new artists and preview artists’ collections online (Gamboa, n.d.; Resch, 2011). Art consumers, collectors and investors are easily able to discover new artists present on the Internet and keep up to date on the latest developments of their favourites (Hiscox, 2013, 2015). Technology improves artists’ accessibility; they no longer depend on gatekeepers’ willingness to present them publicly. Interesting in this context is, however, Gamboa’s finding that technological progress is claimed not to negatively affect traditional access to art (Gamboa, n.d.). Gallery and museum attendance appear unaffected. On the contrary, it is reported that most galleries and museums have experienced a rise in attendance numbers (Katz, 2013).
3.2.2.4.2 Art Production and Distribution: The Online Art Market

Additionally, digital technology has enabled new art disciplines such as video art, three-dimensional sculpture or photography (Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011). With regard to fine artists using digital technology for (re)producing work, recent figures show evidence that over half of surveyed artists already use the Internet, social media tools, and digital devices as means to produce them (Keaney, 2009; National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), 2010).

Furthermore, technology has made art vendors more accessible and the distribution and sales process more streamlined and transparent (Gamboa, n.d). New digital marketplaces, social media and transaction services are expected to help add liquidity to the art market as well as to broaden the scope and depth of available art market data, all of which in turn helps to increase the market’s overall transparency, facilitate more accurate art valuations, reduce transactions costs, and finally increase sales transactions (e.g. DiMaggio et al., 2001; Keaney, 2009; Lombardi, 2009; Synovate, 2009; Bakhshi and Throsby, 2010; National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), 2010; Australia Council for the Arts, 2011a, 2011b; Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011; Thomson, 2013; Thomson et al., 2013; Velthuis, 2012; Trully, 2013; Deloitte and ArtTactic, 2014). Online distribution enables artists to by-pass traditional gatekeepers such as commercial galleries by placing work online directly (Bowcock, 2012; Velthuis, 2012; Bauer and Strauss, 2016) and by building brand awareness to increase sales and income in a relatively cost-effective and resource-saving manner compared to traditional means of promotion. Additionally, audiences have fragmented and become more diffuse, a collection of niche markets, since social networks encourage people with similar interests to link up and follow each other (Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011). Social media is therefore regarded as a set of powerful tools for artists to reach specific audiences interested in what the artists make (Bailey, 2008; Hanna et al., 2011; Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011). Consequently, fine artists should be expected to find it easier by using social media tools to reach the public and their audience directly.

However, the online reality could be much harder for emerging fine artists. Traditional market segments and their barriers, according to Thurnhofer (2014) and as illustrated in Chapter 2, section 2.2.2.2, disappear more rapidly in the online market because every fine artist, whether top or amateur, can equally be present and visible on the market for
audiences. The online market is an open market without any barriers of entry. According to Bauer and Strauss (2016), the massive appearance of new emerging and amateur artists on the Internet leads to a significant devaluation of the present quality level. This consequently provides both opportunities as well as threats for emerging artists. On the one hand, they have the chance to become visible, yet on the other hand they compete in an open market with top artists, established gallery artists, and also with amateur artists for art lovers’ attention. The intensity of competition is stronger on the online market. Brand building to increase the consumption value seems to be absolutely necessary to stand out in such competition.

The value of the global online art market was estimated at three billion US dollars in 2014 with strong growth rates expected in the upcoming years (Hiscox, 2015). Compared to the overall sales volume of 64 billion US dollars in the same year, published by the TEFAF Art Market Report (Artnet.news, 2016a) and confirmed by Deloitte and ArtTactic (2016), the online art market is still relatively small but growing fast. In this context, IBISWorld (2015) publish online sales statistics showing evidence that online art sales in the U.S. have grown annually by 6% on average between 2010 and 2015 and is expected to continue to grow at an annualised rate of almost 10% up to 2020 as the market for online art sales benefits from an affluent and global customer base and consumers increasingly using the Internet to bid on art auctions. It should be recalled that these figures only cover the transaction volumes of the gallery and auction segments of the art market, according to Thurnhofer (2014) (see Chapter 2 for detailed information). The market segments excluded from the gallery market, namely the segments for emerging artists and artists of all kinds, are beyond consideration due to their lack of organisation and transparency.

According to the art insurance company Hiscox (2013, 2015), almost two thirds (64%) of art collectors and occasional art buyers surveyed confirmed that they have bought artworks online without seeing the works beforehand in reality. They have shown strong preference for unique artworks and confidence for higher price segments (Hiscox, 2013). The same surveys reveal that more than a quarter of established and reputable collectors had already spent more than 60,000 British pounds (approximately 75,000 Euros) online (Hiscox, 2013, 2015). The online buyers span both genders and all ages. In particular, more than half of the art buyers aged 65 and older have already bought artworks online.
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(Hiscox, 2013). The Hiscox study provides some further findings in this context that shall be interesting for galleries: almost three fourths of the surveyed galleries confirm that first-time buyers often purchase art online. According to the survey findings by Hiscox (2015), online art-buying consumers said that the primary advantage was the ability to easily search for art (80% of the respondents), the discovery of new art and artists since the Internet has broken down geographical barriers (71%), and the convenience of buying and bidding on art online (67%). The latter advantage was particularly attractive to younger buyers, aged 35 and below (Hiscox, 2015).

These findings reveal great potential for galleries to acquire new and younger customers online as well as for independent emerging artists because online art buyers cover all age classes and exhibit confidence in buying art of small to higher price segments. Consequently, the technological progress of the arts could represent a threat especially for those market intermediaries who fail to capitalise on this digital trend (Codignola, 2003; Velthuis, 2012; IFSE, 2013). According to the Institut für Strategieentwicklung (Institute for Strategy Development, IFSE, 2013), commercial galleries in Germany are only generating 6% of their annual revenues online. Although most galleries have created their own online presence, they use their websites for information purposes only rather than sales activities (IFSE, 2013). In this context, Velthuis (2012) as well as Deloitte and ArtTactic (2014) expect a shift of market power from intermediaries like galleries and public museums to private art collectors and online start-ups in the auction segment, because galleries’ (potential) customers, namely collectors as well as occasional art buyers, are increasingly looking for and indeed buying artworks online (Hiscox, 2013). In particular, the auction segment with its high price levels for the works of established artists (see Chapter 2, art market segments by Thurnhofer) has attracted the most attention for business models of online start-ups in the arts. Hiscox assumes in this context that traditional offline German galleries are not well prepared for online operations and the increasing competition with fast growing international start-up online galleries, auction houses, and art news providers. That will have considerable impacts on galleries’ exclusive positioning and their scope of action.

There are also some concerns and threats mentioned by artists. They named a number of concerns relating to the use of digital media, including the fear that digital arts content could “replace the ‘live’ experience”, that “experiencing art digitally is anti-social”,
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“practical concerns about technological limitations”, or difficulties in gauging the legitimacy of online content (Synovate, 2009, p. 9; Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011; Thomson, 2013).

3.2.2.4.3 Art Security
Within the scope of this study, the aspect of security refers to the protection of artists’ intellectual property rights using technology. More specifically, while technology enables, for example, the easy and cost-effective reproduction and distribution of artworks in the form of prints – often used for created editions of business artists / arts entrepreneurs (see section 3.1.3), the easy reproduction is technically also easily possible for everybody. An unauthorized reproduction of published artworks is not only a criminal infringement of artists’ intellectual property rights (copyright), but also a threat of substitutes (see section 3.2.1.1) directly affecting artists’ income. The copying of images and publicly presented artworks, either on the Internet or physically at exhibitions or in galleries, can hardly be controlled. Anyone with access to the Internet or to a digital camera is easily able to reproduce artistic works protected by copyright law. Artists’ protection of rights against infringement has become more challenging for the legislator due to technological progress (Poole and Le-Phat Ho, 2011). More detailed information about artists’ copyright is provided shortly.

3.2.2.4.4 Conclusion
The economic impact technological progression is having on the arts and fine artists’ chances of professional success and income is perceived as medium because both positive and negative effects are expected. While technological progress is making the arts more accessible to the public and is offering various opportunities to artists to produce and distribute their works directly to their audience, it similarly increases the challenge of an easier copyright infringement as well as the economic pressure particularly on those artists who lack market access as well as the technical and legal skills required to be successful on the digital art market. Due to technological progress, emerging artists who are not represented by successful galleries and mainly required to self-manage their professional career are perceived as having to invest more time and resources on further developing their technical and legal skills, as many of them are
assumed not to be sufficiently educated about copyright laws and promoting themselves and their works in the digital world. These artists need to keep up with the newest technological developments and trends to be further present for the public and to recognise and deploy opportunities for their own professional success and income. Otherwise, they are expected to be rapidly excluded from the opportunity to attract public awareness as art is appreciated more and more online. In light of this, it should be welcomed that some higher education institutions have started offering Visual Arts & Technology bachelor's degrees (e.g. Carnegie Mellon University, College of Fine Arts, 2017; Stevens Institute of Technology, 2017). Even governments are increasingly responsible for ensuring that the regulatory framework remains fit to facilitate artistic creation, cultural diversity, and business activities of artists that legally protect their economic rewards.

3.2.2.5 Legal Factors
For the purposes of this study, these factors concentrate on the economic role of artists' intellectual property rights (IPR) that have an impact on their income. Per definition, an intellectual property right

“is a blanket term that refers to the ways in which original creations and the rights of their creators are protected. Some IPR are automatic, while some have to be registered. The basic idea behind IPR is the same however, to ensure that a creation is not copied or used without permission and to protect the economic rewards of the creators.”

(University of Huddersfield, 2017).

There are four different types of IPR: patents, trademarks, designs, and copyright. This study focuses specifically on copyright since it is assumed to have the greatest influence on fine artists' income (Hebb and Sheffer, 2006; Towse, 2006). Copyrights are automatic the moment someone has created, performed, broadcast, or recorded a work according to the legal definition (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie, 2009).

A further legal regulation affecting individual operating artists' working and business environment and income is the labour and employment law for artists (see section 3.2.2.5.2). This law specifies artists' working relationships that can be crucial to defining the control rights of their work.
3.2.2.5.1 Copyright Law

Copyright is defined as a form of intellectual property which gives the creator of an original work exclusive rights for a certain time period in relation to that work, including its publication, distribution, and adaptation. After that time period, the work is said to enter the public domain. Copyright applies to any expressible form of an idea or information that is substantive and discrete (Towse, 2006).

Considering this, copyright is in cultural policy supposed to influence the supply of artistic work in a positive manner by increasing artists’ weak bargaining position in relation to art distributors and customers (Hebb and Sheffer, 2006; Towse, 2006). In this context, Hugenholtz (2000) stresses the importance of providing strong legal protection for independent creators’ rights of economic compensation and rewards because of a modern information society that is increasingly dominated by powerful media interests seeking to snap creators’ economic rights.

Compared to subsidies (see section 3.2.2.1.1 above), copyright law provides certain advantages to individual fine artists’ income and society’s costs:

- First, with the copyright, it is the art consumer who directly finances the incentive to create artwork and not the taxpayer (Towse, 2006).
- Second, the term of the copyright duration is up to 70 years after the author’s death (University of Huddersfield, 2017) and is thus considerably linked to artists’ works as it is an “inter-generational transfer before it is available in the public domain” (Towse, 2006, p. 570), while subsidies are closely linked to artists’ creative period.
- The third advantage is closely related to the aforementioned ones. Copyright is an ex post reward. While an artwork has automatic protection by copyright, however, it requires the individual artist to have satisfied specific quality criteria in order to obtain copyright-related income. Only artworks that have been ‘consumed’ will generate copyright fees, which is why copyright is an incentive for individual artists to produce works of high quality. In contrast, subsidies are ex ante rewards, providing no concrete incentives to produce sustainable quality over longer periods (Towse, 2006).
Particularly the third advantage strongly relies on the art market to make individual artists’ works available, thus leaving the choice of which works and which artists to promote in the hands of the gatekeeping market intermediaries with their primary interests of profit maximisation.

The copyright law for fine artists encompasses two variations, namely moral rights and artists’ resale rights (Towse, 2006; Crawford, 2010):

- **Moral rights** are rights of attribution, integrity, disclosure, and withdrawal concerned with protecting the personality of the fine artist. They are inalienable and unwaivable (Towse, 2006; Crawford, 2010; Arts Law Centre of Australia, 2016). These rights protect, for example, fine artists from distortion or other modification of a work that is prejudicial to their honour or reputation. Towse (2006) highlights that artists’ intrinsic motivation for creativity for art’s sake is best rewarded through moral rights. She argues that moral rights should therefore be considered an instrument of cultural policy that is expected to be more significant to fine artists than the extrinsic financial incentive of a subsidy (see section 3.2.2.1 above). Rushton (1998) argues that moral rights have a pecuniary incentive effect for artistic production since they encourage artistic brand building, recognition of status, and professionalism. Moral rights are also useful to increase artists’ bargaining power due to their significant hold-up power (Rushton, 1998, 2001; Hansmann and Santilli, 1997; Towse, 2006). It is relatively simple to identify fine artists as creators of their works, for instance, through their signatures or signs on the works.

- **Artists’ resale right** is also an inalienable and unwaivable right to receive a percentage of the revenues when an original work of art is publicly resold by galleries, art dealers, or auction houses (Hebb and Sheffer, 2006; Towse, 2006; Crawford, 2010; Symes Street and Millard, 2016). Private resales normally do not qualify under most national legislations nor do sales to museums (Symes Street and Millard, 2016). The artists cannot sign away this right to resale revenues to sustainably increase their bargaining power (Symes Street and Millard, 2016).

To earn a living, however, emerging fine artists who are not publicly known or represented by galleries or other art distributors and sellers are under relatively
high pressure to sell their works either directly to art buyers or to art dealers and galleries and collectors for prices far below of what they may be publicly paid later when they have built up market reputation and become better known. The resale right is supposed to allow artists to economically participate in the increase of value (Hebb and Sheffer, 2006). While the resale right has a positive economic incentive for artists to build up and maintain their market presence and reputation (brand) in order to increase the future value of their works, it is, however, economically believed that these resale rights have (unintended) adverse incentive effects for art distributors. The resale right is expected to demotivate galleries and art dealers to promote works of emerging, unestablished artists, due to increased costs. The lack of a work’s promotion in turn leads to reduced price levels and lower income for this group of artists (Perloff, 1998). Only already established and successful artists with a stable customer base are said to benefit from resale rights due to their strong ‘pulling effect’ as market brand. That would help them to publicly sell their works without any intermediaries in case galleries reduce their promotional activities. In other words, galleries and art dealers have to actively work for their successful artists if they want to benefit economically.

Supervised by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), the copyright law (including the aforementioned variations influencing fine artists in particular) has been translated into national law by most developed countries (Towse, 2006; WIPO, 2014), which is why fine artists’ intellectual property rights are protected to a broad geographical extent, at least in the major art markets in Europe and the U.S. The landscape of copyright protection in China, currently the third biggest art market worldwide (see Chapter 2, section 2.1 for details), is still relatively weak. Although China has introduced legislation covering every aspect of the protection of intellectual property (WIPO, 2014) and most Western lawyers find the resulting body of law comprehensive, systematic and familiar, there is a difference between having adequate laws and achieving their effective enforcement. The International Intellectual Property Organisation found evidence that copyright infringement in China was still one of the highest in the world in 2005 (Cox and Sepetys, 2006). It is expected and internationally desired that the Copyright Law in China change. In the third amendment to the Copyright Law in 2010, China shall now be able to authorise the copyright administration department the power of sequestration and the
power of seizure, and will raise the penalty for copyright infringement. China even has specialised intellectual property divisions within its courts, and the international art community may therefore expect China to create an increasingly more protective environment for all copyright owners.

From an economic perspective, however, copyright fees may also have a negative effect by raising the cost of creating new artistic works that finally influence the demand for artworks, in part by rising prices (Towse, 2006). Although moral rights can never be transferred, galleries and other art sellers frequently do require artists to waive their moral rights (Caves, 2000; Hebb and Sheffer, 2006), when incurring the risk of falling costs, for instance, through investments made in the marketing, promotion, and brand building of artists or through an advance to artists (often associated with licensing of copyright) that will not be refinanced by later returns from sales. For the sake of economic certainty, art distributors and sellers prefer cost-sharing arrangements, e.g. via traditional gallery contracts, forcing fine artists who want to distribute and sell their works through galleries or art dealers to share with them in the success or failure of the artwork and the associated risk (Caves, 2000; Towse, 2006). Fine artists are typically in a weak bargaining position, as shown earlier in sections 3.2.1.3 and 3.2.1.4. They barely have access to both market and capital and therefore often need to sign contracts with galleries to get their work publicly presented and sold in a relatively short time period to finance their process of making art.

Towse (1999) highlights in this context the different incentives of fine artists to produce high-quality work with regard to the various types and conditions of galleries and other art distribution and selling contracts regulating the sharing of risk and payment of transaction costs. According to Towse’s economic view, artists’ incentive to produce high-quality works mainly depends on whether their cost sharing payment is a lumpsum one-off payment or a royalty on sales (Towse, 1999). The former type of compensation is supposed to offer only little economic incentive to artists to improve quality. This is because the distributing contract partner (gallery) has only little incentive to achieve success in promoting and selling artists’ works on the market. With a flat-rate compensation, the gallery or other distributing partner bears a lower economic risk of falling costs (Towse, 1999), since a considerable part of the promoting and marketing costs is definitely covered through artists’ compensation payment. In contrast, the royalty
system is supposed to offer much higher incentives for both fine artists and their
distribution partners (Towse, 1999). A pure royalty contract, usually up to 50%, stimulates
fine artists to produce the best possible quality, while the distribution and selling partner
has the strong incentive to achieve as much success as possible to generate income.

Consequently, it can be briefly concluded that flat-rate payment contracts are
economically only a second-best solution for fine artists and their chances of earning a
proper income, while royalties on sales stimulate quality and effort to achieve success
resulting in higher chances of income for both parties. The royalty system transfers the
economic risk from the artists to the distribution partners. However, as long as emerging
fine artists suffer from a weak bargaining position in negotiating contracts, they are
assumed to share a considerable part of the transaction costs and finally to bear the
economic risk.

3.2.2.5.2 Labour and Employment Law

Labour law is required to answer the fundamental question of whether fine artists are
contractors or employees (Rasmussen, 1996). By having a clear legal classification, the
different labour legislative frameworks for fine artists and therefore the right to control
their work and also the copyright resulting from their work can be distinguished. It can
basically be stated that if a fine artist is classified as an employee, the employer has the
right to control the details of the employee’s work according to current law (Rasmussen,
1986). Conversely, freedom from such control of work and copyrights tends to establish
the relationship of independent fine artists in their legal role as contractors (Rasmussen,
1986).

Considering this, the Fredericton Arts Alliance (n.d.) provides specific characteristics
for a clear classification of both groups. According to this classification, a fine artist is
defined as an employee when the following determinants are applicable. It is important to
note in this context that one of the upcoming factors is not conclusive.

- The *where and when* of a fine artist’s work is controlled in a relatively high degree
  by another party, the ‘employer’. This includes the control, directly or indirectly,
  what work is to be done, how, when and where it is to be done. It does not matter
  if the employer exercises this control, only that they have the ability to do so.
• The fine artist must be economically dependent on the employer. This is normally associated with the employer alone bearing the economic risk of loss.

• The fine artist must not be an entrepreneur operating an art business, but must form part of the employer’s business. This means that the fine artist’s work is exclusively for the employer and the artist is performing an integral part of the employer’s business.

Conversely, fine artists can clearly be classified as independent contractors when they operate self-employed, meaning they have the control of how, where, when the work is done, when they pay their own expenses, may freely accept or reject work, and do not perform as an integral part of others' businesses (Fredericton Arts Alliance, n.d.).

This classification frees independent business fine artists, particularly those who are operating as arts entrepreneurs, from being classified as employees, but may include those business fine artists who primarily operate as contract artists, economically dependent on only one or a few clients (Arts Law Centre of Australia, 2016). See also section 3.1.3.4.1. Consequently, contract artists should be clear of their rights and legal obligations including the control rights of others over their work.

3.2.2.5.3 Conclusion

The literature findings lead to the assumption that legal factors show a medium level of impact on emerging fine artists’ professional career and income chances, due to the fact that copyright is automatically given, but its enforcement is hard to ensure.

From the economic perspective, artists need to develop legal skills to be entirely clear about their legal obligations and possibilities. However, it is worth noting that the assumption of stronger copyright equating to higher income for artists and higher quality in artistic outcome may be wrong. As long as individual fine artists, who are excluded from the top two art market segments of Olympus and Nations’ Top 100 (Thurnhofer, 2014; see Chapter 2, section 2.2.2.2), lack market access and bargaining power, copyright is a meagre incentive for gatekeeping market intermediaries such as commercial galleries and collectors to promote unknown, not yet established artists and their works. It can therefore be stated that, from an economic point of view, the stronger the copyright, the lower emerging fine artists’ chances are to find art distributors and
sellers and finally to make a living, unless they accept a cost-sharing arrangement or the transfer of their copyrights.

3.2.2.6 Ecological Factors

These factors focus on ecological issues that may have an impact, directly or indirectly, on fine artists' professional success and economic income.

It has become apparent that progressing global warming and climate change is currently the major ecological danger to humanity (Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), 2009). Mankind therefore needs to broaden its understanding of ecological or environmental sustainability as the arts need to understand its particular responsibilities to address these issues (ASEF, 2009; International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), 2014). Some higher education institutions have started to encourage art students to investigate, question, and expand upon inter-relationships between cultural and natural systems (University of New Mexico, 2016). Fine artists have always inquired into human and natural environment. While some fine artists find inspiration in their surroundings, some ecologically interested people and artists apply the arts to convey their messages with impact and with the aim of reaching larger audiences (Brown, 2006; Carruthers, 2006; Chandler et al., 2013). Fine artists possess the communication and innovative thinking skills required for the dissemination of ecological information in imaginative ways (Chandler et al., 2013). Additionally, fine artists' capacity to arouse emotional responses and advance ecological discourse can stimulate behavioural changes that support sustainable living. Through such participatory and dialogical practices, fine artists can produce works that attract public attention and connect people with what they ecologically value (Fowkes and Fowkes, 2005; Chandler et al. 2013; Chameides, 2014; Gardiner, 2015).

Considering this study's aim and fine artists' economic rewards, participating in and fostering the ecological discourse may be an opportunity for fine artists to create an art concept that attracts public attention, to engage with a large audience, to produce artwork with a relatively high consumption value for ecologically interested art consumers, and finally to earn a living. Art federations such as the Arts Council England are permanently looking to support artists with creative and practical responses to ecological concerns (Fowkes and Fowkes, 2005; Hartley, 2009), for example, by
presenting their works in special exhibitions, promotional activities, or by financing ecological art projects.

However, besides the opportunity to cover a specific ecological niche for increased public attention, ecological factors may have a relatively low impact on emerging fine artists’ chances of making a living.

### 3.2.2.7 Conclusion on Fine Artists’ Macro Environment

The PESTLE analysis is a useful technique for reviewing the literature on the external forces that have an impact on the contemporary art market and thus on business fine artists’ individual chances of making a living in this environment. Based on the literature findings, it can accurately be assumed that political, economic, and social factors play a key role in shaping emerging fine artists’ professional careers. They in particular are expected to suffer from their macro environment the most, while fine artists operating in gallery market segments are assumed to be less influenced in their operations and earnings, as summarised in the following Table 3.2-4.

**Table 3.2-4: Summary of Literature Findings on Fine Artists’ Macro Environmental Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Fine Artists (excluded from gallery market)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Fine Artists (gallery market)</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium - high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Fine Artists (Top 100, Olympus)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low - medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low - medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author’s own illustration*

Since macro environmental factors are beyond their control, emerging fine artists excluded from the market and usually operating alone without any support of powerful network partners have to find the best possible ways to manage their professional careers and increase their individual income chances. In contrast, established and successful top artists can employ the resources of network partners to their benefits, which makes it much easier for them to meet the macro environmental challenges.
successfully. This implicitly means that emerging business fine artists are recommended to prepare themselves properly. By understanding these factors in the external environment, they are empowered to shape their activities and professional careers appropriately. They need to know how the macro environmental forces affect the arts marketplace and thus their working and business environment. Higher education institutions should equip their students with knowledge of the economic landscape of the fine arts and their realistic career opportunities. Development of an entrepreneurial mindset and skills should help to provide them with vital information required to realise opportunities and take control of their careers.

3.2.3 Conclusion on Literature Review

This study’s aim is to answer the question of why practising fine artists find it so difficult to make a living in the arts and what they can actively do to improve this challenging professional situation. To achieve this aim it was appropriate to identify the different influencing factors for a literature review that may have an impact on fine artists’ professional success and economic income. Basically, internal as well as external influencing factors are distinguished in this context. The internal factors are exclusively related to fine artists’ typical personality patterns, their motivations to make art and a living in the arts as well as their developed skills and professional preparation. The external factors were identified and classified by applying two widely acknowledged business strategy analyses.

Porter’s industry analysis model reveals the five most significant forces influencing an industry’s profitability or income. These external micro environmental factors help to identify the specific characteristics of the contemporary art market, required to evaluate fine artists’ direct working and business environment. By reviewing the dominating forces in industry, the key findings in the literature show evidence that emerging fine artists are by far the weakest part in that industry. They face uphill challenges comprising a low bargaining power vis-à-vis art consumers and suppliers as well as high threats of substitute products and new artists entering the market and intensively competing for market attention. These factors finally lead to low market prices and relatively high financial obligations to ensure the professional survival as an artist. Low income and relatively high costs are key factors for emerging business fine artists to earn a living.
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The review of macro environmental factors additionally highlights the high impact of political, economic, and social factors on emerging fine artists’ professional career. While governmental interventions such as subsidies or grants are assumed to be responsible for heating up the intense competition among artists excluded from the market (resulting in low market prices, as mentioned above), the overall quality in the market is similarly decreasing. Subsidies keep poor and average art quality and artists professionally alive at the expense of talented artists. This shows counterproductive effects on artists’ career and income opportunities in the arts and facilitates the art market’s structural poverty. In contrast, findings on arts incubation services lead to the assumption of some positive effects. These services are an opportunity to enable artists to actively take control of their careers and to face professional challenges successfully, as often demanded by scientists (for example, Bridgstock, 2007, 2009, 2011a, 2011b).

With respect to artists’ internal factors, the literature’s key findings implicitly offer a solution to their professional dilemma: while personality traits are hard to change, skills and attitude can be learned and developed in a targeted manner. Emerging fine artists are therefore recommended or even forced to develop the skills and mindset required to successfully meet the different external macro and micro environmental challenges if they want to make a living in the arts. Since they usually operate alone as one-person businesses without any support of external partners, emerging fine artists are primarily required to self-manage their careers. This requires the development of appropriate skills and an open-minded entrepreneurial attitude to understand the business environment and to deal with its impacts successfully. It is noteworthy that this does not automatically mean educating fine artists to business people. However, they should at least be able to know the different factors of their working and business environment and how these influence their professional career and income chances.

Considering the literature findings, including the key facts that the external factors are beyond artists’ control, personality traits are hard to change, and artistic talent is usually no guarantee for professional success in the arts, this study’s research focuses on emerging fine artists’ educational opportunities to self-manage their professional careers. This focus has high relevance because education and professional preparation seems to be the only factor emerging fine artists can actively and directly control as their individual success factor to make a living as practising artists.
Consequently, the following three research questions are finally derived from the literature findings and addressed in this study:

1) **What skills are crucial for practising fine artists to make a living in the arts?**
2) **Are and, if so, how and to what extent are fine art students educated on successfully making a living in the arts during their studies at HEIs?**
3) **Do arts incubators consider support services required by emerging fine artists in their programmes and are they able to scale up their services to professionally prepare large numbers of business fine artists to make a living in the arts?**

By answering these research questions, this study contributes to fine artists’ targeted training and professional preparation. The research findings have practical relevance for fine art students, practising fine artists, higher education institutions offering art degrees, and arts incubators providing educational and business support services for artists. While the study provides fine artists vital information on the most influencing factors for their careers, it additionally reveals fine artists’ professional needs and demands as well as the current status of fine artists’ professional preparation at higher education institutions and the various aspects to improve it. Increasing the quality of fine artists’ professional preparation is of particular practical relevance since they often have to bear large portions of the educational costs. These can often reach several tens of thousands of euros, British pounds, or US dollars for a bachelor’s degree in fine arts, although they are hard to pay off only by professional income for the vast majority of fine arts graduates, according to artists’ labour market statistics. The answers to these research questions also have practical relevance for arts incubators because new knowledge is expected to increase the quality of their infrastructure, educational trainings, and business support services. By answering the research questions, this study contributes therefore to the existent body of literature and knowledge in the fields of artists’ professional preparation, arts entrepreneurship education, and arts business incubation.
Chapter 4 Methodology

“What we call our data are really our own constructions of other people’s constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to.” (Geertz, 1973, p. 9)

4.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the research approach taken to address the three research areas and aims identified in the previous chapter. Section 4.1 outlines the philosophical underpinning. Section 4.2 gives an overview of research design and methodology. Section 4.3 outlines research methods selected in addressing the research aims. Section 4.4 states the processes of data collection and analysis. All this is followed by a conclusion section (section 4.5) which summarises the methodological approach.

4.1 Research Philosophy

This section describes the philosophical underpinning of how the research was undertaken in the context of this study. Essentially, research philosophy is a belief in the way in which data about a phenomenon should be gathered, analysed, and used (Walsham, 1995, 2006). When studying the aforementioned phenomenon of practising artists hardly being able to make a living, the best that can be done is to describe and explain it in its contextual setting and therefore from the subjective point of view of those involved, i.e. the fine artists, fine art lecturers, and commercial fine art gallerists.

The research at hand has an interpretivist research philosophy, led by economic thinking and interpretations of data and findings in particular on economic issues of being a practising business fine artist and fine arts entrepreneur. This is due to the fact the researcher has a professional focus on start-ups, business incubation and venturing as well as arts entrepreneurship. On account of this given economic perspective, this study provides ‘economic interpretations’ rather than social or artistic ones. They are, however, open to different forms of interpretation and meanings, depending on the different point of views and backgrounds. The one truth does not exist, the one that is equally valid for all other sciences and researchers.

It is the interpretative philosophy of research that contends that reality can only be fully understood when it is subjectively interpreted and intervened. In order to understand how
fine artists adopt and adapt to their micro and macro environment, to the use of educational programmes, and to arts incubation services, an interpretivist position is required. There are many interpretations of reality, however, and these interpretations are themselves a part of the scientific knowledge and contribute therefore to existent knowledge.

### 4.2 Research Design and Methodology

To achieve the dissertation’s aims, the individual perspectives, understandings, thoughts, expectations, and emotions are enquired from artists, lecturers in arts and experts in art-related fields with respect to market requirements and educational preparation. Consequently, an exploratory and inductive research approach with a survey strategy is taken (Figure 4.2-1). This approach is needed because there are hardly any empirical findings to explain, show, or identify

- the crucial skills for practising fine artists’ professional success to make a living;
- whether, how, and to what extent fine art graduates are equipped with the required skills to make a living as practising artists;
- business fine artists’ professional service needs; and
- whether arts incubators are capable of scaling up their service spectrum to educationally prepare large numbers of business fine artists for their professional career and economic success (income).

The study’s chosen research design is appropriate in the context of the research aims. It is exploratory and inductive in order to describe the picture of the social phenomenon of business fine artists’ professional and entrepreneurial situation that is being studied and to build abstract ideas, derived from experience based on detailed observations of the world (Neuman, 2003; Lodico et al., 2010). The cross-sectional approach is therefore particularly useful for putting fine artists’ key market barriers, challenges, educational situation, and professional opportunities for improving their economic situation into the spotlight of scientific awareness.
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Figure 4.2-1: Research Design

*Source: Adapted from Saunders et al. (2007, p. 132)*

By reviewing the literature in Chapter 3, three research aims with explicit focus on fine artists’ education and professional preparation to successfully deal with the challenging external micro and macro environment were identified (Figure 4.2-2).

**Figure 4.2-2: Research Aims**

*Source: Author’s own illustration*
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The following Figure 4.2-3 maps the research instruments used to investigate them.

![Figure 4.2-3: Research Methods](Source: Author’s own illustration)

Each of the research methods outlined in Figure 4.2-2 above is justified in the context of the research aims in the following sections.

The research design and employed methods have been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the London South Bank University under the registration number UREC 1227.

4.3 Rationale for Selecting the Research Methods

As illustrated in Figure 4.2-3 above, the literature review, comprising the analyses of micro and macro environmental factors and fine artists’ internal factors as well as the analysis of secondary data were at the heart of this study’s research activities conducted across the three derived research questions. The literature findings provided the necessary data and information. However, the data and findings are often related to sectors other than the fine arts since this specific discipline of fine arts has been neglected in research compared to other industries and art disciplines. The literature findings are used as the foundation for conducting qualitative research and applying
suitable methods with specific regard to the contextual situations in the fine arts. In doing this, literature findings can be validated as well as new aspects and gaps revealed and knowledge gained that contributes to the still scarce body of literature in the fields of fine artists’ professional preparation, arts entrepreneurship, and arts incubation.

4.3.1 Research Methods for Investigating Practising Fine Artists’ Crucial Skills for Professional Success in the Arts (Research Aim 1)

To achieve the first research aim of identifying practising fine artists’ crucial skills for professional success in the arts, the literature and secondary data were reviewed in a first step with focus on artists’ personality and internal factors as well as external business environmental factors fine artists have to successfully deal with to make a living in the arts, including the micro environmental industry forces according to Porter (see sections 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.5) and artists’ business macro environmental factors (see sections 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.6). In a second step, this review was combined with qualitative research methods including surveys by questionnaire of fine art lecturers, undergraduates, and commercial and contemporary fine art galleries.

Larger and anonymised surveys of lecturers, all of whom were practising artists (Appendix D), as well as of fine art undergraduates (Appendix F) were chosen in order to broaden and deepen the knowledge of educational aspects regarding fine artists’ actual status of vocational preparation for the market.

The market perspective of fine artists’ business environment and market requirements was provided by commercial and contemporary galleries (Appendix G) in their role as powerful ‘gatekeepers’ to the market and thus as unofficial market authority of art quality. Due to these functions, commercial galleries provide valuable insights into the market segment that is relevant for the study’s overall research aim.

The surveys by questionnaire were conducted in two countries for the purpose of identifying differences in business environments and success factors between the UK as a worldwide leading art market and Germany as a representative of considerably smaller art markets in Europe. The variance of research methods arose, on the one hand, as the result of different analytical levels and according to the, in part, strongly varying opportunities to gain access to the subject of investigation and, on the other hand, for the sake of evaluating and triangulating the findings from different angles.
The use of these qualitative research methods is appropriate to achieve the first aim of this research and suits the study's research philosophy. Anonymised surveys provide the main advantages compared to other survey methods of reducing probabilities of socially desirable answers combined with larger samples. These methods were expected to reveal artists' market barriers and success factors from the different perspectives of key market participants.

4.3.2 Research Methods for Investigating Fine Art Students' Educational Preparation for a Professional Career in the Arts (Research Aim 2)

A review of the literature and secondary data in the fields of entrepreneurial learning environments, effective teaching methods, and status quo of business and entrepreneurship education at HEIs in Europe and abroad was undertaken with the data available (see sections 3.1.5.2.3 and 3.1.5.2.4). The identification of effective learning environments and teaching methods as well as possible gaps in the educational processes at HEIs was helpful so as to identify concrete improvements in the professional preparation of fine artists either during their studies at HEIs or as a continuation in alternative education programmes, for example, arts incubation programmes.

In order to create a snapshot of fine art undergraduates' art business and arts entrepreneurship education, analyses of published documents of regular curricular in Fine Art degree programmes and those of single subjects, including module handbooks and programme specifications as well as information about institutions' missions, strategy plans, and annual reports turned out to be most suitable and yielding. The analysis was associated with information requests made to fine art lecturers, staff of career departments, leaders of extracurricular in-house trainings in entrepreneurship, and programme directors of university-based incubators and enterprise centres in order to gain further information about the availability and extent of entrepreneurial education opportunities for (fine) artists during their studies at HEIs. The data and findings were triangulated and complemented by the aforementioned surveys by questionnaire of fine art lecturers (Appendix D) and students (Appendix F). Lecturers were further asked for information relating to the course (regular curricula and training offerings) and institutional level (HEIs' orientation towards arts entrepreneurship) in order to obtain data from
teaching artists. Basically, lecturers who are simultaneously practising artists can be considered educational experts providing valuable insights into the educational situation, real working and business requirements, and the entrepreneurial positioning and orientation at their HEIs.

The survey by questionnaire of fine art students was closely linked to the survey of lecturers – the objective being to experience the personal views of fine art students as prospective practising fine artists in terms of their educational preparation and expectations. They were asked for information relating to the course level in order to gain direct data from the learners’ own perspectives.

As mentioned earlier, the surveys were conducted among lecturers and students in the UK and Germany for the purpose of identifying differences in fine art undergraduates’ tertiary education between both education systems. The surveys were also suitable methods to gain instant insights into fine art undergraduates’ professional preparation and HEIs’ strategic commitments to arts entrepreneurship education with a low probability of socially desirable answers. Methods to capture emotions of lecturers and students, for example, by using interviews techniques, were not necessary for achieving the second research aim.

4.3.3 Research Methods for Investigating Arts Incubation Business Models to Facilitate Professional and Entrepreneurial Careers of Business Fine Artists (Research Aim 3)

The aim of the literature review and analysis of secondary data in the context of the third research aim was to identify the relevant supportive services required by business fine artists and provided by arts incubators as well as their impact on business artists’ professional development and growth (see section 3.2.2.1.3). Secondary data required was mainly provided by self-presentations of successful operating incubation programmes.

Business models and programmes of existing arts incubators were analysed using published data on their websites with special focus on provided services, target clients, key stakeholders, and geographic concentration. To identify weaknesses or gaps in their service spectrum for emerging business fine artists’ specific needs, demands, and concerns on business, support services were identified by conducting structured
interviews with those practising, emerging business fine artists who were not represented by commercial galleries or other supportive networks (Appendix C). The emerging fine artists were randomly selected.

These research methods were particular suitable for gaining the data required, as capturing emotions of surveyed fine artists was valuable to this study.

4.4 Process of Analysis and Samples

The following sections describe the processes of collecting data including the surveyed samples in the context of achieving the three research aims with the help of research methods illustrated in Figure 4.2-3 above.

4.4.1 Structured Interviews with Emerging Business Fine Artists

In total, nine working and unestablished newcomer or emerging artists not represented by galleries or other supportive art networks (at the time of the interview) were randomly selected and interviewed (Appendix C), seven of whom were at the Berliner Liste 2015, a fair for contemporary art from 17 to 20 September 2015 in Berlin that enables artists not yet represented by galleries to show and sell their work to a cosmopolitan, art-savvy audience. The other two emerging fine artists were discovered within the researcher’s personal network contacts. Their interviews were conducted by telephone on the 21 and 22 September 2015. Six out of nine interviews were tape-recorded with the artists’ permission, while three interviews were conducted only by notes due to noisy and distracting interview environments at the Berliner Liste 2015 (this applies to one interview) and upon explicit request of the two interview partners who were interviewed by telephone (Table 4.4-1).

Table 4.4-1: Interview Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length (hrs:min:sec)</th>
<th>Type of recording</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 September 2015</td>
<td>00:17:12</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 September 2015</td>
<td>00:52:28</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 September 2015</td>
<td>00:40:12</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:23:43</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:22:21</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Swiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:20:00</td>
<td>hand-written notes</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:18:05</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 September 2015</td>
<td>00:20:00</td>
<td>hand-written notes</td>
<td>Studio Braunschweig</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22 September 2015</td>
<td>00:20:00</td>
<td>hand-written notes</td>
<td>Studio Nice</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own illustration
Each structured interview lasted between 20 and 50 minutes, depending how much time and input was given for the individual questions.

The transcription was personally undertaken by the researcher. It focused primarily on content rather than on the style of speaking due to the chosen inductive and qualitative research approach of this dissertation that aims to reveal, discuss, and interpret the individual views, needs, concerns, opinions, expectations, and motivations of interviewees who are considered experts in their individual situation. Following Kuckartz et al. (2008), a literal transcription clearing up dialects, syntax errors, hesitation vowels or sounds, and long excesses completely unrelated to the interview questions was applied. This type of transcription was an adequate mixture of commenting and readability and therefore ideally suited for this research approach.

Due to the similarity of given answers to the structured questions from all interviewees, the principle of 'empirical or scientific saturation' was already applicable after the first four interviews; however, some more interviews were conducted for the sake of being robust. Further interviews with this target group would probably not have provided new information for the relevant research aim.

4.4.2 Survey by Questionnaire of Commercial and Contemporary Galleries

The process of identification of commercial and contemporary fine art galleries was conducted from 15 to 30 April 2015. A key word search on the Internet with the terms “fine art gallery” associated with the country names “UK” and “Germany” revealed various sources for identifying commercial galleries, as illustrated in Table 4.4-2. Commercial galleries of both countries were chosen exemplarily to identify differences in perspectives of market requirements between the two European markets which significantly differ in sizes (number of transactions) and international reputation.
Table 4.4-2: Sources for Identification of Commercial and Contemporary Fine Art Galleries; UK and Germany.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Museums &amp; Galleries; <a href="http://www.london-galleries.co.uk">www.london-galleries.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Bundesverband Deutscher Galerien und Kunsthändler e.V.: <a href="http://www.bvdg.de/galerien">www.bvdg.de/galerien</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in London: <a href="http://www.allinlondon.co.uk">www.allinlondon.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own illustration

The access to galleries’ names and contact details was provided by their websites and gallery associations. Overall, 634 commercial and contemporary fine art galleries were identified, of which 214 galleries were in the UK and 420 in Germany. However, due to inaccurate contact information, absences (business travels), and closures of businesses, the relevant sample size of potential and invited galleries decreased to a total of 590 galleries, of which 197 galleries were located in the UK (N_{GAL.UK}=197) and 393 in Germany (N_{GAL.GER}=393), as illustrated in Figure 4.4-1 below.

The sample of galleries was addressed and invited to take part in the survey via e-mail. The participant information sheet and the link to the online survey were attached to the invitation e-mail. The questionnaire was completed online from 5 to 29 May 2015 (see Appendix G). The answers are saved directly and anonymously in a database of Netigate.de. The data and given answers will be destroyed five years after the successful completion of the studies according to data protection agreements.

In total, 149 galleries took part in the survey, 44 in the UK and 105 in Germany. However, not all of them fully completed it despite three e-mail reminders. For this reason, the survey shows various response rates, ranging from a minimum of 20.30% ($n_{GAL.UKmin}=40$) to a maximum of 22.34% ($n_{GAL.UKmax}=44$) in the UK survey and from 19.59% ($n_{GAL.GERmin}=77$) to 26.72% ($n_{GAL.GERmax}=105$) in the German survey, respectively, as shown in Figure 4.4-1.
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4.4.3 Identification of Fine Art Degree Programmes at Higher Education Institutions for the Purpose of Analysing Fine Art Students’ Professional Preparation and Entrepreneurship Education

To analyse fine art students’ professional preparation, as defined as the second research aim of this study, the identification of relevant courses and degree programmes as well as of HEIs providing such courses and degree programmes at the university level in the UK and Germany was necessary first and foremost. As previously mentioned, both countries were exemplarily chosen for identifying differences in educational systems between these countries in terms of the entrepreneurship education of fine art students. This process of identification was mainly conducted by a key word search on the Internet. The terms used for identifying relevant courses and degree programmes were “Bachelor in Fine Art”, “Bachelor in Painting”, and “Bachelor in Photography”. Table 4.4-3 provides an overview of the relevant individual subjects and full-time degree programmes in the UK and Germany in the academic year 2013/14. If available, the corresponding JACS (Joint Academic Coding System) code is mentioned as well. The JACS code is used for a
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clear identification of UK degree programmes (Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), 2013). The German programmes fail to reveal such a code of identification.

Table 4.4-3: Overview of Examined Single Subject Full-Time Fine Art Degree Programmes at University Level; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>FHEQ Level</th>
<th>JACS Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Fine Art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W100, W101, W102, W150, W190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine and Applied Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Art and Design: Fine Art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Art Practice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Art Painting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W103, W101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Painting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Photography</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W640, W642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Photography for Digital Media</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>WP63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>FHEQ Level</th>
<th>JACS Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HND in Fine Art</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>W9809, 001W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND in Photography</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>W640, 001W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degree (FDA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA in Professional Photography</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA in Contemporary Arts Practice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own illustration

The next table (4.4-4) illustrates the sources that were used for the identification of relevant HEIs in both countries.
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Table 4.4-4: Sources for Identification of Relevant Higher Education Institutions Offering Fine Art Degree Programmes; UK and Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCAS; <a href="http://www.ucas.com">www.ucas.com</a></td>
<td>Bundesverband Bildender Künstlerinnen und Künstler e.V.; <a href="http://www.bbk-bundesverband.de">www.bbk-bundesverband.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISTATS; <a href="http://www.unistats.direct.gov.uk">www.unistats.direct.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>Stiftung zur Förderung der Hochschulrektorenkonferenz, Hochschulkompass; <a href="http://www.hochschulkompass.de">www.hochschulkompass.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-University.net; <a href="http://www.uk-university.net">www.uk-university.net</a></td>
<td>Das Bildungs- und Studenten-Portal; <a href="http://www.fh-rpl.de">www.fh-rpl.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian, University Guide 2013; <a href="http://www.theguardian.com">www.theguardian.com</a></td>
<td>Studis online: <a href="http://www.studis-online.de">www.studis-online.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Arts; <a href="http://www.britisharts.co.uk">www.britisharts.co.uk</a></td>
<td>EFORS.eu; <a href="http://www.study.efors.eu/de/Studium/Deutschland">www.study.efors.eu/de/Studium/Deutschland</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saatchi Gallery; <a href="http://www.saatchi-gallery.co.uk">www.saatchi-gallery.co.uk</a></td>
<td>plus Media GmbH, Die online Studienberatung; <a href="http://www.studieren-studium.com">www.studieren-studium.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency; <a href="http://www.hesa.ac.uk">www.hesa.ac.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own illustration

The identification and analysis of HEIs took place between December 2013 and April 2014. The entire set of identified accredited HEIs that offered fine art degree programmes at the university level for undergraduates in the academic year 2013/14 encompassed 134 universities as well as higher education colleges in the UK (N_UK=134) and 34 universities and Kunsthochschulen\(^3\) in Germany (N_Ger=34). However, not all of these institutions provided the required data or replied to written enquiries. Therefore, the sample size was 87 HEIs (Appendix H), as illustrated in Figure 4.4-2 below. Seventy-five institutions in the UK (n_UK=75) and 12 in Germany (n_Ger=12) published the required data in their course brochures, programme specifications, detailed module handbooks, or in their answers to information requests.

\(^3\) In Germany universities and Kunsthochschulen offer higher education in Fine Art. Their services are quite similar; however, Kunsthochschulen focus more on practical experience than on research.
In addition, extracurricular seminars, workshops and short courses in entrepreneurship, marketing and finance as well as post-graduate programmes in the subjects of arts entrepreneurship, art management, fine art, photography, and painting offered by these identified HEIs were also analysed. The focus on in-house offerings results from the examination of whether fine art undergraduates were equipped with the crucial skills during their fine art studies at HEIs.

Overall, 55 post-graduate programmes and 46 extracurricular in-house courses and seminars were additionally reviewed and analysed (see Figure 4.4-3 and Appendix H).
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Figure 4.4-3: Structure of the Samples, Fine Art Degrees for Post-Graduates (PG) and Extracurricular In-House Courses in Entrepreneurship and Business (EE) at HEIs; UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

Source: Author's own illustration

4.4.4 Analysis of Fine Art Students’ Professional Education at HEIs

The analysis of fine art students’ educational preparation for their professional and often entrepreneurial career comprises two levels: on the course level including the course specifications and content, and on the institutional level to provide insights into HEIs’ strategic commitment towards entrepreneurship education across all subjects.

4.4.4.1 Analysis Criteria on Course Level

The analysis on the course level involves the qualitative and quantitative evaluation of educational offerings for fine art students. The main focus of the second research aim was, however, on the investigation of the regular fine art curricula for undergraduates at the university level at HEIs. The necessary course information comprised detailed course structures and programme characteristics. Additionally, in order to illustrate a much broader overview of the educational situation of fine art students, post-graduate programmes (masters programmes), and existing entrepreneurial or business-related in-
house extracurricular training offerings were likewise taken into consideration. In this context, findings related to the entrepreneurial orientation of the regular fine art curriculum, including the extent of entrepreneurial skills taught, teaching methods used or the integration of experienced, established, and self-employed fine artists and alumni as coaches or mentors into the teaching process (guest lectures and residency or mentoring programmes) were of special relevance. More specifically, the course data was converted into measurable educational key performance indicators (KPIs), which were based according to the Bologna programme conventions either on ECTS credit points or workload measured in working hours per average student, as illustrated below in Table 4.4-5. By completing a course, seminar, or module, a student is then awarded national or standardised European credit points (ECTS). Typically, one year of study corresponds to 60 ECTS or 120 UK credit points. Therefore, a three-year bachelor’s programme usually has 180 ECTS or 360 UK credit points and a five-year diploma programme at German HEIs has 300 ECTS credit points. Due to the increasing degree of standardization of the workload in Europe, ECTS credit points were particularly used as a valuation principle for measuring and illustrating the proportions of entrepreneurial skills with respect to the total workload of provided fine art courses and programmes within and across both countries. Every ECTS credit point stands for a certain workload, measured in time. In practice, one ECTS credit point is equal to 20 hours of student work in the UK (QAA, 2008b; Hörig, 2010; Tuning, 2014) and 30 working hours in Germany (Hörig, 2010; Bachelor.de, 2014; Studieninformation Baden-Württemberg, 2014). Owing to these inter-country differences in measuring workload in time per one ECTS credit point, the estimated working hours to develop entrepreneurial skills were particularly used as an evaluation principle for comparative purposes of the students’ average studying effort among both countries.
### Table 4.4-5: Applied Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Applied KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent were "five plus two" entrepreneurial skills taught in the regular fine art curriculum of undergraduates? | KPI "Entrepreneurial Fitness"  
  ratio: workload "five plus two" entrepreneurial skills to total workload of fine art curriculum (in working hours) |
| To what extent were employability skills taught in the regular fine art curriculum of undergraduates?                  | KPI "Employability"  
  ratio: workload employability skills to total workload of fine art curriculum (in working hours) |
| To what extent were fine art students able to access extracurricular in-house courses with focus on entrepreneurship and business management? | KPI "Extra-Entrepreneurship"  
  number of internal entrepreneurial and business-related extracurricular courses per academic year that are available for fine art students |
| To what extent were study visits or work placements compulsory part in the regular fine art curriculum of undergraduates? | KPI "Compulsory Work Experience"  
  ratio: workload of compulsory work placements to the total workload of fine art curriculum (in weeks) |
| To what extent were practising and self-employed fine artists integrated as guest lecturers into the regular curriculum of undergraduates? | KPI "Guest Lectures"  
  number of guest lectures in academic year of 2013/14 |
| To what extent were practising and self-employed fine artists integrated as individual mentors/on-site coaches into the regular fine art curriculum of undergraduates? | KPI "Mentoring"  
  number of professional artists working as mentors with undergraduates in academic year 2013/14 |
| To what extent were the full-time teaching staff experienced and self-employed practitioners?                          | KPI "Real-Life Experienced Lecturers"  
  ratio: number of teaching artists (practising artists) to total number of teaching staff on the course |

Source: Author's own illustration

#### 4.4.4.2 Analysis Criteria on Institutional Level

To reveal the state and developmental potential of HEIs towards arts entrepreneurship education, specific criteria were identified. Following Gibb (2012), who defined a conceptual framework for an entrepreneurial university, the analysis on an institutional level was mainly focused on four key areas with their specific criteria, as illustrated in Figure 4.4-4.
Gibb’s framework provided a useful guide to analyse and evaluate higher education institutions’ entrepreneurial status quo and potential by considering different spheres or areas of influence.

- **Area One: Mission, Governance and Strategy**

  Both mission statements and strategies are excellent criteria for the relevance of and commitment to entrepreneurship. Both criteria mainly define the first key area of institutions’ entrepreneurial potential to be developed and expressed by the institutions’ top management and should therefore be considered as binding orientation for the future. Further useful criteria of this key area are the organisation design and the knowledge organisation. The criterion of organisation design enables an insight into the levels of decentralisation of decision making and responsibility for strategies and operations. The criterion of knowledge organisation deals with the level of the disciplinary nature of a HEI or interaction between established disciplines to foster a culture of entrepreneurialism. The required data for these criteria was published on HEIs’ websites, strategic plans, and annual reports.
• **Area Two: Stakeholder Engagement**

The second key area is primarily concerned with the engagement of stakeholders. In the context of this study, the institutions’ engagement with arts entrepreneurs and graduates (alumni) as well as their integration into the learning environment showed itself to be most relevant and analysed. To measure the extent of stakeholder engagement, the two KPIs “Guest Lectures” and “Mentoring” (see Table 4.4-5 above) were applied. The required data was mostly gathered through surveys among lecturers and information requests made to administrative staff.

• **Area Three: Entrepreneurship Education of Teaching Staff**

This third area does not encompass the analysis of regular fine art curriculum and additional training offerings. This analysis was conducted separately on the course level, as described earlier in detail. The investigation of this area in the context of the analysis on an institutional level was primarily focused on entrepreneurial cross-campus initiatives and the arts entrepreneurial education and development of lecturers. Entrepreneurially experienced lecturers are expected to be more capable of teaching entrepreneurialism, entrepreneurial skills and behaviour, and to act like mentors as compared to inexperienced ones. The required data was gathered through surveys among lecturers and information requests from administrative staff.

• **Area Four: Knowledge Transfer, Exchange and Support**

The fourth area consists of the collaboration and use of sources of knowledge external to HEIs. It was particularly interesting to experience whether and to what extent HEIs offered their arts graduates incubation services or financial support to nurture their career in self-employment. The required data was gathered through surveys among lecturers and information requests from administrative staff.

These four areas of influence with their briefly explained criteria were used to investigate the current commitment to entrepreneurship of HEIs that offered degree programmes in Fine Art in the UK and Germany.
4.4.5 Survey by Questionnaire of Lecturers in Fine Art

The main objective of the survey among fine art lecturers (Appendix D), all of whom were also practising artists, was to find out their personal views and opinions as experts regarding the major challenges and needs of fine artists in their professional and entrepreneurial careers. In their double role as practising artist and lecturer of fine art students, they provided valuable insights into both the real-life working world as professional artists and the current educational preparation of fine art students at HEIs to meet the market requirements. Possible mismatches between these two spheres were identified from the view of deeply involved “insiders”.

Access to lecturers’ names and contact details was given through the HEIs’ and their art faculties’ websites or enquired by information requests. However, not all of the relevant 134 UK and 34 German HEIs that offered degree programmes in Fine Art and single subjects provided the required data or replied to information requests regarding the contact details of their lecturers and teaching staff members. Therefore, the sample size was smaller. In total 125 HEIs, from which 103 institutions in the UK (n_{UK}=103) and 22 in Germany (n_{GER}=22) provided the required information about their lecturers in Fine Art including name, function, and contact details, as illustrated in Figure 4.4-5.

![Figure 4.4-5: Identification of Relevant HEIs Providing Contact Details of their Lecturers in Fine Art; UK and Germany](image-url)

Source: Author’s own illustration

The process of identifying fine art lecturers was conducted alongside the identification of the relevant HEIs. Overall, 747 fine art lecturers were identified at 103 UK HEIs and 384
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at 22 German institutions. However, due to sabbaticals, inaccurate contact details, absences (study visits), and resignations, the relevant sample size of potential and invited participants decreased to 652 lecturers in the UK ($N_{LEC.UK}=652$) and 331 lecturers at HEIs in Germany ($N_{LEC.GER}=331$), as illustrated below in Figure 4.4-6. The sample of lecturers ($N_{LEC.UK}=652$ and $N_{LEC.GER}=331$) was addressed and invited to take part in the survey via e-mail. The participant information sheet and the link to the online survey were attached to the invitation e-mail.

The questionnaire was completed online from 20 January to 17 February 2015. The answers were saved directly and anonymously in a database of Netigate.de, a specialised provider of online surveys. The data and given answers will be destroyed five years after the successful completion of the studies according to data protection agreements.

Although 219 lecturers participated in the survey, not all of them fully completed it despite three e-mail reminders. Due to this, the different questions relating to the first two research questions showed various response rates, ranging from a minimum of 20.55% ($n_{LEC.UK min}=134$) to a maximum of 22.39% ($n_{LEC.UK max}=146$) in the UK survey and from 18.13% ($n_{LEC.GER min}=60$) to 22.05% ($n_{LEC.GER max}=73$) in the German survey, as shown in Figure 4.4-6. The response rates were highest at the beginning of the survey when asked for general information and gradually decreased to the minimum response rates as the survey progressed.
The difficulty of practising fine artists in making a living: Why arts entrepreneurship education is important

Chapter 4 Methodology

**Figure 4.4-6: Lecturer Survey: Response Rates; UK and Germany**

*Source: Author’s own illustration*

The participating 219 lecturers were allocated to HEIs as follows: up to 146 lecturers were teaching at 65 different UK HEIs, while up to 73 lecturers were teaching at 22 different German HEIs. The maximum number of participating lecturers per UK HEI was eight. The majority of UK HEIs (58 out of 65) were represented by one to four lecturers in the survey. In Germany, the maximum number of lecturers per HEI was nine. The majority of German HEIs (17 out of 22) was represented in the survey by one to three lecturers (see Appendix E for details).

### 4.4.6 Survey by Questionnaire of Undergraduates in Fine Art

While the identification of lecturers was easily possible through HEIs' websites, fine art students’ names and contact details were not revealed. They were therefore addressed via their lecturers. Lecturers were asked to forward both the participant information sheet and link to the ‘student survey’ to their students. The success of the ‘student survey’ was therefore enormously dependent on the lecturers’ willingness to support this research.
The student survey was answered by a total of 168 fine art students (Appendix F), of which up to 72 students were studying at UK HEIs and up to 96 students at German institutions (Figure 4.4-7).

**Figure 4.4-7: Student Survey: Number of Participating Students; UK and Germany**

*Source: Author’s own illustration*

### 4.4.7 Analysis of Existing Arts Incubators

To investigate arts incubation programmes, it was necessary to make inventory of arts incubators’ business models and provided services (Appendix I). Over a period of several months, the names of as many arts incubators as possible from multiple sources were gathered and then individually researched. The inventory was therefore a snapshot of arts incubator activity taken during October 2015 and January 2016. The identification of names ensued by means of multiple sources, including a key word search on the Internet using the terms “arts incubator”, “art incubator”, “creative incubator”, “cultural incubator”, and the German term “Kunstinkubator”. Further sources used were the member lists of the business incubation associations InBIA (2016) (U.S.), UKBI (2016) (UK), BVZI (2016) (Germany) as well as Essig’s (2014a) inventory of arts incubators in the United States.
from which several names were removed in the recent past. Each identified arts incubator was then individually researched including the analysis of published data on their websites and responses to written enquiries with reference to their business objectives, providing business assistance services and organisational structures. Overall, 92 arts incubators identified worldwide were subject of research. 60 out of 92 entities were located in the United States, followed by eleven in the UK, four each in Hungary and Germany, three in Sweden, and the remaining nine entities in other European countries, Asia, Canada, and New Zealand. With regard to their key (or claimant) stakeholders, 33 out of 92 entities were considered arts incubators with a focus on artists, as illustrated in Table 4.4-6.

Table 4.4-6: Inventory of Arts Incubators by Key Stakeholders and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimant Stakeholder</th>
<th>United States of America</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>In Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Incubator/Hub</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own calculation

Regardless of their missions, primary objectives, and key (claimant) stakeholders, all arts incubators had in common that they provide services of value for artists’ professional development. This was the reason why all 92 entities became objects of further analysis.

4.5 Summary

This chapter justifies the selection of the abovementioned research methods to address the three research themes. It also clarifies the sample selection. The following table (4.5-1) gives a summary of the steps taken in this study.
Table 4.5-1: Summary of Research Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Philosophy</strong></td>
<td>interpretative philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Design</strong></td>
<td>exploratory and inductive; cross-sectional survey strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Aim 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Artists' Crucial Skills for Professional Success and Income</td>
<td>• literature review, secondaray data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• surveys by questionnaire of 219 lecturers and 168 undergraduates in Fine Arts in the UK and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• survey by questionnaire of 149 commercial galleries in the UK and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Aim 2</strong></td>
<td>• literature review, secondaray data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Artists' Professional Education at HEIs</td>
<td>• surveys by questionnaire of 219 lecturers and 168 undergraduates in Fine Arts in the UK and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• information requests from lecturers/career departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis of the fine art curriculum and strategy plans of 87 HEIs in the UK and Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Aim 3</strong></td>
<td>• literature review, secondaray data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalability of Arts Incubation Programmes</td>
<td>• structured interviews with 9 emerging fine artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis of business models of 92 arts incubators worldwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own illustration
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“For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them.”

(Aristoteles)

5.0 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the findings of the research addressing the three research aims and research methods elaborated in Chapter 4. Various qualitative research methods are applied to identify practising fine artists’ crucial skills for professional success and earning a living (section 5.1), to investigate their educational preparation at HEIs in the UK and Germany (section 5.2), and to analyse the scalability of business services for large numbers of practising business artists provided by arts incubation programmes as alternative means of professional education and preparation (section 5.3). This is followed by a summarising section (section 5.4). The findings are robust since scientific saturation was reached with the qualitative research.

To achieve the first two aims the research focuses on the UK and Germany, while the analysis of arts incubation programmes is globally oriented. The UK and Germany were selected due to their significantly different market sizes for the purpose of identifying differences in market challenges and success factors faced by fine artists.

5.1 Investigating Practising Fine Artists’ Crucial Skills for Professional Success (Research Aim 1)

The first research aim is the identification of the crucial skills practising fine artists require to professionally succeed and make a living in the arts. In this context, surveys by questionnaire of fine art lecturers, fine art students, and commercial contemporary art galleries also identify the perceived key market requirements and market success factors from their individual perspectives.

5.1.1 Identification of Key Market Challenges

In total, 198 fine art lecturers, all of whom were practising artists (see Appendix D), 47 fine art students (see Appendix F), and 117 commercial fine art galleries (see Appendix G) identified the key market challenges, more precisely, the major barriers to and factors
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for the professional success of practising fine artists from their individual perspective, as highlighted in red boxes in Tables 5.1-1.

Table 5.1-1: Barriers to and Factors for Professional Success of Fine Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Barriers</th>
<th>Commercial Galleries</th>
<th>Fine Art Lecturers</th>
<th>Fine Art Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK (n=40)</td>
<td>Germany (n=77)</td>
<td>UK (n=133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of mentions (multiple mentions possible)</td>
<td>Number of mentions (multiple mentions possible)</td>
<td>Number of mentions (multiple mentions possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... market access</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... visibility (public and audience perception)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... reputation/brand (marketing/promotional activities)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... network contacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... skills and preparation (openness for business and commerce)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... outstanding art (quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... personality</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... professional attitude/work ethic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... faith in gallery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market specifications (structure, gatekeepers)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversupply of art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reasons; I do not know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 11 out of 30 German fine art students (none in the UK) mentioned the need for a secured basic income as key market barrier; visibility suffers from multiple job holdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Factors</th>
<th>Commercial Galleries</th>
<th>Fine Art Lecturers</th>
<th>Fine Art Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK (n=40)</td>
<td>Germany (n=77)</td>
<td>UK (n=135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of mentions (multiple mentions possible)</td>
<td>Number of mentions (multiple mentions possible)</td>
<td>Number of mentions (multiple mentions possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outstanding art</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality (fresh, inspiring, individual, marketable)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing/promotional activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network contacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market access</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visibility (exhibitions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills (openness for business and commerce)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work ethic (determination to succeed; endurance and persistence)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luck</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reasons; I do not know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on their own professional experiences and individual perceptions, the survey participants classified various key market requirements for becoming and being in particular *economically successful* in the arts, as illustrated in Table 5.1-1 and listed below.

- producing outstanding artwork (quality); innovative ideas (concepts) of high quality,
- being an extroverted and marketable personality,
- attracting/increasing attention and visibility; effective promotional activities,
- having market access and exploiting market opportunities,
- building up a good network of contacts in the arts,
- assembling a comprehensive set of professional and entrepreneurial skills, and
- developing an entrepreneurial mindset and personal characteristics, such as confidence, ambition, hard work ethic, resilience.

Notable differences between the UK and Germany were not identified. That suggests that barriers to and factors for professional success of practising fine artists are quite similar in both of these mature markets, despite their differences in size (volume and transactions) and international reputation.

The findings, however, also indicate the fundamental tension between the two poles of art-producing fine artists with limited resources and art-demanding commercial galleries in their role as powerful gatekeepers and market barriers for emerging practising artists.

As mentioned earlier in the context of the literature review (section 3.2.1.4), galleries are mostly profit-oriented and thus driven by the market demand of art collectors on which they are often financially dependent. Due to this, galleries represent the market perspective by showing a clear focus only on searching for and selecting quality for their clients (see Table 5.1-1). The aspect of quality is, however, highly subjective. Questioned on their definition of quality, both galleries and lecturers were totally divided (see Appendices D and G). Quality is difficult to explain because it appears to be an extremely emotional issue. The aesthetic value of an artwork seems to be neglected by galleries, since many gallerists are not educated in the fine arts but rather are lateral entrants in the arts (see Appendix G). They define quality primarily by means of the two criteria of saleability and marketability of artworks and personalities (UK: mentioned by 80% of the
surveyed galleries; Germany: mentioned by more than 90% of surveyed galleries). See Appendix G. In contrast, art-producing lecturers define quality in works' aesthetic values. Consequently, quality is relatively weak to grasp or manage as a success factor; it is the underlying cause of the tense relationship between artists and galleries. This finding, however, is beneficial for art's sake as it means that artists are required to show their own specific style of art because there is nothing to copy to enter the path of success in the market. Artists' dilemma in this context is considered more in the market structure, as illustrated in sections 2.2 and 3.2.1.4, providing galleries with a high market power and more or less the official authority to define quality. The powerful intermediaries rule the art market, not the artists.

In this context, lecturers confirmed the skills relevant for professional success in the arts, as defined in the working model of the crucial ‘five plus two’ skills. From their point of view, practising business fine artists are requested, next to art-related skills and market knowledge, to develop an entrepreneurial mindset as well as the crucial ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills, and a personality to successfully resist the major threats and deal with the factors of professional success, as identified in Chapter 3. These skills as well as the artist's personality are supposed to particularly help to increase, among other things, artists' abilities to increase their market attention and power (see sections 3.2.1.3 and 3.2.1.4), social value (see section 3.2.2.3.2), and finally the market prices of their works. In any case, emerging business fine artists need visibility and market access for their professional success. Their particular claim to market access and need of self-promotion skills and network contacts along with quality, as shown above in Table 5.1-1, could be understood in this context. As mentioned by Thurnhofer (2014) in section 2.2.2.2, more than 80% of all artists are excluded from the market and therefore hardly visible and publicly recognised, which constitutes one key factor for their hardly being able to make a living in their profession as working artists.

It is also notable that fine art students have shown a relatively high expectation that persistence and a positive attitude towards hard work, which was summarised as work ethic in Table 5.1-1, are also important for their professional success. This aspect had, however, a much lower relevance for practising artists/lecturers and galleries. That could mean that in practice inexperienced students were more idealistically driven by the belief that hard work would lead to success. Market-experienced lecturers may be more
realistic at this point, believing that marketing activities and networking contacts outshine professional ambition and talent. However, the answers given by commercial galleries and fine artists/lecturers clearly show that hard work alone does not lead to success because saleability is finally the factor with the highest impact on success.

5.1.2 Art Graduates’ Preparation to Overcome Market Barriers

Considering these facts, the surveyed fine art lecturers and students were further asked whether they expected their students or themselves to be prepared to successfully overcome the aforementioned barriers after graduation. The expectations of lecturers are illustrated in Figure 5.1-1.

Figure 5.1-1: Lecturer Survey: Graduates’ Expected Preparation for Market Challenges; Findings in UK and Germany

Source: Author’s own illustration

The majority of lecturers expected their students to be basically prepared for the market after graduation. However, 60% of them appended to their positive expectations the addition of “with limitations.” As it is important for this study to experience the restrictive arguments in order to gain a deeper understanding of current mismatches in education and/or market structures and opportunities for adjustments, all those lecturers who
answered the aforementioned question with “yes, with limitations” and “no” were additionally asked about the reasons for their restrictive expectations; in total, 177 lecturers or 84% of the sample group, comprising 120 at UK HEIs and 57 at German institutions. Their open-ended answers were “coded” for content and classified into four main categories of identified lacks, as seen by these lecturers (see Appendices D and E for details): 1) lack of entrepreneurship education and market orientation; 2) students’ lack of their artistic abilities, professional attitude, and work ethic; 3) lack of social acceptance of art; and 4) other reasons.

The dominant concern regarding graduates’ professional preparation was considered by lecturers in graduates’ lack of entrepreneurial skills due to the missing market orientation in the regular curriculum (mentioned by 69% of UK lecturers and 64% German lecturers). In this context, some lecturers revealed one key reason for their expectation: they did not consider career advice and development as a task of their teaching (see Appendix D).

The lack of entrepreneurial skills was also primarily mentioned by 30 out of 47 students who emphasised the need to be more entrepreneurially taught about real-life tasks and challenges (see Appendix F). This finding allows the assumption that fine art students accept the fact that they need to learn business and entrepreneurial skills and competencies to be prepared for the market challenges that lie ahead. However, this finding also indicates HEIs’ failure in preparing art students for a professional and entrepreneurial career as practising artist. They do not perceive themselves sufficiently equipped with the skills required to be prepared for being an artist. However, HEIs’ primarily intended learning outcomes and strategic objectives still have to be clarified before a failure in professional preparation can finally be concluded. It is also possible that HEIs’ scope in professionally preparing students is defined much broader so that art students are also prepared for careers outside the arts. The concrete objectives and status of arts education are the scope of investigation in section 5.2 of this chapter.

The second reason for concern mentioned only by lecturers was considered in the lack of students’ personality traits and abilities (mentioned by 17.5% of UK lecturers and 21% German lecturers). Some lecturers questioned students’ professional attitude and understanding of being a professional artist. This concern seems reasonable in light of
the fact that not every fine art student aims at making a living as a practising artist after graduation. However, as shown above, those art students who consider being an artist as career option complain the lack of skills and real-life teaching to develop the professional attitude. At this point it becomes clear that both lecturers and students need to know each other's expectations on the learning outcome.

The third reason for concern, once again only mentioned by lecturers, was artists' low valuation in society (mentioned by 9% of lecturers in each case). Based on the given answers, two deficiencies were identified: first, the lack of social acceptance of art as profession and, second, the lack in educational resources. This first lack was related to the difficulty in finding acceptance for unknown art and artists in the marketplace. Art institutions, investors, and dealers revealed – in the opinions of the lecturers – a low level of interest for unknown work and artists, as the literature findings (see section 3.2.2.3.2) and lecturers' answers illustrate (see Appendix D). One lecturer wrote in this context,

“The fact that artists are marginalised, or even actively exploited by economic or social structures, is a large factor in artists’ ability to make a living. Artists do not have a dedicated Union to represent them.”

The second lack in society was related to insufficient educational resources. Lecturers complained that there were only a few teaching jobs available in the arts, leading to a decrease of the teaching quality and student development. One key reason for this is mentioned later as a research finding in section 5.2.1.2.1 with regard to the added values provided by HEIs in developing graduates’ employability. This concern also confirms the literature findings describing a systematic remove of art education in elementary schools to higher education institutions as a result of increased fees and decreased public spending (see Appendix O for more details).

5.1.3 Identification of the Crucial Skills for Practising Fine Artists' Professional Success

As findings above show (see section 5.1.1), skills were considered crucial for the professional success of practising fine artists. In this context, lecturers and students were additionally asked to identify and rank the relevance of skills they expect to be crucial for their professional success in the arts. 204 out of the 210 surveyed lecturers classified
their top 10 skills by mentioning creativity, networking, art specific, sales/marketing, and opportunity skills followed by planning (strategic thinking), market know-how, communication/presentation, financial skills, and leadership skills with the highest relevance for the economic success of practising fine artists (see Appendix D). The rankings by lecturers in both countries were quite similar, with the exception of a slightly higher assessment of art specific skills in Germany, while opportunity skills were ranked higher by the UK lecturers. However, the differences were not decisive for the research. The homogenous picture provided by real-life experienced lecturers allows the conclusion that, along with art-related professional skills and market knowledge mentioned among the top 10, the working model of the crucial ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills for fine artists (see section 3.1.5.2.2.2) has been empirically confirmed. While the ‘five plus two’ skills help to develop and run an attractive and professionally promising art business concept, which enables to successfully meet the external threat factors (see sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 as well as section 6.1.1), an entrepreneurial mindset, considered as success factor in section 5.1.1, enables artists’ to be prepared for professional opportunities.

However, when asked to determine the crucial skills, 43 students showed an altogether different and far more heterogeneous picture, particularly across both countries, compared to the lecturer findings (see Appendix F). Along with idea and networking skills, the surveyed students in both countries evaluated art-specific skills (quality) and market knowledge more important. The further skills were, however, ranked differently. As consequence, the student findings neither confirm the working model of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills nor the literature findings relating to the most relevant skills for entrepreneurial and small business success. Their heterogeneous findings might be the result of a more idealised image of art and success expectations or of little real-life working experience and knowledge of market challenges and requirements, or both.

5.1.4 Conclusion
The survey findings clearly illustrate that real-life experienced lecturers in fine art confirm the working model of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills and entrepreneurial mindset as crucial for the professional success of practising fine artists. This model is, however,
not confirmed by art students, probably due to their lack of real-life working experience and a more idealistic understanding of the arts as a profession.

In this context, a majority of both lecturers and fine art students expect a bachelor’s degree not to be sufficient to prepare art graduates for a professional career as practising artists due to a lack of transferred knowledge and developed skills. This finding may indicate HEIs’ failure to achieve their general role of professionally preparing their students, defined as core HEIs’ task by the Bologna Process (see section 3.1.5.2). However, it is still to be clarified what educational objectives are valid at HEIs. According to some lecturers, the development of those skills is not an integral part of their lectureship. This reasonably raises the question of whether teaching entrepreneurial skills is optional and depending on lecturers’ individual ability and willingness or whether art curriculum does not integrate these skills as a learning outcome. These concerns will be discussed in the context of the second research question (see section 5.2.1 relating to the findings of the second research aim).

The literature as well as the research findings of this study lead to the assumption, from a resource point of view, that a three-year bachelor’s degree in fine arts is definitely insufficient professional preparation for an entrepreneurial career in the arts. On the one hand, this three-year period of study given to develop the crucial skills is surely too short. As literature findings in section 3.2 have shown, the working and business environment of practising fine artists is highly complex and challenging (see also fine artists’ job profile provided by Prospects.ac.uk in section 1.2), requiring various non-art related skills (the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills at the very least) and an entrepreneurial mindset, while it takes plenty of time to develop these skills to an appropriate level of quality. On the other hand, HEIs are definitely not capable of providing bachelor’s degrees that offer ongoing, timetabled instruction to take the growing number of art students through the various developmental stages of learning how to be a practising artist from novice to master. Instead, a bachelor’s degree provides ‘introductory teaching’ on particular skills, which enhances art students’ individual perception, enriches intellect, stimulates creativity, and tries to adopt a foreign point of view, a key to self-confidence and reflected outside perception that in turn is a necessity for personal and professional progress. If they achieve all this, then their likelihood of becoming creative contributors to society is
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relatively high (see section 3.2.2.3.2 for further details to artists’ social value). Art lecturers or teachers do not make artists! HEIs, art lecturers, or art teachers provide an education to give young people the opportunity to learn to become an artist. This particular aspect should be criticised from the point of view that students should be clear about what a bachelor’s degree in fine arts is capable of achieving prior to enrolment in order to prevent increasing dissatisfaction among students, parents, art lecturers, and other key stakeholders of higher education, as illustrated above in section 3.1.5.2 with regard to the general role of higher education and students’ expectations. As long as a bachelor’s degree in fine arts claims to be capable of professionally developing fine art students to become practising artists, HEIs will fail to meet their key stakeholders’ expectations. Consequently, fine art students who want to become practising artists and make a living in the arts (business fine art students) are therefore recommended to continue their studies in master’s or even doctoral degrees and/or to attend external trainings for professional development. Spend the extended time in education would help them to develop skills and ideas and create a useful support network.

The bachelor’s degree seems therefore to primarily teach creativity and flexibility associated with valuable transferable skills to make a living in a variety of professions. What skills are developed in a bachelor’s degree and how HEIs interpret their educational missions are subjects of the second research question (section 5.2). However, fine art students should realise their career chances in the arts, ideally prior to enrolling in a bachelor’s degree that costs several thousands of British pounds or euros (see section 3.1.5.2). HEIs should definitely provide clear information to their (prospective) students in fine art in market knowledge and developing an entrepreneurial mindset, including open-minded thinking and the ability to recognise and exploit artistic and/or business opportunities. This is what art students at HEIs, independent of their underlying professional and commercial motivations, should at least expect as return on their educational investments.
5.2 Investigation of Fine Art Students’ Professional Education at HEIs (Research Aim 2)

The literature provides few concrete findings on the state of artists’ professional preparation and arts entrepreneurship education at HEIs with a focus on the fine arts. Owing to this, this research project aimed to reveal the state at HEIs in the UK and Germany offering fine art degree programmes for undergraduates at the university level, post-graduate degrees, and extracurricular training programmes for fine artists in the academic year 2013/14. The investigation comprised analyses on course and institutional levels.

5.2.1 Findings on Course Level

The investigation on a course level was conducted in accordance with the analysis criteria and key performance indicators (KPIs) described in Chapter 4 “Methodology”, section 4.4.4.1.

5.2.1.1 Intended Learning Outcomes

A first impression of the rationale of the various fine art degree programmes was provided by their intended learning outcomes. By formulating intended learning outcomes, HEIs present their individual understanding and interpretation of education and professional preparation. This information was usually communicated in the programme specifications.

An analysis of course documents, information requests, and HEIs’ websites revealed graduates’ employability as the main intended outcome in the UK, according to the general role of HEIs (see section 3.1.5.2). 70 out of 75 UK HEIs explicitly defined this outcome as the main objective of their fine art education, along with the subject-specific artistic education (see Appendix H for details). The fine art curriculum at UK HEIs was designed to achieve graduate employability through the transfer of knowledge and the development of specific skills in the following two principal sets of skills:

- **Subject-specific practical and professional skills**

  Fine art graduates should have developed the abilities to analyse, develop, and evaluate creative responses and ideas to solve complex visual and subject-specific
problems. In addition, they need to be able to produce innovative artwork of a professional standard using subject-specific materials as well as a range of practical techniques and processes, not to mention researching and produce informed critical opinions on historical and contextual issues.

- **Transferable skills and capabilities**

Transferable skills refer to the abilities to communicate and present information clearly and effectively as well as confidently and professionally to a range of audiences in both written and oral form as well as to plan, prioritise, and work effectively as an individual or as a member of team towards a certain deadline. In addition, fine art students should be able to take responsibility for independent, self-directed activities, make problem-solving decisions, and demonstrate effective self-reflection, self-reliance, evaluation, organisation, project and time management as part of a life-long learning process.

These findings show that the intended learning outcomes of degree programmes for undergraduates at UK HEIs did not explicitly comprise the development of an entrepreneurial mindset or of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills. An essential part of fine art education at UK HEIs instead meant teaching students employability skills alongside subject-specific art knowledge. Prospects.ac.uk (2013), UK’s official graduate career website, emphasised the importance of teaching transferable skills within fine art courses which help to increase students’ employability and thus their adaptability to employers’ needs, in- and outside the art industry. This understanding was representative for the vast majority of surveyed UK HEIs. For instance, Aberystwyth University was quoted as remarking: “Studying for a degree in Fine Art will equip you [the student] with a range of transferable skills which are highly likely valued by employers.” (Aberystwyth University, 2013). This learning outcome implicitly means that fine art students will not exclusively be educated and prepared for becoming practising artists after graduation. They will be prepared to become creative and employable, attractive for employers inside and outside the art industry.

Both sets of skills, the professional subject-specific and employability skills, could be, however, considered the foundation for developing the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial
skills that are of a higher order (see Appendix K), as defined in Chapter 3, section 3.1.5.2 in accordance with de Wolf and Schoorlemmer (2007) and Rudmann (2008).

In this context, it is interesting to find out what fine art learning outcomes were intended at German HEIs. Fine art degrees at German institutions feature a slightly different focus in comparison to those in the UK. German programmes focused primarily on the development of an independent artistic personality. The fine art courses prepare students to excel at the practice and performance of the fine arts. Teaching transferable skills in order to increase students’ employability or preparing them for how to become a practising artist were either marginally or altogether left unmentioned by these institutions. Eight out of twelve German HEIs defined the rationale of their programmes in equipping students primarily with those skills which help them to discover their own authentic artistic voice as well as developing their own creative, artistic and aesthetic concepts and finally their own artistic personality (Appendix H). For example, the Dresden Academy of Fine Arts described its understanding of being a practising fine artist as follows:

“Being an artist is not a profession in the classical sense, yet becoming an artist is one of the most intriguing lifestyle choices of our era. Those who wish to take this path harbour a fundamental desire not only to develop themselves artistically, but also involve all aspects of their individuality in that process. A degree at the Dresden Academy of Fine Arts offers students the opportunity to gain important experience and skills across the broad spectrum of modern art in order to enable them to take their own artistic path in the future.”

(Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden, 2016)

This understanding of an educational learning outcome can be considered representative of the majority of surveyed German HEIs. Although four out of the twelve institutions mentioned the development of transferable skills, only two of them emphasised the importance of employability skills as part of their course rationale.

It can be concluded that a major difference between fine art degree programmes for undergraduates at HEIs in the UK and Germany exists with regard to their intended learning outcome. While the primary aim of German HEIs in fine art programmes is to prepare students to excel in the arts as arts personalities, UK HEIs exhibit a clear focus
on graduates’ employability in- and outside the art industry and consider the bachelor’s degree in fine arts as a professional preparation programme in a relatively wide sense. In contrast, German HEIs do not consider the arts as a profession and therefore do not aim for professional preparation of their fine art students at all. This art educational identity is reflected in a higher proportion of degrees outside of the Bologna Process in Germany, where relatively more diploma degrees in (liberal) fine arts with a relatively free, meaning less standardised, art curriculum compared to bachelor’s degrees are offered (see Appendix H for more details).

However, the fact that HEIs in both countries did not explicitly mention entrepreneurship as a learning outcome and course rationale does not necessarily mean that the identified ‘five plus two’ skills were not taught. Further analysis and the use of KPIs were therefore required.

5.2.1.2 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

The use of KPIs was necessary to make the findings on a course level more measureable and understandable (see Chapter 4, section 4.4.4.1 for details).

5.2.1.2.1 KPIs “Entrepreneurial Fitness” and “Employability”

Next, it was of great interest to discover whether and to what extent fine art students, including prospective business fine artists, were taught with the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills and entrepreneurial mindset as well as with employability and subject-specific, professional skills. Course handbooks and other programme specifics were examined to identify skills taught and their allocation in the fine art curriculum as measured in workload (ECTS credits and hours of studying). In consideration of this, further investigation was thus focused on the analysis of fine art course modules with the help of two KPIs: “Entrepreneurial Fitness”, describing the proportion of taught ‘five plus two’ skills, and “Employability”, measuring the proportion of transferable employability skills.

The analysis of regular fine art curricula for undergraduates in the academic year 2013/14 with regard to both KPIs revealed several interesting key findings, as follows:
• The average proportion of ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills on regular fine art curricula was 5% at HEIs in the UK and less than 2% at German institutions (see Figure 5.2-1 below);
• the average proportion of employability skills in regular fine art curricula was 43% at UK HEIs and 36% in Germany;
• the average proportion of professional, subject-specific (art) skills in regular fine art curricula was 51.5% at UK HEIs and almost 62% at German ones;
• the teaching of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills was compulsory in both countries; and
• some of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills as well as an entrepreneurial mindset were not taught at all.

Figure 5.2-1: Average Proportions of Skills, Regular Fine Art Curricula; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

Source: Author’s own calculation

The research findings are summarised in Table 5.2-1 below.
Table 5.2-1: KPIs “Entrepreneurial Fitness” and “Employability”, Regular Fine Art Curricula; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of HE Institutions (sample)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mean workload &quot;five plus two&quot; entrepreneurial skills, in ECTS credits)</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mean workload &quot;five plus two&quot; entrepreneurial skills, in working hours)</td>
<td>180.8</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof compulsory/optional</td>
<td>9.04/0</td>
<td>3.5/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness” (in %)</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) KPI “Employability”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean KPI “Employability” (in %)</td>
<td>43.22</td>
<td>36.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(simple average: sum of individual ratios of “five plus two” entrepreneurial skills in relation to number of HEIs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min (compulsory and optional)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>14.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max (compulsory and optional)</td>
<td>69.44</td>
<td>48.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>35.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own calculations

The findings reveal differences between the art curriculum in the UK and Germany with regard to employability and art education. These differences are not surprising in the context of the intended learning outcomes in both educational systems. Surprising was, however, the very low proportions of entrepreneurial skills in the UK and Germany. Since there has been no optimum percentage of workload defined, the “Entrepreneurial Fitness” KPI was able to provide some first measurable figures. The transformation of the average ECTS credits for the ‘five plus two’ skills in learning hours, however, shows that fine art undergraduates at UK institutions had about 180 learning hours available to develop the taught entrepreneurial skills, while students at German institutions had only 100 hours (Table 5.2-1). Considering the 10,000-hour rule for developing skills to the point of excellence mentioned in the literature (see section 3.1.5.1), the findings suggest that fine art undergraduates in both education systems had hardly any time to develop the entrepreneurial skills taught in curriculum to a proper level. This confirms the assumption, as mentioned earlier in section 5.1.4, that a three-year bachelor’s degree is obviously too short-termed and not appropriately structured to take students through the various developmental stages of being an artist and hence for developing all the skills.
necessary to successfully meet the job profile, as illustrated in section 1.2 by Prospects.ac.uk (2016). Considering this assumption, the research findings relating to the “Entrepreneurial Fitness” of fine art students become less surprising, yet still sobering.

Consequently, it was of further interest to find out which skills of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial set were taught. The skills were therefore noted by the number of times each one was explicitly or implicitly mentioned in the module and programme handbooks of each of the regular fine art curricula analysed. The results of this analysis are illustrated in Figure 5.2-2 for both sample groups.

![Figure 5.2-2](image)

The findings show that in both samples four out of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills were instructed. In addition to the three skill sets of idea, networking, and marketing (sales and promotion), a few UK and German institutions taught funding skills in the context of their professional practice and business modules. Other business disciplines were accounting and commercial law (intellectual property law). It is in this context thus not astonishing that the skill with the highest relevance in fine art curricula in both sample groups was the development of an art idea, mentioned by every one of the analysed HEIs in both samples. The reasons for this highest ranking are obvious: fine art education
is based on creativity. More than in any other profession do fine art students need to create ideas for their professional and artistic expression and development, including the development of an outstanding, differentiating artistic personality that could help to increase their degree of awareness and raise their profile in society among peer artists, gallerists, art dealers, journalists, critics, and finally art investors, if wanted. An outstanding (art/business) idea is considered crucial in the literature for a successful professional development, since the art idea could be the origin of a Unique Selling Proposition\(^4\) (USP) and the artist’s branding. The formulation “could be” should make clear in this context that factors other than the art idea, as discussed in literature review, sections 3.1 and 3.2, may also have a significant impact on the probability of professional success.

The importance of being able to build and maintain networks was recognised by every third UK HEI, while only two out of 12 German institutions integrated this set of skills into their regular fine art curriculum. This finding is astonishing since network contacts are considered success factors in the arts, at least for business fine artists, and clearly mentioned by surveyed lecturers (see section 5.1.1). The reasons for this can only be guessed at this point, but it can be assumed that fine artists are required to build up network skills and contacts on their own in the context of their time at college without any further support by their lecturers due to the simple fact that networking skills are hardly an integral part of the art curriculum. Additionally, it may be guessed that it is simply not known how to teach these skills. Nearly the same can be said about the transfer of self-promoting skills. Other crucial entrepreneurial skills such as opportunity skills, associated with an entrepreneurial mindset, strategic thinking (planning), leadership, and cash management skills were left out of consideration altogether. These skills are therefore relevant and their absence is unfortunate because they could help fine artists, irrespective of their commercial motivations (see section 3.1.3), to reduce some major threats and factors influencing their chances of artistic and professional success, for instance, by increasing their individual luck factor (see section 3.1.6) and chances of public recognition as well as their social contribution and reputation (see section

\(^4\) The USP can be considered the distinctive factor as to why the artwork of a specific artist is recognised with an more awareness and demand than those of others
3.2.2.3.2).

In light of the above, lecturers in fine art were surveyed on whether they felt the need for adjustments in the regular fine art curriculum towards more market orientation and entrepreneurship education in order to increase the proportion of entrepreneurial skills instructed to undergraduates. Their answers are not surprising because they are in line with the lack of entrepreneurial skills that they recognised for their students after graduation (see section 5.1.2). Two thirds of the participating lecturers answered this question in a positive manner by confirming the need for adjustments towards more market orientation and entrepreneurship education, as illustrated in Figure 5.2-3 and in Appendix D.

![Figure 5.2-3: Lecturer Survey: Need for Adjustments Towards Market Orientation and Entrepreneurship Education; Findings in UK and Germany](image)

Those 93 lecturers at UK institutions and 37 German lecturers who answered this question positively were additionally asked about their individual opinion concerning the adjustments that should be made. This question was open-ended so that the surveyed lecturers could individually address their ideas. The main proposals are summarised as findings in Figures 5.2-4 below.
Adjustments towards developing students’ entrepreneurial mindsets and skills turned out to be most prioritised. Real-life scenario teaching was mentioned second most frequently as an important avenue to develop an understanding about the meaning of becoming and being a professional artist. A few lecturers called that type of teaching “art survival training”. The lecturers recommended using simulation trainings, role-playing games, and live projects to give students and prospective fine art professionals a realistic ‘job description’. More and longer work placements were mentioned in this context as a further means to better prepare fine art students for the business environment of practising artists (Appendix D).

To make an interim conclusion at this point, with the help of the KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness”, clear evidence is shown that fine art undergraduates were hardly equipped with the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills required for successfully meeting market
challenges, particularly the threat factors identified in this study as a practising artist after graduation, neither at UK nor at German HEIs. The reasons were diverse. Firstly and foremost, HEIs in the UK and Germany do not really aim to prepare art students for a career as practising artists, as clearly expressed in their learning outcome (see section 5.2.1.1) and fine art curriculum design (this section). This finding is of particular concern for all those art students who consider becoming practising artists as a realistic career path. They presumably suffer from a lack of appropriate educational focus. Secondly, an entrepreneurial mindset as well as some crucial entrepreneurial skills such as opportunity identification and realisation, leadership, strategic thinking (planning), and finance/cash management skills were completely missing in the regular fine art curricula. These skills are relevant to enable art students to reduce some of the threat factors after graduation as business artists, as identified in Chapter 3, e.g. the threat of low social reputation and market prices. These missing skills are considered foundations for professional success and income in the arts. Thirdly, those entrepreneurial skills that were embedded in the regular fine art curriculum, namely idea, networking, self-promoting, and finance skills were only taught to a very low extent. Although this is understandable due to a lack of time resources during their studies and an additional lack of explicitly teaching art students to become business artists, as illustrated in the previous section 5.1, the development of an entrepreneurial mindset associated with opportunity recognition skills should be possible for all students, regardless of their professional and commercial motivations, because this also facilitates art graduates’ employability. Instead, fine art students were primarily equipped with subject-specific professional and transferable (employability) skills. Developing graduates’ employability is HEIs’ key role and it can be said that they usually achieve this aim, when considering fine artists’ destinations after graduation (see section 3.2.2.3.5), even though it is very questionable from both the economic and human capital point of view what added value is provided by art colleges in charging almost 30,000 British pounds for educating art students to enter retail, catering, waiting, and bar staff, as illustrated in section 3.2.2.3.5. These job profiles hardly require an expensive higher education at universities.

One surveyed UK fine art lecturer wrote in this context,
“all higher education is increasingly having to justify its existence through employability of graduates. It’s now a requirement that HE courses demonstrate how they are preparing students for employment and it’s hard to see how this can be done for fine art students.”

A second lecturer wrote,

“art education in the UK at least is in crisis for this very reason. Many institutions (my own included) made the decision to close art schools due to this challenge and the lack of persuasive answers.”

And another lecturer added,

“we don’t have a government that sees education as a virtue in itself and we certainly don’t have one that supports the arts. To be pessimistic, courses that don’t lead directly to employment may soon lose all funding” (see Appendix D).

Those statements underpin the dilemma of offering a wide spectrum of subjects in arts or social sciences and humanities and achieving high rates of graduate employability – without developing entrepreneurial skills that help graduates to better self-manage their professional careers. This could obviously be a serious conflict of interests between HEIs, politics, the economy, and students as key stakeholders of higher education.

5.2.1.2.2 KPI “Extra-Entrepreneurship” and Post-Graduate Programmes

As concluded earlier in section 5.1.4, a bachelor’s degree in fine arts could be too short-termed or structured to provide ongoing, timetabled instruction that will take many fine art students through their various developmental stages of learning art as a profession from novice to master. It is therefore advisable for art students to spend an extended time in additionally studying for a master’s or even doctoral degree, helping them to develop their skills required for professional success and income. Also considering the fact that some art students in a class may aim to become business fine artists, the HEIs may offer extra art entrepreneurship and/or business trainings with focus on the arts. The study at hand therefore further investigated whether entrepreneurial post-graduate programmes and in-house extracurricular courses and trainings in art business management and arts entrepreneurship were provided for fine art students (see Appendix H). To start with the
latter, the focus of investigation lay on 46 identified *in-house* offerings to discover whether fine art students were provided with additional programmes for their professional preparation. The analysis of specifications of in-house training programmes in the academic year 2013/14 and information requests show the following results, as summarised in Table 5.2-2 below:

- On average, more than every second HEI in the UK (42 out of 75) and every third in Germany (4 out of 12) offered entrepreneurial extracurricular courses, available for HEIs’ *students and graduates of all subjects*.

- Entrepreneurial and extracurricular courses or training programmes with particular focus on the needs of (fine) artists were not offered.

- Entrepreneurial trainings were an especially essential service at universities. Two thirds of universities in the UK sample (in total 32 out of 42 institutions with extra trainings) offered such training opportunities, while this proportion was much lower at further and higher education colleges (24%). The German sample explicitly includes universities.

- The most commonly offered course duration was one day (66% at UK HEIs and 75% at German HEIs). The courses were normally organised as workshops and seminars to a broad range of specific entrepreneurial and business-related topics, dominated by business venturing and business plan writing. However, other topics such as self-employment, finance and funding, (online) marketing, intellectual property law, business management, project management in the creative industries, customer acquisition, managing creativity, self-promotion and concept presentations were also among the offerings.

- The one-day courses were by and large free of charge for students and graduates, while courses with durations between three and five days were normally fee-based.

- The vast majority of UK HEIs offered more than 10 of those extracurricular courses in the 2013/14 academic year. In Germany, two out of the four universities with extracurricular offerings provided more than 10 courses in the 2013/14 academic year.
• These courses were organised and managed centrally either by the HEIs' enterprise and business development teams, including university incubators (UK: 37 out of 42 HEIs; GER: 50%, business faculty) or by the career service departments (UK: 13%; GER: 50%). The art departments or faculties did not organise them at all.

• Fine art students normally do not attend the offered extracurricular business and entrepreneurship courses. The reasons were not identified in the context of this study. However, in accordance to Fenton et al. (2013) it is to assume that neither students nor graduates really consider themselves as entrepreneurs. In addition they will not be adequately addressed with a unified, standardised, one-size-fits-all approach to entrepreneurship education by business schools that likely fails to recognise the heterogeneity of art and other non-business students' needs and demands.

Table 5.2-2: KPI "Extra Entrepreneurship", Results of In-house Extra Trainings; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of HE institutions with business-/entrepreneurial-related courses (in-house)</td>
<td>42 (54.67%)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof Universities</td>
<td>32 (80%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof University Colleges</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof Further &amp; Higher Education Colleges</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KPI "Extra Entrepreneurship" (indicative number of internal courses per academic year)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 courses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 courses</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Duration (in days)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 days</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof against payment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 days</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof against payment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 days</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof against payment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price per Course (in GBP/EUR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>250 GBP</td>
<td>150 EUR (~120 GBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>690 GBP</td>
<td>1,500 EUR (~1,200 GBP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organised and managed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Service Dpt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise and Business Development Team (Incubator/Business School)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The exact number of courses for the academic year 2013/14 could not be identified because the complete course schedule for the academic year was not available. Therefore, the number of published courses over the next six months were taken into consideration in order to make a projection for the entire academic year. This number is therefore only an indication! The exact number has no considerable influence on the study! The aim is to show a trend in offering entrepreneurial-related extra trainings.

** The reference unit "days" is not exact and probably misleading. Some courses were organised for several days with a workload of only 1-3 hours per day, while several one-day courses had a higher workload of hours in total. The courses' exact workloads were not available.

Source: Author's own calculation
The findings show a relatively clear picture that fine art undergraduates, particularly at universities in the UK, had attractive opportunities to attend mostly one-day free workshops and seminars with entrepreneurial topics. However, these courses were not managed by art faculties or departments. In Germany, entrepreneurial extra-courses were only offered by universities’ career service departments, while the Kunsthochschulen specialised in art did not provide extra trainings at all.

At this point, the dilemma in entrepreneurship education, as already revealed by Fenton et al. (2013), has to be highlighted again. Although entrepreneurship trainings are available, they do not seem to attract art students, even not prospective business fine artists or prospective arts entrepreneurs. Arts entrepreneurship was neither embedded in the regular fine art curriculum nor in extra trainings. These findings allow one to assume that arts entrepreneurship education was barely available and embedded in HEIs’ curriculum for the academic year 2013/14. This assumption was empirically confirmed through the findings of the lecturer survey (Appendix D). The lecturers in fine arts were asked whether (fine) art specific training programmes in entrepreneurship had already been implemented. Their answers provided a clear picture for both countries: The vast majority of respondents (98 out of 136 participants in the UK and 40 out of 61 lecturers in Germany) answered that question in the negative, as illustrated in Figure 5.2-5 below.
Besides extracurricular offerings in entrepreneurship, post-graduate degrees (masters degrees) in Arts Management and Arts Entrepreneurship were further alternatives for developing entrepreneurial skills at HEIs. The analysis of 55 master’s degree programmes offered at the 87 analysed HEIs in the academic year 2013/14 reveals three key results (see also Appendix H):

- Every university and university college in the UK, a total of 49 HEIs, offered master’s degree programmes for fine art graduates, while only every second HEI (in total 6) offered a master’s programme in Germany.
- Three out of 49 offered masters programmes in the UK focused on ‘Entrepreneurship for Creatives’ with an average proportion of ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills on the total workload (KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness”) of 33%,
while four programmes focused on ‘Arts Management’ with an average KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness” of 17.8%. However, the highest proportion with 42 masters programmes was in ‘Fine Art’ (also including ‘Art & Design’ and ‘Contemporary Arts’) with an average “Entrepreneurial Fitness” KPI of 10.1%. Five out of 12 German HEIs offered masters programmes in ‘Fine Art’ (so-called Bildende Kunst) with an average “Entrepreneurial Fitness” KPI of 6.8%, while one institution offered a Masters in Curatorial Studies with an intense focus on arts management with a proportion of entrepreneurial skills on the total workload of 20%.

- The UK masters degrees offered in ‘Entrepreneurship for Creatives’ and ‘Arts Management’ were solely taught by the art faculties/departments. A cross-disciplinary master’s programme for fine art graduates failed to exist. Consequently, the masters programmes provided the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills on average to a considerably higher extent than the average programmes for undergraduates, even though some of the ‘five plus two’ skills were still missing in the curriculum, similar to the courses for undergraduates. The idea of spending an extended time for studying for a master’s degree to have the time and space to develop the ‘five plus two’ skills, as concluded earlier in section 5.1.4, could be a promising one, particularly for graduates with commercial motivations.

The key findings on the analysis of offered master programmes in both sample groups in the academic year 2013/14 are illustrated in the Table 5.2-3 below.
Table 5.2-3: Master Programmes for Fine Art Graduates;
Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of HEIs with Master's programmes in their Art Department/Faculty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof Universities / Kunsthochschulen</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof University Colleges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof Further &amp;Higher Education Colleges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HEIs with Master's programmes in Fine Art (incl. Art &amp;Design, Photography, Contemporary Arts)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HEIs with Master's programmes in Arts Management /Curatorial Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HEIs with Master's programmes in Entrepreneurship for Creative Practice, Business and Creativity or Creativity and Enterprise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Proportion &quot;five plus two&quot; Entrepreneurial Skills to Total Workload (in %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Fine Art</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Arts Management/ Curatorial Studies</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Entrepreneurship for Creatives</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own calculation

5.2.1.2.3 Offered Learning Environment and Applied Teaching Methods

The analysis of course programmes reveals that in both countries studio practice and self-study were the most often provided learning environments to transfer basic knowledge to subject-specific issues and employability. The use of formal lectures, small-sized workshops, compulsory work placements, guest lectures, individual and group tutorials which allow the development of an entrepreneurial mindset were also scheduled to a great extent. HEIs definitely provided a broad variety of learning environments and teaching methods enabling the successful development of entrepreneurial skills, as discussed in section 3.1.5.2.3.

However, 204 fine art lecturers were asked about the use or intended integration of modern teaching methods exclusively enabling real-life simulation learning into the regular fine art curriculum. Many of them preferred the use of simulation games as possible means to adjust the current fine art curriculum towards more market orientation and entrepreneurship, as mentioned in section 5.2.1.2.1 above. Lecturers’ responses are illustrated in Table 5.2-4.
Table 5.2-4: Lecturer Survey: Used and Intended Teaching Methods in Fine Art Curriculum; Findings in UK (upper section) and Germany (lower section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>already implemented</th>
<th>in preparation</th>
<th>in principle conceivable but no plans for preparation</th>
<th>currently unimaginable</th>
<th>evaluation is not possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>real-life simulation (role-playing games)</td>
<td>25 (18%)</td>
<td>17 (12%)</td>
<td>83 (60%)</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case studies</td>
<td>124 (90%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;learning from peers&quot; (students teach students)</td>
<td>125 (90%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning methods</td>
<td>38 (27%)</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>66 (47%)</td>
<td>18 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal mentoring</td>
<td>59 (42%)</td>
<td>31 (22%)</td>
<td>39 (28%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: "Can you imagine implementing the following teaching methods in the regular fine art curriculum to develop entrepreneurial skills of your students?" (number of mentions; response rate: 21.3%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>already implemented</th>
<th>in preparation</th>
<th>in principle conceivable but no plans for preparation</th>
<th>currently unimaginable</th>
<th>evaluation is not possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>real-life simulation (role-playing games)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>37 (57%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (18%)</td>
<td>n=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case studies</td>
<td>32 (49%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>12 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (18%)</td>
<td>n=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;learning from peers&quot; (students teach students)</td>
<td>37 (57%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>20 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>n=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning methods</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>38 (58%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
<td>n=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal mentoring</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>35 (54%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>n=65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own calculation

According to the survey findings, real-life simulation methods were definitely neither widely implemented in the regular fine art curriculum of HEIs in the UK and Germany nor in concrete preparation for implementation in the near future. This kind of teaching would only have a positive impact when higher education institutions think about adjusting their
regular fine art curricula towards more market preparation and entrepreneurship. In addition, e-learning methods were also scantily in use. They could be beneficial to help lecturers to create new temporal space for teaching and mentoring and provide more personalised learning and student interaction, for instance, through project work or simulation games (Quade and Schlüter, 2017). E-learning methods allow self-paced learning at any time and at any location that help increase student engagement, motivation, and attendance.

The reasons for not considering real-life and e-learning methods are diverse and justified either in the institutions' strategic aims in general, in the intended learning outcomes of fine art education in particular, or in a lack of entrepreneurially educated teaching staff, or simply in the related costs and time requirements of implementing these methods. Such questions will later be answered with the help of the findings on the institutional level.

5.2.1.2.4 KPI “Compulsory Work Experience”

Work placements and internships provide fine art undergraduates with the chance to gain important practical experience in the real working world outside HEI studios. While work placements can enhance students’ employability and entrepreneurial skills, it also helps them to find out more about working in that industry. In this context, only compulsory work placements were of interest for further analysis on account of two aspects: firstly, compulsory work placements are a much stronger commitment of HEIs to their students (than optional placements) in order to gain practical experience and develop crucial skills alongside their studio work. Secondly, and more important for this analysis, the time and length of compulsory work placements are clearly regulated by the curriculum. This fact eases the analysis and comparison of KPIs considerably. However, the presence of optional work placements in the regular fine art curricula was taken into account for information purposes.

The analysis of course material and information requests shows that only a minority of degree programmes had integrated compulsory work placements; the vast majority of them facilitated only optional placements, as illustrated in Figure 5.2-6.
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Figure 5.2-6: Provided Work Placements, Regular Fine Art Curricula; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

Source: Author’s own calculation

As outlined in Figure 5.2-6 above, only 12 out of 75 UK HEIs (16%) provided compulsory work placements, while this proportion was higher (one third) at German institutions (4 out of 12 HEIs), half of which half provided internships of up to six months. The vast majority of 71% UK HEIs, however, provided work placements and internships as an optional part of the regular fine art curriculum. Almost every tenth UK HEI did not implement any work placements into their curricula.

The periods of compulsory placements varied from two to twelve weeks. Internships, though, lasted much longer. At German HEIs, they were considered practical semesters and usually lasted between four to six months. That depended on the art sector and individual employer. Internships or practical semesters were not compulsory parts of the regular fine art curricula at UK HEIs.

The length of work placements was additionally illustrated as a key performance indicator. The KPI “Compulsory Work Placement” was calculated as the ratio between the number of weeks of compulsory work placement to the total number of course weeks (total course duration). As a result, this KPI shows the proportion as a percentage of compulsory work placements to the total length of the course. The academic year was calculated at 30 weeks without vacations in accordance with InternationalStaff (2013),
The difficulty of practising fine artists in making a living: Why arts entrepreneurship education is important

Chapter 5 Research Findings

The University of Edinburgh (2013), and University College London (2013). Considering this, Table 5.2-5 provides an overview of the key findings.

Table 5.2-5: KPI “Compulsory Work Placement”, Regular Fine Art Curricula; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of HE institutions (sample)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HE institutions with compulsory work placements in regular fine art curriculum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in %) thereof Universities</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof University Colleges</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thereof Further &amp; Higher Education Colleges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI “Compulsory Work Experience”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in % of course duration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (simple average of HEI with compulsory work placements)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own calculation

With regard to these findings, there are some reasonable concerns that the vast majority of fine art undergraduates were able to develop entrepreneurial skills only via compulsory work placements:

- Firstly, the proportion of HEIs that integrated compulsory work placements into their regular fine art curriculum was relatively low. Only 16% of UK HEIs and 33% of German institutions established compulsory placements as (key) element of their art education. However, the majority of UK HEIs (71%) provided optional work placements instead.

- Secondly, the usual ‘short term’-placements of two to three weeks are too short in time to gain practical experience and develop an entrepreneurial mindset and skills. First time placements in particular, where student and employer/individual artist do not know each other (well), will require some time for both sides to get familiar with each other. Usually, first time ‘placed’ students need to watch the employer/individual artist at work in order to get familiar with processes and behaviour first. Then, after a certain period of acclimatisation, students will be tasked with greater support services and more independently complex activities.
Consequently, the ratio between the periods of acclimatisation to the length of placement is relevant for students’ skill development. The higher the ratio, the slimmer chances are to develop real-life experience and entrepreneurial skills.

- The third point of concern is related to the selection process and availability of adequate employers/individual artists. Chances to develop entrepreneurial skills are likely to be higher when the employers/individual artists themselves are actively and successfully involved in entrepreneurial activities. Successful artists and employers, however, are very much in demand. This underpins a basic uncertainty in the availability of those placements for all students. Usually art organisations and successful artists require a formal application as means to select applicants, detailing why the student is suitable for this specific placement and what he/she can bring to the role.

Applying for a work placement can be as competitive as applying for a permanent job with many organisations now holding formal interview and/or assessment centre days. Hence, the difficulty in securing a work placement is a pressing problem, as addressed by Comfort and Bonaventure (2012). With this in mind, only a few students might be able to find a placement with successful artists, while many others need to look for ‘second-best solutions’ that in turn might not be adequate enough to help to gain practical experience and develop the required skills.

There might be further points of concern. One of the best training environments for fine art students wishing to pursue a professional and entrepreneurial career is still available with successful practising fine artists themselves. Established practising artists could act as mentors for the real working life of emerging practising fine artists. Their valuable experience would be a ‘gold mine’ for any fine art student, particularly for those who want to ‘proof’ their ideas for an arts business. Students could best learn how to ‘move and behave’ the best way. Due to these facts, it is to recommend that fine art students, who particularly aim to make a living as practising artists, look for (optional) placements with successful business fine artists or even galleries. The greatest challenge, still, will be their availability and access for work placements.
5.2.1.2.5 KPI “Real-Life Experienced Lecturers”

As outlined in the literature, the success of developing some of the ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills provided by HEIs in fine art curriculum and post-graduate degrees (see section 5.2.1.2.1 above) depends to a great degree on the quality of the teaching staff. A well-qualified teacher is able to achieve more entrepreneurial learning outcomes with poor programme content than poorly qualified teachers could do with a good programme. This is why it was of further interest to know whether and to what extent members of teaching staff in fine art courses were experienced in real-life working as practising artist.

According to the course documents, publications on the HEIs’ websites, answers provided to information requests, and finally to the findings of the conducted survey among fine art lecturers, all lecturers were practising artists and experienced in self-organisation, across all institutions in both sample groups. The KPI “Real-life Experienced Lecturers”, which was calculated as a ratio of the number of practising artist lecturers to the total number of teaching lecturers in the regular fine art curriculum, was therefore set at figure one. Practical experience, according to some answers to information requests, was a required prerequisite to become a lecturer.

Practical experience, however, does not necessarily mean that lecturers were therefore entrepreneurially well-qualified, even familiar with teaching arts entrepreneurship or willing to teach it as integral part of their teachers’ self-understanding. The interesting aspect in this context was whether lecturers were qualified and trained to teach and develop entrepreneurial mindsets and skills. Additionally, it was interesting to know if they were entrusted by their faculties to teach arts entrepreneurship. The answers to these questions are provided in section 5.2.2.3 below as part of the findings on institutional level.

5.2.2 Findings on Institutional Level

To reveal the state and developmental potential of HEIs towards arts entrepreneurship, education-specific criteria were identified, as follows in the next sections.
5.2.2.1 Higher Education Institutions’ Mission, Governance, and Strategy

HEIs’ mission statement, corporate strategy, organisation design, and knowledge organisation were excellent criteria for the relevance of and commitment to its entrepreneurship education across all subjects. These criteria mainly define their entrepreneurial potential and were developed and expressed by the institutions’ top management and are therefore considered as binding orientation for the near future. The required information was documented in strategic, university, corporate, and institutional plans, or in annual reports on HEIs’ websites (see Appendix H for details).

5.2.2.1.1 Analysis of HEIs’ Mission, Governance, and Strategy

The analysis of HEIs’ missions and strategic objectives with regard to entrepreneurial education was conducted in two steps: In a first step, it started with a simple key word search. The institutions’ documents with regard to their mission statements, vision, and strategy were screened for the following terms: “self-employment”, “entrepreneur”, “entrepreneurship”, “entrepreneurial skills”, and “enterprising skills”.

- Although all 75 institutions in the UK published their mission statements online, only 64 of them made their current strategic objectives known as part of their government policy. In Germany, none of the twelve institutions in the sample revealed their strategies.
- Eight out of the 64 institutions in the UK mentioned one or more of the above listed terms in the context of their strategic objectives and mission statements; none in Germany.
- Seven German institutions explicitly announced their self-understanding and/or mission to develop mature and responsible personalities with a high level of individuality and creativity. Strategic documents and annual reports were not published by German HEIs, which is why they are excluded from any further investigation.

In a second step, the documents of the 64 institutions in the UK were investigated in more depth with regard to their content-related strategic statements.

- The investigation reveals that the primary strategic objective of the vast majority of UK HEIs (55 out of 64) was to explicitly ensure graduate employability in order to serve communities’ and employers’ needs and progress. This objective was
especially the core mission for colleges, although most investigated universities also stressed graduate employability as their most important performance outcome – as already expressed and shown earlier in the context of HEIs' intended learning outcome (see section 5.2.1.1 for details). According to their strategy documents, this objective was mainly achieved by high-quality teaching, practice-based student experiences, excellence in research, and close partnerships with communities and industry partners (employers). Another 4 out of 64 institutions defined their primary strategic objective in developing a reputation as worldwide leaders in research and teaching.

• Only 5 out of 64 institutions (8%) included entrepreneurship as a strategic aim in their strategy documents, two of which were art colleges. These institutions mentioned entrepreneurial student and staff experiences and opportunities as institutional objectives of highest relevance across the campus within the next years. Being entrepreneurial did not mean, in their understanding, that graduates automatically set up their own businesses. These institutions obviously were strategically focused on developing an entrepreneurial mindset with appropriate skills. They gave their students access to environments to gain entrepreneurial experience, and they encourage staff and students to create innovative ideas for integrating entrepreneurial attitude and skills as well as an entrepreneurial teaching and learning environment into the academic curriculum.

Graduate employability clearly dominated the missions and strategic orientation of the majority of investigated HEIs. Essentially, art graduates’ employability could mean both the ability to maximise art students' potential to progress as professionals in a salaried employed or self-employed environment, for example, as practising artist. However, and this is quite an interesting finding, the analysis of ‘graduate employability’ as the main strategic objective brought to light that the institutions defined this term in a relatively narrow sense. 42 out of 55 UK institutions explicitly regarding graduate employability as their main strategic objective saw their expertise in delivering the skilled workforce required by employers from every industrial sector as their most relevant educational contribution. The remaining 13 UK institutions preferred a more ‘inter-disciplinary’ approach by also considering enterprising skills as important educational factor in the
curriculum to equip graduates of all subjects for the world of work with the best possible set of skills, including both employability and enterprising/entrepreneurial skills.

### 5.2.2.1.2 Analysis of HEIs’ Organisation Design

The analytical criterion that is *organisation design* enabled an insight into the levels of the decentralisation of decision making and responsibility for strategies and operations. A decentralised and largely autonomous organisation is considered more suitable to manage uncertainty and a complex environment than are centralised organisations (Gibb and Haskins, 2014). An entrepreneurially oriented education institution should, argue Gibb and Haskins (2014), operate in a decentralised environment to make the most appropriate decisions for its different subjects, interests, and needs. The survey among fine art lecturers reveal the following findings, as illustrated in Tables 5.2-6 and 5.2-7 below.

#### Table 5.2-6: Lecturer Survey: Organisation Design; Findings in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. … recruiting full-time lecturers?</td>
<td>104 (77%)</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. … using innovative teaching methods in the regular fine art curriculum?</td>
<td>118 (87%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. … making adjustments to the regular fine art curriculum?</td>
<td>111 (82%)</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. … engaging with stakeholders?</td>
<td>107 (80%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. … collaborating with other faculties to create art specific training programmes?</td>
<td>108 (80%)</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>13 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. … acquiring alumni as mentors for art students?</td>
<td>100 (74%)</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. … acquiring other practising artists as mentors for art students?</td>
<td>86 (64%)</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
<td>28 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. … art department’s / faculty’s funding?</td>
<td>31 (23%)</td>
<td>65 (48%)</td>
<td>39 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author’s own calculation*
Participating fine art lecturers made clear their tendency of decentralised decision making processes and responsibilities in regards to curriculum, recruiting staff, and engaging with stakeholders, including the integration of alumni and other practising artists as guest lecturers and mentors into the teaching process. The area of the department's/faculty's funding seemed, however, to be the responsibility of a centralised department or office. This is not really surprising due to the fact that especially universities and colleges focused on various subjects need to ensure funding of the whole institution in order to provide a broad curriculum and high quality teaching. The educational organisation in Fine Art was different in Germany since subjects of various art disciplines were mostly separated from the curriculum that universities usually offer. These subjects were the focus of so-called *Kunsthochschulen* with their different art departments and faculties.

Table 5.2-7: Lecturer Survey: Organisation Design; Findings in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ... recruiting full-time lecturers?</td>
<td>49 (82%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ... using innovative teaching methods in the regular fine art curriculum?</td>
<td>50 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ... making adjustments to the regular fine art curriculum?</td>
<td>53 (88%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ... engaging with stakeholders?</td>
<td>49 (82%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ... collaborating with other faculties to create art specific training programmes?</td>
<td>47 (78%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ... acquiring alumni as mentors for art students?</td>
<td>50 (83%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ... acquiring other practising artists as mentors for art students?</td>
<td>50 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ... art department's / faculty's funding?</td>
<td>34 (57%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own calculation
With regard to the organisation design, the surveyed art departments and faculties in both countries exhibited a high level of decentralisation. The organisational prerequisite for an ‘entrepreneurial department’, according to Gibb and Haskins (2014), was fulfilled.

5.2.2.1.3 Analysis of HEIs’ Knowledge Organisation

The criterion of knowledge organisation deals with the level of the disciplinary nature of HEIs or interaction between established disciplines to foster a culture of entrepreneurship.

According to the findings related to art departments’/faculties’ willingness to collaborate with other HEI departments, as described in Tables 5.2-6 and 5.2-7 above, an interdisciplinary teaching and learning approach in the arts was basically and easily possible. The majority of surveyed art departments were independent in their decision making and responsibility to create multi- or inter-disciplinary training programmes for their students. However, as two key findings in this context already indicated, a multi- or inter-disciplinary teaching approach has hardly been realised:

- As the findings on a course level with regard to the KPI “Extra-Entrepreneurship” clearly show, interdisciplinary modules or trainings to transfer business knowledge or to develop entrepreneurial skills were seldom offered. Due to this, it is reasonable to assume that a multi- or inter-disciplinary teaching approach, at least with the business school, seems not to exist or only at a very modest level.

- Additionally, the survey findings among fine art lecturers, as presented in Chapter 5, section 5.2.1.2, show a clear need for both adjustments of the current regular fine art curriculum towards more market orientation and entrepreneurship education and tailor-made training programmes for fine artists due to lacking offers. The majority of participating lecturers in both countries demand deeper exchange of knowledge and experience in further subjects for their fine art students. They implicitly recommend a multi-disciplinary teaching approach, which in turn likely means that such an approach has not yet been implemented in fine art education.

It can be summarised for the first area of institutional analysis that art departments and faculties in both countries were mostly managed with a high level of decentralisation. However, little to no entrepreneurial orientation or commitment was recognised, neither in
the institutions’ mission statements and strategic documents nor in recently adopted multi-disciplinary teaching and learning approaches.

5.2.2.2 Higher Education Institutions’ Stakeholder Engagement

The second area on the institutional level deals with the aspect of using external skills and experiences to develop (art) students entrepreneurially. The following Figure 5.2-7 provides an overview of the different key stakeholders of HEIs, adapted from Gibb and Haskins (2014).

Figure 5.2-7: Key Stakeholders of HEIs

Source: Adapted from Gibb and Haskins (2014, p. 20)

With these key stakeholders in mind, it is of particular interest to experience whether, how, and to what extent the art departments/faculties of the investigated 87 HEIs engaged with and integrated the stakeholders of the groups framed in red into their regular fine art curriculum for other than study visits and work placements. These include local, regional, and national (business) fine artists or arts entrepreneurs, as well as industry or business experts (business/employers), fine art graduates (alumni), experts of development agencies, and lecturers of other faculties.

For measuring stakeholder engagement, the two KPIs “Guest Lectures” and “Mentoring” were utilised. Particularly mentoring is considered as very effective means to develop entrepreneurial skills and an entrepreneurial mindset (see section 3.2.2.1.3.2 for...
more details with regard to the crucial services in professional preparation of business fine artists in incubation programmes). The analysis of programme specifications and answers to information requests demonstrates the following results:

- The majority of HEIs in both samples (65 out of 75 HEIs in the UK and 10 out of 12 institutions in Germany) provided guest lecture programmes.

- The mean number of guest lectures in the academic year 2013/14 was 18 at UK HEIs. Calculating the academic year as 30 weeks, this figure meant that one regular guest lecture took place more than every second week on average. At German institutions, the mean was 10 visits of guest lecturers in the questioned academic year, meaning that one guest lecture took place every third week on average.

- 24 HEIs in the UK sample provided guest lectures every week on average, while the maximum frequency at German institutions was 15 visits per academic year, on average one visit every second week.

- Established regional and local artists were mainly invited as guest lecturers, while other industry experts, such as gallerists, art dealers, and collectors as well as employers and lecturers of other departments, were not employed as guest lecturers. Only 8 out of 75 UK institutions and none in Germany invited lecturers of other departments and other industry partners.

- 24 out of 75 investigated HEIs in the UK integrated a permanent mentoring programme into their regular fine art curriculum, while such a programme was not provided at any of the surveyed German institutions.

- On average, between 3 and 4 external artists worked as mentors in a one-year residency programme.

- Many lecturers answered information requests with regard to current mentoring programmes by pointing out that they were already mentors for their students, which was why there was no additional need for an actual mentoring programme.

- The integration of graduates (alumni) as mentors into the regular fine art curriculum was made possible at 18 out of 75 UK institutions. In Germany, none of the
investigated institutions integrated alumni mentors into their fine art curriculum; one institution was, however, in preparation for that.

The findings are summarised as KPIs in Table 5.2-8.

Table 5.2-8: KPIs “Guest Lectures” and “Mentoring”, Regular Fine Art Curricula; Findings in UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI “Guest Lectures”</strong> (number of guest lectures in academic year 2013/14; 30 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HE institutions with a “Guest Lectures” Programme</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>30.00*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI “Mentoring”</strong> (number of permanent mentors in academic year 2013/14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HE institutions with a “Mentoring” Programme</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of HEIs with integrated “Alumni-Mentors” in Fine Art Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes / (in %)</td>
<td>18 / (24%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in preparation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own calculation

These findings show clear evidence that two stakeholder groups, mainly external artists and potential employers, were widely integrated into the fine art education process at HEIs in both countries. They are mostly integrated at UK institutions as guest lecturers and work placements but also to a minor extent as mentors. Particularly at German art institutions, the importance of mentors, even alumni mentors, was not taken into account as an educational element at all. Mentoring was, according to some given answers of surveyed lecturers, usually carried out by them in person due to their experience in self-organisation. This finding causes some concern relating to fine art students’ ability and opportunity to develop an entrepreneurial mindset and entrepreneurial skills. The relatively low presence of mentoring in arts education at HEIs allows one to assume that
fine art students, particularly those who want to develop an entrepreneurial mindset and some appropriate skills, have to forego the benefits of an excellent teaching and learning opportunity, since mentoring is considered one of the most effective and crucial teaching methods for developing entrepreneurial skills.

5.2.2.3 Higher Education Institutions' Entrepreneurship Education of Teaching Staff

As mentioned earlier in section 5.2.1.2.5 with regard to lecturers' real-life experience, the next ‘institutional area’ of entrepreneurship education is especially focused on initiatives of educating lecturers in teaching entrepreneurship. According to mentorship in the previous section it can be said that excellently trained staff in entrepreneurship is assumed to be more capable of increasing the quality of developing an entrepreneurial mindset and skills in their students compared to less trained lecturers. Art students could particularly benefit from effectively applied and prepared entrepreneurial teaching methods. The survey among fine art lecturers revealed in this context the following two key findings (see also Appendix D):

- Lecturers in fine art were not regularly trained in arts entrepreneurship education. 132 out of 137 participating lecturers in the UK (96%) and each of the 63 participating German lecturers (100%) said that they were not regularly trained in arts entrepreneurship education by their institutions.

- The vast majority of lecturers also did not look privately for external training opportunities to develop their teaching skills in arts entrepreneurship. Only a few lecturers, 16 out of 137 in the UK and 4 out of 63 in Germany, had shown private initiative and motivation to improve their teaching skills in arts entrepreneurship education externally.

Both findings show evidence that fine art lecturers in both countries were only marginally encouraged or trained in arts entrepreneurship education by their institutions, if even at all. HEIs did not seem to have either internal training programmes for the members of their teaching staff on hand or sincere interest in cooperating with external providers. The reasons for this may be complex and manifold. First and foremost, lecturers need to understand the need for arts entrepreneurship education in preparing art students to make a living as practising artists. If they do not bear this conviction in mind, arts
entrepreneurship education will be doomed from the start. This conviction, however, requires a paradigm shift from art for art's sake towards art for the market. Secondly, it is still unclear what is concretely meant by the term *arts entrepreneurship education*, as illustrated in detail in section 3.1.5.2.4. Considering this, it is simple to assert that lecturers do not really care about their teaching quality, but it should also be simple to accept the fact that concrete information on what arts entrepreneurship is about and how it can be taught is still missing. There may be further reasons why art lecturers have not experienced trainings in arts entrepreneurship education, as already discussed in section 3.1.5.2.4. As a consequence of this finding and of HEIs' self-understanding to provide excellence teaching quality, HEIs should conduct more research in this field, while lecturers should definitely be more encouraged by their institutions – and perhaps even awarded – to make use of external training opportunities.

### 5.2.2.4 Higher Education Institutions' Knowledge Transfer, Exchange and Support

It is common practice of HEIs to support entrepreneurial ideas and business concepts of their graduates through start-up centres and university-based incubation programmes. The fourth and last area of analysis on the institutional level poses therefore the question of whether HEIs offer supportive consulting, coaching, incubation, and financial services (similar to arts incubators; see section 3.2.2.1.3 for details) also to their fine art students and graduates, who show commercial motivations and aim to make a living as business artist or arts entrepreneur.

Considering this, the lecturers were asked about their institutions' supportive services, as illustrated in Figure 5.2-8.
These findings clearly illustrate that HEIs in both countries rarely offered any supportive services to fine art graduates. Only some few lecturers confirmed the existence of incubation services, such as personal and administrative on-site services or marketing. According to the survey of lecturers, a university-based arts incubation programme was hardly established.

Regarding the key findings on an institutional level, it can be concluded that the investigated HEIs and art departments were not strongly committed to arts entrepreneurship education. This is especially the case when considering the fact that graduates’ employability in the broader sense, meaning art students’ ability to work in-and outside the arts industry, is a primary objective in higher education. The vast majority of HEIs did not define entrepreneurship education of their students as a strategic objective or mission, nor did they strongly engage with the wide spectrum of stakeholders.

Figure 5.2-8: Lecturer Survey: Supportive Services to Fine Art Graduates; Findings in UK and Germany

Source: Author’s own calculation
in entrepreneurship education issues, nor did they encourage their teaching staff to attend entrepreneurship teaching training, and nor did they offer interdisciplinary art-specific trainings and additional support services for fine artists' professional preparation, as finally confirmed by the lecturers (Figure 5.2-9).

Figure 5.2-9: Lecturer Survey: Embedding of Entrepreneurial Engagement and Education; Findings in UK and Germany

Source: Author's own calculation

5.2.3 Conclusion

Section 5.2 addressed, as its second research aim, fine art students' professional preparation at HEIs. To achieve this aim, the strategies and course programmes in Fine Art of 87 HEIs were investigated. 87 regular fine art curricula for undergraduates, 55 post-graduate programmes in Fine Art, Arts Management and Arts Entrepreneurship, and 46 in-house entrepreneurial extracurricular trainings at HEIs were analysed with the help of key performance indicators (KPIs) as well as surveys among 204 fine art lecturers. The results show evidence that a systematic and institutional or art-faculty-driven education in
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arts entrepreneurship for fine art students hardly existed in the academic year 2013/14. The reasons were diverse:

- neither in the UK nor in Germany were HEIs strategically committed to an entrepreneurship education of their students across all subjects;
- a mere few of the ‘five plus two’ skills were taught (and to a very low extent) in the regular fine art curriculum;
- real-life simulation teaching methods were seldom implemented;
- only a few post-graduate programmes focused on arts management and entrepreneurship;
- extracurricular, in-house entrepreneurship trainings were not art-specific and poorly attended by fine art students; and
- fine art lecturers were not educated in arts entrepreneurship teaching.

The professional preparation and entrepreneurial development of fine art students who aim to make a living as practising artists strongly depends on the individual experience, engagement, willingness, and ability of lecturers to develop the entrepreneurial mindsets and skills. Although some important elements for an entrepreneurial learning environment were present, lecturers expected students not to be sufficiently prepared for the market challenges after graduation owing to missing entrepreneurial skills (Appendix D). The research provides two explanations for this discrepancy: First, the lecturers were caught in the curriculum with its focus on teaching employability skills besides professional and art-relevant skills so as to achieve the overall aim of graduates’ employability. That was confirmed by the research findings (see section 5.1). Second, the lecturers themselves were missing (parts of) the entrepreneurial skills required to teach arts entrepreneurship, as empirically shown in the context of the findings in this section.

As a consequence of these key findings and in the context of business fine artists’ challenging environment, it can be concluded that studying for a bachelor’s degree in fine arts at HEIs will not help to develop the skills and mindset required to successfully meet the various threats and external factors that affect business artists’ chances of professional success and income in the arts. This finding is therefore a major concern because education is considered the only key factor practising fine artists can develop and control to manage their professional career. This finding is additionally alarming with
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respect to the low returns art graduates can expect from their high investments in arts education at HEIs. Considering the labour market and income statistics as well as art graduates’ destinations, the enormous costs of education will hardly pay off. While such students and business artists need to seek alternative or at least supplementary training programmes, it is therefore urgently recommended that HEIs take the following into account:

• to reconsider the term ‘arts entrepreneurship’. It needs to be more clearly linked with the creative aspirations, since it is too closely associated with the business world. Although fine art students recognise the need for entrepreneurial skills, as research findings have shown in section 5.1.2, but it is not automatically part of their self-identity (see section 3.1.3.4.3 for arts entrepreneurs' motivations). It is in this context, for example, opportune to design real-life simulation courses, as wanted by lecturers (see section 5.2.1.2.3), where fine art students interested in arts entrepreneurship are given the opportunity to place their art and developed skills at the core of a created art business concept.

• to listen more to business fine art students’ demands and needs on how they define arts entrepreneurship for themselves. It is not to be expected that fine artists would like to become money- and business-driven entrepreneurs (see section 3.1.3.4.3) often presented to the public as examples of the flourish of high-tech and Internet industries. The majority of business fine artists including arts entrepreneurs is more expected to aim to make a living in the arts based on their intrinsic motivation to live out their passion. As this is the case, it could be sufficient for HEIs to actively attract business fine art students’ attention for their challenging and entrepreneurial business environment, as described in Chapter 3, section 3.2.

Given the pressure on HEIs to teach for employability it is incumbent upon undergraduate education to include real-life and work-related learning, as mentioned above. Developing an arts entrepreneurial mindset addresses this need. In this context, HEIs are recommended to help develop, among professional art-specific skills, an entrepreneurial mindset for undergraduates and skills to identify, create, and realise opportunities as a profound foundation for a professional or entrepreneurial career as a practising artist as well as for art graduates’
employability. As far as business oriented fine art students and graduates demand more entrepreneurial skills, post-graduate degrees, extracurricular and art-related trainings or external services should be actively promoted and provided by the career service departments or university-based incubators. Post-graduate students already have developed a fair understanding of their career opportunities and expressed their desire to develop entrepreneurial skills. In this case, the regular fine art curriculum for undergraduates needs only redesigned to systematically develop students’ entrepreneurial mindsets and opportunity skills. A total adjustment towards more arts entrepreneurship and market orientation, as often claimed by entrepreneurship researchers (e.g. Beckman), would then not be required.

- **do more in rewarding fine art lecturers for engaging with arts entrepreneurship education.** In this context, top management at HEIs should entrust their lecturers with the responsibility of equipping themselves in arts entrepreneurship teaching and to create and implement an entrepreneurial learning and teaching environment including real-life simulation teaching. HEIs should additionally reward their fine art lecturers for entrepreneurial means to develop the entrepreneurial mindsets and skills of their students since these abilities and skills also increase graduates’ chances of employment in other jobs. At least lecturers should be entrusted to teach arts entrepreneurship when they are able and willing to do it. Excellence in lecturers’ teaching quality and graduate employability, definitely including the ability to start entrepreneurial carriers successfully, could be a promising way for HEIs to distinguish themselves and attract new students. Therefore, entrepreneurship education of both lecturers and students should be an important part within universities’ strategic orientation, mission, and visions.

- **to do more in protecting and fulfilling key stakeholders’ interests.** It appears obvious that a negative outcome for any HEI stakeholder is given when fine art graduates feel compelled to abandon a professional and entrepreneurial career as practising artists due to a lack of the required entrepreneurial mindset and skills. This is already evident, as fine art graduates’ destinations explicitly show evidence (see section 3.2.2.3.5 for more details). Such an outcome would surely not help to increase the reputation of the HEI or the worth, merit, or value of professional arts...
degrees and programmes. On the contrary, systematic failure will likely devalue and demoralise (prospective) fine art students and be disadvantageous to the field of arts education with further effects on the nation’s creative arts industries and social wellbeing.

5.3 Investigation of Arts Incubation Business Models as a Means to Facilitate Business Fine Artists’ Professional and Entrepreneurial Career (Research Aim 3)

Based on the literature findings of Chapter 3, section 3.2.2.1.3, this section is dedicated to research on arts incubators. It focuses on both emerging business fine artists’ needs and demands for business support services and the analysis of business models of existent arts incubators worldwide, including their key stakeholders and related strategic objectives as well as their service spectrum. The research aims to identify the incubation programmes' capabilities to scale up their services to prepare large numbers of business fine artists for their professional and entrepreneurial careers in the arts worldwide.

5.3.1 Business Fine Artists’ Service Needs and Demands

The literature review highlighted the fact that an arts incubation programme should be designed according to its client artists’ needs so as to be attractive, effective, and above all successful in preparing its client artists to business artists and arts entrepreneurs (see section 3.2.2.1.3). As emerging business fine artists’ specific needs and demands with regard to supportive services have not been identified and analysed in previously published studies, the empirical analysis started with structured interviews conducted with nine practising emerging business fine artists (see Appendix C). Not all of them were represented by galleries, arts agencies, or any other individual experts or networks in the arts at the time of the survey, so they had to self-manage their professional lives. Due to the similarity of given answers to the structured questions from all interviewees, the principle of ‘empirical or scientific saturation’ was already applicable after the first four interviews; however, some more interviews were conducted for the sake of being robust.
In the following, the key findings relating to their needs and demands for professional support services are summarised and presented in categories (see also Appendix C).

5.3.1.1 Presentation of Key Interview Results by Categories

5.3.1.1.1 Artists’ Professional Aim and Current Ability to Make a Living in the Arts

The emerging fine artists were asked for the personal meaning of being able to make a living as a working artist. The answers of all nine interviewees were unambiguous and clearly showed that they are considered emerging business fine artists because they stated that making a living as working artist would be “very important” (interviewees #2, #4 and #6), “great” (interviewees #3 and #7), the “aim of being an artist” (interviewees #5, #8 and #9), or “a dream” (interviewee #1). Interviewee #2 stated in this context the necessity to earn at least a decent income in order to cover the daily cost of making art as well as to contribute to the economic situation of the family.

However, all nine interviewees stated that they were not able to make a living in the arts. Seven of them also mentioned not even being able to cover the cost of materials and exhibitions (interviewees #1, #2, #4, #5, #6, #7, and #8). That means that every exhibition would be a loss-making business for them.

5.3.1.1.2 Visibility and Market Presence

The nine emerging business fine artists were further asked about their individual status of being visible. All nine interviewees clearly stated to suffer from low visibility, owing to a lack of resources in time and funds for required exhibitions and due to a lack of market access through missing contacts and contracts with commercial galleries. The statements of interviewees #1, #5, #9, and #8 could be representative for this issue. Interviewee #1 said, "in order to improve visibility and market attention the required time, funds, and contacts are missing." Interviewee #9, who was more focused on an online presence, added that “online presence in the marketplace depends strongly on website position on Google. All this is very time-consuming; particularly marketing and networking activities suffer from less time spaces." Interviewee #8 claimed the need for “more funds to realise more exhibitions.” Interviewee #5 stressed the need for presenting at more quality exhibitions in order to attract awareness and visibility. The following statement could be typical for this group of respondents: “In order to increase the visibility of works
they need to be promoted at more and qualitative better exhibitions; the better the quality of an exhibition the more esteemed is the artist’s work quality and the better the audience’s quality” (interviewee #5).

Besides showing and promoting artwork to audiences at exhibitions, the interviewees additionally mentioned the opportunities for networking (7 mentions: interviewees #1, #3, #4, #6, #7, #8, and #9) and explaining their artworks to other artists to get feedback for their further improvement (5 mentions: interviewees #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7) as further reasons for attending exhibitions. Noteworthy but not surprising in this context is that those artists that look for feedback particularly want it from peers rather than gallerists or art buyers in order to improve themselves artistically and professionally. This motive indicates that artists regard their peers as a ‘core source’ of artistic competence and quality assessment. This is not really surprising when considering the fact that commercial intermediaries define quality differently by means of works’ saleability (see research findings in section 5.1.1). This raises the question whether and for what reasons galleries are needed, as discussed in section 5.3.1.1.3 below.

The artists were additionally asked about their assessments and requirements to work with specialised service providers in marketing who could help increase their visibility on the market. All nine artists were definitely open to the idea of using specialised service providers for increasing their visibility. However, all nine defined in this context some specific requirements that service providers have to meet in order to actually be valuable for them. The analysis of responses identified five different requirements, namely:

- “competence and reputation”,
- “sensitivity for an artist’s needs”,
- “trustful collaboration”,
- “availability”, and
- “affordability”.

The affordability of external services was mentioned by five artists (interviewees #3, #4, #6, #8, and #9). The requirement of having access to available service providers was mentioned once by interviewee #2 who stressed that “artists would feel more motivated when there were someone permanently fighting in their corner to increase their market value. Of importance is that the support is offered permanently and not only event-related
as galleries mostly do. Their marketing support should be stable.” Four artists emphasised the service provider’s competence and reputation as crucial (interviewees #1, #4, #5, and #7). The statement of Interviewee #4 could be representative: “I would like to be supported by professionals in marketing and promotional activities if they have already shown their competence and added value in the market – that is very important.” In this context, interviewee #4 additionally includes the fourth and fifth requirements on experts of being sensitive for an artist’s needs for a trustful collaboration, as illustrated in the statement that “these experts also need to be highly sensitive to artists’ real needs. They need to know the artist well as they need to know them to get a good feeling for a trustful collaboration. Additionally, the artist should have the final say.” The sensitivity for needs as well as trustful collaboration was mentioned by two artists (interviewees #4 and #5).

5.3.1.1.3 Artists’ Need for and Access to Galleries

As mentioned above the interviewed artists were therefore additionally asked about their access and motives to address galleries.

The key motives to be represented by a gallery were twofold: one group (5 mentions: interviewees #2, #3, #5, #6, and #8) wanted a gallery for covering the costs of marketing, promotional activities, and exhibitions. For example, interviewee #8 was clear in this by stressing to have a “lack of sufficient funds for marketing and exhibitions”, while interviewee #5 highlighted “time, cost coverage, and contacts” as key reasons for wanting a gallerist. The other group (4 mentions: interviewees #1, #2, #4 and #7) emphasised the need of a gallerist’s competence in knowing and approaching artists’ target audiences. Interviewee #7 stated in this context that a gallerist was needed to “promote my art to the right art buyers.” Interviewee #2 considered the value of a gallery by supporting “an adequate pricing depending on the target group.” One out of nine artists insisted not to need a gallerist at all due to his/her own online distribution channel and online exhibitions.

Since all nine interviewees were not represented by galleries, they were further asked about their assessment of attracting them. While one artist was focused on online sales and therefore not interested in attracting galleries (interviewee #9), all other eight artists agreed in their assessment that galleries are very difficult to attract. Interviewee #2 could
be representative for the other eight artists by saying that “it is difficult to get their time and attract them with your work if you do not have a history or pushy recommendations from collectors.” Interviewee #3 spoke of a “mystery” and added in this context that “the process of being discovered or found is hardly understood as gallerists want and expect you to be present and visible at specific events or exhibitions or to work with reputable institutions and organisations. That seems to be an interchanged reality.” Two mentions (interviewees #4 and #6) were related to the requirement of having to be “mainstream” in order to attract a gallerist. An “art style that is definitely not mainstream is not wanted” stated interviewee #4, for example. While these two artists seemed to consider their own potential input to a business relationship with galleries, two other fine artists were more externally focused on galleries’ potential input for a mutual business relationship, as they stated that “the gallerist has to have contacts to my target buyers, otherwise I do not need one” (interviewee #7) and “it is difficult to find a good gallerist who has the money, the important contacts, and finally the access to the relevant exhibitions” (interviewee #5).

The findings related to artists’ motives to address galleries show that newcomer or emerging artists do not have high expectations of establishing business relations to galleries due to a lack of funds to become visible for them. The lack of, or access to, funds seems to be the key to the vicious circle that keeps emerging artists captive in ‘darkness and poorness’. In this context, commercial galleries are mainly needed to cover cost for marketing and exhibitions and to build contacts to target audiences. If galleries cannot provide these added value services, they seem to become less important in artists’ view as stepping stones in their professional development.

5.3.1.1.4 On-site Mentoring

The literature findings in arts incubation indicate a clear value in mentoring programmes for the professional development of incubation clients. In order to validate this finding with regard to emerging fine artists, the interviewed artists were asked about their need and demand for on-site mentors. All nine fine artists mentioned their need for on-site mentors, e.g. for showing one “[...] the best way of living as a working artist” (interviewee #2), for “[...] setting targets and aiming consistently for their implementation [...] to become aware of processes, pitfalls, and making the right decisions, asking the right questions
and developing further in specific situations” (interviewee #3), or simply for becoming “[…] better and better” (interviewee #4). Others need mentors “[…] when specific demand is given” (interviewee #7) or in the context of presentations, high ranking exhibitions, and other marketing activities (interviewees #1, #5, #6, #8, and #9).

5.3.1.1.5 Meeting Artists (Networking)

Networking is among key services of incubation programmes in order to facilitate clients’ professional development by gathering feedback and sharing information, ideas, and knowledge. All of this was also mentioned by the interviewed nine artists. However, as the literature findings with regard to artists’ typical personality pattern have also been able to show (see section 3.1.4), networking is not a self-functioning phenomenon. It usually requires stimulating impulses and a kind of extroversion. This is of relevance because working artists are mainly organised as one-person businesses and often introverted. Artists usually work for themselves, often excluded and isolated from others and rarely in teams or small groups. Due to this, the artists were asked about their currently experienced challenges in networking. This question aimed to identify ways and means to stimulate artists’ interactions. Only four out of nine artists could define their individual obstacles in networking. Three of them (interviewees #4, #5 and #9) mentioned a lack of time for being on the Internet or meeting others in person. The fourth artist (interviewee #3) preferred to have only contact to personally known artists, which was why other artists had not been contacted at all so far.

These findings signify a huge dilemma for emerging fine artists to make a living in the arts. On the one hand, networking is a considered key factor for professional success, as identified in literature (see section 3.1.5.2.2.2) and confirmed in the context of this study’s research (see section 5.1.3). On the other hand, artists would like to have contacts to peers and other people, mainly in order to exchange ideas and get feedback on the quality of works. But they mention suffering from a lack of time for networking and are often simply not able to network due to their introverted and secluded life. This finding is reasonable in the context of the interview findings, illustrated above in section 5.3.1.1.2 as further reasons for exhibitions under the category “visibility”. Artists try to take advantage of the opportunity for networking while at exhibitions when not involved in a creative art-making process. This could in turn mean that artists accepted for an
incubation programme would only do networking when there is a reason to ‘interrupt’ their creative art-making process. Those reasons for interruptions could be, to suggest a few, workshops and trainings, coffee breaks, incubator exhibitions, and regular ‘ideas and knowledge’ days where artists and mentors meet to discuss specific topics of interest.

5.3.1.1.6 Administrative Work

Another category was defined by asking the artists about their work activities outside of the creative art-making process, such as market research, tax, legal, insurance, funding, and pension issues. Their responses led to the formation of three sub-categories including “meaning”, “workload”, and “existent support”.

- **Meaning:** All artists signalised negative emotions with administrative work, showing negative facial expressions or expressing words like “terrible!” (interviewee #4) or “necessary evils” (interviewee #3). As reasons, the interviewed artists declared administrative work as a loss of creative time (7 mentions; interviewees #1, #2, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #9) and “a bother” (interviewee #4).

- **Workload:** Asked about the average workload of administrative work they had, their responses varied between absolute and relative figures. Two artists said to have reserved one fixed day per week (interviewee #3) or three to five days per month (interviewee #6) only for administrative tasks. The other seven artists estimated their workloads of up to 50 percent and more (5 mentions; interviewees #1, #2, #4, #5, #7, #8, and #9). As the exact identification of the average workload is not that relevant for this study, however, the indicated workload of up to 50 percent for uncreative tasks filled with negative emotions provides an interesting insight into artists’ daily working life.

- **Existential support:** Subsequently, the artists were asked whether they received support in managing their administrative tasks. Only two of the interviewed nine artists claimed to have support from family members, usually life partners (interviewees #2 and #7). The other seven artists had no support whatsoever.

The interview findings in this category demonstrate that administrative work seems to be done more or less half-heartedly with a reluctant attitude because of its uncreative nature. However, this circumstance is of relevance for emerging fine artists’ chances to
increase their visibility. On one hand, the average workload for administrative tasks was estimated at up to 50%. This means that these artists use only 50% of their time for creative art-making! On the other hand, some administrative work could have an important impact on their visibility. For example, creating attractive invitations and lists of people for exhibitions or e-mailing interested peoples in the arts. Although this work has an uncreative touch in artists' view, it should be done with due diligence.

There seems to be a significant need and demand by artists for a ‘Personal Assistant’. Unlike the usual business administrative services of business incubators that provide infrastructure services, such as telephone and mailing services or office equipment, the service Personal Assistant is supposed to help to individually free artists from time-consuming administrative tasks in order to increase their time resources for the creative art-making process. Therefore, the service Personal Assistant would be a totally new understanding of business administration services in modern incubation for creative entrepreneurs. In the following, artists were asked about their opinions on this service opportunity.

5.3.1.1.7 Personal Assistant (PA)

The artists were asked about their attitude on employing a Personal Assistant (PA), about the tasks a PA could free them of, and their requirements for a PA. Three different sub-categories ensued from this: “meaning”, “tasks”, and “requirements for a PA”.

- **Meaning**: All nine artists were very open-minded about this idea.
- **Tasks**: Asked about specific tasks that could be “outsourced” to the PA, the artists offered a wide spectrum, depending on their individual needs for support. Most often mentioned (5 mentions; interviewees #3, #4, #7, #8, and #9) was the need for “marketing” support by a PA, including sales preparations. The next most often mentioned tasks were “networking” and “event/exhibition organisation” (3 mentions each from the same interviewees #5, #6 and #8). The outsourcing of all administrative tasks to a PA was mentioned by two artists (interviewees #1 and #2). Mentioned once in each case were all of “search for working and exhibition spaces” (interviewee #4), “market research” (interviewee #5), “shipping preparations” (interviewee #9), and “tax declaration” (interviewee 4).
• **Requirements for a PA:** Four out of nine interviewed artists declared their requirements for a Personal Assistant. Similar to the mentioned requirements for service providers (see section 5.3.1.1.2) and on-site mentors, they demanded a personal relationship of trust and sensitivity (2 mentions; interviewees #3 and #5) that is affordable (1 mentions; interviewee #8) and quickly and easily accessible (1 mentions, interviewee #2).

Consequently, the findings in the last two categories mean that PAs are urgently needed. This could be an interesting opportunity for arts incubators to work closely together with fine art students in their early years of study in the context of (compulsory or optional) work placements (see section 5.2.1.2.4 for more details related to the need for work placements in developing entrepreneurial skills). By supporting client artists as PAs, fine art students could learn a fair deal of what it means to be a working artist or even an arts entrepreneur at the very beginning of their own professional development. They would also be able to develop an entrepreneurial mindset over time in this context.

**5.3.1.1.8 Artists’ Ideas for further Services**

The artists were additionally asked about their ideas for further services that would ease their daily working life and free them from ‘exhausting’ tasks and restrictions in time and funds. The search support for affordable working and exhibition spaces was mentioned three times by interviewees #1, #4 and #6. Support in online marketing was mentioned by two artists (interviewees #8 and #9). Interviewees #9 and #2 further mentioned the coverage of shipping costs as an important support, while interviewee #9 was looking for additional support in search engine and webpage optimisation. Sales support was mentioned twice by interviewees #3 and #7. Outsourcing art-related craftworks such as preparing canvases was mentioned as possible support by interviewee #5 because these tasks become increasingly difficult and sophisticated with increasing age.

**5.3.1.1.9 Conclusion**

In principle, the interview findings signify the need and demand for visibility services because being visible seems to be the key for emerging business fine artists’ chances to make and sustain a living in the arts. This finding is confirmed by lecturers’ and students’ survey findings (see section 5.1.1). Increased visibility is to achieve by regular (incubator)
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exhibitions in association with targeted marketing and promotional activities directed towards appropriate audiences. In order to enable and stimulate networking activities, artists need to be skilled in networking and freed from time constraints. This could be achieved by providing them with a Personal Assistant (PA) responsible for taking care of administrative work which artists feel unmotivated or too exhausted to do themselves. Unlike most administrative services offered in incubation programmes including mainly the provision of office equipment and basic administrative tasks such as telephone service or emailing, PAs are more integrated into artists’ daily working lives, which represents a chance for fine art students to gain the real-life working experience they often lack during their studies at HEIs (see section 5.2.1.2.3 for research details). In order to stimulate artists’ sales activities and income flow, the incubator provides (together with strategic partners) purchase financing services including art leasing, art renting, buy-back options, or traditional zero percent rates. Furthermore, the availability of affordable working and exhibition spaces is demanded by artists. This could be achieved by providing either physical facilities or online agency services. All in all, emerging business fine artists particularly need services and access to resources in the fields of:

- visibility,
- networking,
- education,
- building of target audiences (market access),
- time and funds, and
- facilities.

5.3.2 Analysis of Arts Incubators’ Business Models

The following analysis of available arts incubator business models was undertaken in order to show whether artists’ specific needs were adequately addressed by arts incubators and to identify the key strengths and weaknesses in their business models with regard to the opportunities for scaling up their services to a higher number of client artists who aim to make a living in the arts as working artist regardless of their locations.

The analysis was based on Essig’s (2014a) empirical findings. In the context of this research, her analysis on the United States was extended to arts incubators around the
globe. The particular research focus was on arts incubators’ delivery of services demanded and needed by artists, their geographic business focus and reach as well as their restrictions on increasing the number of supervised client artists.

### 5.3.2.1 Basic Findings
The sample size of this analysis includes 92 arts incubators in total (see Appendix I). 60 out of 92 entities were located in the US, followed by 11 entities in the UK, four each in Hungary and Germany, three in Sweden, and the remaining nine entities in other European countries, Asia, Canada, and New Zealand. Concerning their claimant stakeholders, 33 out of 92 entities were considered arts incubators in the strict sense of Essig’s typology (Essig, 2014a), as already illustrated above in Table 4.4-6 in section 4.4.7. According to this investigation, arts incubation was clearly dominated in quantity by the United States, followed by the UK in second place with a clear lead over other European countries and Asia. As already illustrated by Essig (2014a), most arts incubators were community-focused on their primary objectives and introduced as tools of public policy (42 out of 92 arts incubators). However, this research shows that the proportion of incubation programmes with a clear focus on artists’ development and on having artists as claimant stakeholders was, compared to the total number of arts incubators, considerably smaller.

### 5.3.2.2 Findings on Business Models
Independent of their missions, primary objectives and claimant stakeholders of all arts incubators had in common that they provide services of value for artists’ professional development (see Appendix I for details). This was the reason to include all 92 entities as objects of further analysis with particular regard to their business models and services.

#### 5.3.2.2.1 Provision of Services Demanded and Needed by Emerging Business Fine Artists
The analysis of arts incubators’ services needed and demanded by fine artists for their professional development shows the following results, as illustrated in Table 5.3-1:
Table 5.3-1: Provision of Services Needed and Demanded by Emerging Business Fine Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objectives</th>
<th>Services Needed and Demanded by Artists</th>
<th>Provided by Arts Incubators (mentions; n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>regular (incubator) exhibitions</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>targeted promotional/ marketing activities</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>with professional service providers</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with peers (client artists)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Assistance/ Education</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentoring</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Personal Assistant for administrative work (not equal to providing office services such as equipment, telephone service, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>targeted building of audience</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding (micro-loans; sponsoring)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after-market support</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase financing (art leasing, renting, financing, buy-back clauses, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>providing working and exhibitions spaces</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own calculation

Table 5.3-1 shows that visibility and networking services as well as trainings were widely provided business services among arts incubators. Providing facilities for working and exhibitions was also a far-reaching service element in international arts incubation. Mentoring programmes were integrated into the incubation process in the case of ‘only’ every second incubator. However, specific services needed and demanded by emerging artists – such as Personal Assistant services that increase artists’ resources in creative time, targeted audience building, or financing solutions to stimulate buying willingness (purchase financing) – were hardly provided by the incubators.

5.3.2.2.2 Geographic Business Focus

At 89 out of 92, almost all arts incubators in the analysis showed a regional business focus (Appendix I), highly likely due to stakeholders’ interests and political commitments.
with regard to the specific business region and/or lack of funds and other resources for geographic expansion. Although the regional focus provides a key advantage in building close contacts between the incubator, artists, and other regional individuals and organisations, it also includes some major disadvantages. A regional focus may cause difficulties in recruiting (a sufficient number of qualified) staff, mentors, and talented emerging business fine artists for the incubation programmes or in creating valuable synergies between artists located in different regions or countries or in presenting them to international audiences as artists explicitly demand. In contrast, the two incubators with a global focus named maximisation of profits as their primary business objectives, globally searching for the most promising arts entrepreneurs for their incubation programmes.

5.3.2.2.3 Restrictions on Scaling up the Number of Client Artists

The findings show that 85 out of 92 arts incubators provided tangible services, of which 64 entities explicitly provided facilities as working and exhibition spaces for their client artists. See Appendix I for more details. These entities accepted as many client artists for their physical incubation programmes as they were able to provide adequate working spaces, usually for the complete incubation period of up to three years. The analysis indicates that each of the identified 64 physical incubators accommodated and supported approximately 30 client artists on average. Consequently, physical incubators seem to suffer from tangible restrictions with regard to their ability to scale up the number of their clients at adequate costs. In contrast, the other seven incubators were organised virtually and therefore did not provide any working spaces. Virtually organised programmes do not suffer from these tangible restrictions and could expand their client base much more easily at lower costs. Described in other words, virtual arts incubators seem to have a more flexible organisational design for growth.

5.3.3 Conclusion

The literature shows that artist-in-residence as well as art incubation programmes are promising alternatives for the professional development of emerging fine artists (see section 3.2.2.1.3). However, only arts incubators were mainly politically initiated and therefore subject of research in the context of this study. They are designed as political tools to provide support services, entrepreneurial education, networking, promotional
activities, and mentorship, all of which enable business fine artists to create their own art business successfully. The usual duration of such programmes is three years, an ideal expansion to the skills developed during studies at HEIs. The services and skills provided in an incubation programme are usually missing at HEIs and not taught in fine art curriculum. This is the key reason why arts incubators are valuable complementary providers of business fine artists’ professional preparation to making a living in the arts.

However, the relatively small number of business artists supported and supervised by a relatively small number of arts incubators worldwide can be subsumed as ‘low capacities in arts incubation’. This lack of capacity combined with most arts incubators’ tangible restrictions and regional business focus could be the key dilemma of the arts incubation industry. Although arts incubators and entrepreneurship research often emphasise the benefits of being physical, e.g. by going on coffee dates and other spontaneous meetings in short distances as a stimulating environment to create a climate of creativity and networking (see section 3.2.2.1.3), this physical business model has a major conceptual weakness: access to physical arts incubators is quite limited. Only a handful of business artists will benefit from said trainings, on-site coaching, and other support services. Arts incubators are forced to strictly select their clients and effectively control the timely exits of developed and/or ‘poorly performing’ business artists unable to achieve their developmental milestones. For business artists, this situation equates to intense competition for one of the incubator’s coveted spots. These dilemmas of limited space and lack of awareness among artists should be overcome by a more contemporary, more innovative approach of arts incubation that is, for instance, designed as an open, flexible, interactive and scalable virtual network (Thom, 2011), which includes artists, specialised skill providers, coaches/mentors, gallerists, art collectors, experts, art buyers, HEIs, and other participants in the art industry. Only if it is possible to effectively incubate the (fine) arts to a much greater extent, will both business artists and arts incubators be more recognised as a social means to provide professional and entrepreneurial value in the arts. As already mentioned in section 3.2.2.1.3, artists may experience a career boost and higher social prestige and recognition thanks to their involvement with professional programmes. This phenomenon is also mentioned by incubation clients in high-tech industries: they experience higher recognition in society and business only due to the fact of being with an incubator. This implicitly allows art
market participants like galleries and collectors presume that a certain artist is willing and empowered to succeed in the market. Considering the discussion of modern Western society being considerably built on the concepts of productivity, competition, and performance (see section 3.2.2.3.6), business fine artists who experience the benefits of professional preparation with incubators are likely empowered to increase their social recognition, market power, and prices, because artists’ socially low status and low market values are considered major threats to their chances of making a living in the arts.
Chapter 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

“Being good in business is the most fascinating kind of art. Making money is art and working is art and good business is the best art.” (Andy Warhol)

6.0 Introduction

This chapter summarises the salient conclusions and recommendations offered in this research. In addition, the theoretical and practical contributions of this research are outlined together with recommendations for future research in artists’ professional preparation and arts entrepreneurship education. This chapter also acknowledges the limitations of the study and highlights suggestions for improvements.

This thesis was driven by the marked paucity of research explaining the social phenomenon that many practising fine artists find it so difficult to make a living. The overall aim was to reveal the different factors responsible for this phenomenon in order to reveal possible approaches for a targeted professional preparation of fine artists. This is relevant since art is a basic human need and artists are free to decide whether or not they consider art as a profession which will enable them to earn a living.

By reviewing the different internal and external factors having an impact on artists’ chances of earning a living as practising artists, it became clear that most of these factors are beyond artists’ control, except for artists’ education and an open-minded, positive attitude towards hard work ethic. Artists’ key opportunity to make a living as practising professionals is to develop the skills and mindset required to understand the challenging working and business environment and to be prepared for it.

The overall research aim was therefore to be achieved by aiming for the following three research objectives with focus on artists’ professional education:

- identification of practising fine artists’ business environment as well as of the crucial skills for practising fine artists’ professional success to make a living in this environment, as skills and attitude are learnable;

- revealing whether, how, and to what extent fine art graduates are equipped with the required skills to make a living as practising artists during their studies at HEIs; and
• discovering whether arts incubators are capable of scaling up their service spectrum to prepare large numbers of fine artists for their professional career and economic success (income).

In order to achieve these objectives, a qualitative, exploratory and inductive research methodology was employed with a cross-sectional survey strategy. The following section highlights the key conclusions.

6.1 Research Conclusions
From a detailed analysis of the research findings, the conclusions and contributions to knowledge can be organised into the following categories.

6.1.1 Key Reasons Why Practising Fine Artists Find it Difficult to Make a Living
The research revealed in Chapter 5, section 5.1 fine artists’ professional success factors from galleries’ and artists’ point of view. These success factors include the crucial skills to make a living as emerging practising artist in the very challenging business environment, as illustrated in Chapter 2, section 2.2.2.2 and in Chapter 3, sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. The knowledge of fine artists’ business environment with its various threat factors to artists’ professional success as well as of the crucial skills for professional success as practising artists (see Table 3.1-5 in section 3.1.5.2.2.2 for more details) contributes to the body of knowledge in the fields of practising fine artists’ professional preparation, arts education as well as art market requirements and success factors.

The review of literature and secondary data was combined with cross-sectional research including the art market’s key groups. Questionnaire surveys among up to 219 lecturers in Fine Art (Appendix D), 168 fine art undergraduates (Appendix F) and 149 commercial and contemporary fine art galleries (Appendix G) were conducted. The questionnaire surveys were conducted in two countries for the purpose of identifying differences in business environments and success factors between the UK as a worldwide leading art market and Germany as representative of considerably smaller art markets in Europe.
The literature and research findings revealed in particular **six serious threat factors** for practising fine artists’ professional success and ability to make a living in the arts:

1. The findings show that the contemporary art market is characterised by distinct segments of varying market access, attention and visibility to which is controlled by informal market barriers, consisting of powerful networks of commercial galleries, art collectors, and successful artists. As a result, the vast majority (expected more than 80%) of all fine artists practise in market segments excluded from buyers’ awareness (see section 2.2.2.2 for details). The **lack of access to the market and demanding art buyers** is the **first and foremost key reason** why most of them fail to make a living in the arts.

2. The second key reason is closely related to the first because not every practising fine artist shows a pursuit of monetary rewards and the commercial motivation to make a living. The same can be said about hard work ethic. Practising fine artists who do not show an appropriate work ethic and ambition to achieve professional success, always remember that a certain amount of artistic talent is a pre-requisite for success (see section 3.1.5.1 for details), will likely fail to make a living in the arts. **Not wanting to make a living in the arts** is therefore the **second key reason**.

3. Considering this, those fine artists who aim to make a living, the so-called business fine artists, need to develop skills required to create a ‘business art concept’ that responds to market demand in order to generate income (see section 3.1.3.4 for more details with regard to business artists’ business concepts). However, some business concepts are simply not good enough to deal with the challenging business environment and to attract attention or to generate and respond to market demand. **Being incapable of generating income, for example, due to a lack of skills** required to conceptualise and run an art business can therefore be considered the **third key reason** for practising business fine artists to find it difficult to make a living (see research findings for more details, section 5.2).

4. Emerging business fine artists, who are excluded from market and market attention, face intense competition with other emerging fine artists easily entering the lower market segments below the visible gallery-segments due to hardly existent market entry barriers. This rivalry is additionally strengthened by governmental subsidisation (see section 3.2.1 for details) that enables the professional survival of
artists with poor quality at the expense of the overall quality of art available. According to Abbing (2002), governmental subsidies are a key reason for structural poverty in the arts, contributing to a low social value of emerging fine artists as important creative activators within society (fourth key reason).

5. The low value of emerging fine artists in society as well as their missing market reputation and quality evaluation automatically lead to reduced consumption values and finally to low market prices for their artworks (see sections 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.1.5 for more details). Low market prices are considered the fifth key reason.

6. This low status in society and missing market reputation also lead to minimal bargaining power vis-à-vis suppliers of art materials and potential art buyers (see sections 3.2.1.3 and 3.2.1.4 for more details), including galleries and collectors. Low bargaining power and social value usually do not only lead to lower market prices but also to disadvantageous agreements with higher costs (see section 3.2.2.5.1 for more details). As long as emerging fine artists suffer from a weak bargaining position in negotiating contracts, they bear the economic risk of any transaction by covering a considerable part of the costs. Additionally, the relative costs of living, for social protection and insurance, as well as for studio rent and materials to make art have permanently increased as a result of a general increase in productivity and income in most industries. Making art and a living seems to have become relatively more expensive for artists and their professional survival is thus much more difficult (see section 3.2.2.2.2 for further details). Relatively higher costs are therefore considered the sixth key reason for practising fine artists’ professional income.

In contrast, fine artists who are able to enter gallery-market segments seem to be much more protected from these threats. The higher the achieved market segments, the lower the threats to artists’ profitability and income. This segmental market structure explains why the art market as a whole is considered a winner-take-all market where only a few top artists are completely economically protected.

The six threat factors highlighted require emerging business fine artists to self-manage their own career more and more entrepreneurially so as to make a living in the arts. It seems to be an entrepreneurial business itself to make a living in the fine arts. In this context, emerging business fine artists need to develop an entrepreneurial mindset and
the crucial ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills, as illustrated in Table 3.1-5 and empirically confirmed in section 5.1.3. Their professional preparation and education is a key factor for being able to control to their professional benefits, resulting in a marketable and attractive art business concept. However, it is equally a threat factor due to a lack of it, as empirically shown in section 5.2 and highlighted as the third key reason above.

Suggestions for further research include, on one hand, a survey of the art-demanding side, e.g. by interviewing art collectors and occasional art buyers with particular regard to their buying behaviour and quality criteria. Their knowledge of specific buying factors and trends should have a positive impact on increasing fine art graduates’ and practising business fine artists’ awareness of buyers’ needs and demands. On the other hand, further research must include the identification of threat factors in other art disciplines, such as acting, dancing, or music, and it should be extended to other non-business subjects with a high level of graduate self-employment, e.g. journalism, physical therapy, or gastronomy.

6.1.2 Arts Education

The investigation in section 5.2 above has covered an area which is still overlooked in the literature: arts entrepreneurship education. By analysing the regular fine art curriculum for undergraduates at 87 HEIs, 55 post-graduates programmes, and 46 extracurricular training offerings at HEIs as well as information about the institutions’ missions and strategic plans (Appendix H) with the help of key performance indicators (KPIs), this research exhibits undeniable evidence that a preparational education of fine art students for a professional career as practising artists barely existed at UK and German HEIs in the academic year 2013/14. The research on arts education shows evidence that fine art graduates are hardly equipped with the skills and mindset required for professional survival and success due to HEIs’ clear lack of focus on the professional career as practising artist. The development of graduates’ entrepreneurial mindset and skills, however, have an immediate impact on the long-term reputation of a HEI as fine art students and students from other non-business subjects increasingly demand an education that prepares them effectively for their later (entrepreneurial) careers.
The requirements for a professional and entrepreneurial career of fine artists are still under-examined in the literature. Therefore, further research is recommended in order to establish a deeper and broader understanding in this field. Longitudinal studies would be indispensable. Moreover, a comprehensive analysis of cause and effect relationships in entrepreneurial education at HEIs and market preparation could provide deeper insights into the educational processes and institutional structures so as to reveal opportunities for sustainable adjustments in the future. Some important questions still remain unanswered, e.g. What skills are particularly important to teach undergraduates? What skills are possibly more important for post-graduates to professionally prepare them for a career as practising artists? How should they be taught and particularly to what extent? These and many other questions need to be answered to gain a deeper understanding of the relevant issues for effectively preparing them professionally.

This study contributes to knowledge by stimulating further discussion and research into arts education and entrepreneurship education of non-business students in general. There is still a marked paucity of research that focuses upon entrepreneurship education designed to be delivered outside business schools and for the benefit of students specialising in subjects not directly related to business such as arts, health, journalism, gastronomy as well as engineering, electronics or computing. Furthermore, the survey findings could additionally contribute to knowledge by stimulating the discussion towards a more contemporary and broader understanding of the terms ‘employability’ and ‘entrepreneurship’, away from salaried employment and entrepreneurial business planning and venturing towards more opportunity recognition and realisation as well as professional autonomy and entrepreneurial thinking and behaviour.

6.1.3 Arts Incubation

By investigating the world’s current arts incubators’ services, stakeholders, objectives, and business foci, the literature findings demonstrated that art incubators are promising alternatives for the professional development of fine artists (see section 3.2.2.1.3 for more details). They are designed to provide business support services, entrepreneurial education, promotional activities, and mentorship that enable business (fine) artists to successfully create their own art business. The incubation programmes analysed,
however, exhibit serious limitations in supervising larger numbers of fine artists, since they are mainly designed physically with limited numbers of working spaces for a few local artists.

Considering this, the research contributes to knowledge in the still uncharted field of arts incubation by reasonably considering arts incubators as promising alternatives to tertiary education for the professional development of practising fine artists who aim to make a living. Suggestions for future research in this context include longitudinal research for measuring the impact of arts incubation services particularly on practising fine artists’ professional development, since arts incubators often support clients of several art disciplines in their programmes.

6.2 Limitations of this Study

The investigation in section 5.2 above particularly identifies some limitations of this study.

The regular curriculum in fine art offered at HEIs comprises a workload of 120 to 300 ECTS credits, which are allocated to various course modules. Since each module aims to teach particular skills, knowledge, and abilities, credits are allocated only to the entire module without an individual allocation between the several specific skills. This makes an exact assignment of credits to (entrepreneurial) skills and therefore the determination of working hours impossible. This information was not published by the HEIs in their course specifications and module handbooks. This was discerned by taking the total credits of those modules into account that concentrate only on the transfer of entrepreneurial skills (‘full credit’ approach) or by filtering out entrepreneurial from non-entrepreneurial skills and dividing the total credits of those ‘mixed skill’ modules by the number of skills taught in these modules (‘proportionate credit’ approach). Thus, the different skills of the crucial ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills were then considered as one united set of entrepreneurial skills without any distinctions between the different single skills.

KPIs on their own normally lack the consideration of qualitative issues due to their quantitative nature. They break down substantial data into comparative figures without any focus on qualitative aspects. For example, the KPI called “Compulsory Work Experience” can only measure the length of compulsory work placements (see section 5.2.1.2.4). It only shows how long or to what extent students were able to gain practical
experience. This KPI, though, did not explain whether a work placement was actually adequate to gain specific entrepreneurial skills and practical experience. It could not provide information on the quality of learning environments provided and what skills were developed. Recommendations for further research include, therefore, the analysis of supplementary and qualitative details. In this specific context, future research should be able to show the qualitative dimension of work placements as an important teaching tool for entrepreneurial skills. Further research should provide information about the tasks, learning environments, and challenges ‘placed’ students specifically meet.

In addition, continued research is recommended to more deeply take into account the interdependencies between research subjects at the different levels of analysis (Chapter 5, sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2), since the research subjects are in no way independent. Articulated more precisely, future research could and should investigate, for instance, the interdependency between the organisational structure of HEIs (including art department’s or faculty’s autonomy in terms of human resource management and finance) and the number of guest lectures, study visits, enrolled art students, and/or on the intensity of given personal on-site support. The consideration of interdependencies between the analysis criteria on the different levels should enable a better understanding of the complex organisation and structures of education in fine art.

Suggestions for future research also include avoiding the concentration of gathered data. The survey among fine art lecturers in particular, as described in Chapter 4, section 4.4.5, shows a tendency of an overweighted consideration of the educational and institutional specifications of a few HEIs represented by a relative high number of participating lecturers (see Appendix E for details). As the survey findings show, almost one third of the participating UK lecturers (44 out of 146) represented only 11% of the UK HEIs (7 out of 65) in the survey, while in Germany almost 60% of the participating lecturers (43 out of 73) taught at one third of German HEIs (7 out of 22). HEIs with large numbers of invited and participating lecturers were therefore overweighted and dominant. Suggestions on improving this factor focus on creating a more equally proportioned sample, e.g. by inviting a limited number of lectures per HEI.
6.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The research findings provide fertile ground for targeted research into art market structure, the triangle-relationships between artists, society and art buyers/commercial intermediaries, and arts entrepreneurship with various foci as follows:

1. There is still an urgent need for a new understanding of the term ‘entrepreneurship’ with regard to the arts. Research needs to answer the question of what it means to be entrepreneurial for fine artists and for students of other non-business subjects. A better understanding would help to adjust entrepreneurship education more towards creativity and change according to artists’ and non-business students’ needs and demands, since it is safe to assume that the traditional understanding of business venturing and planning is no longer valid for one-person businesses.

2. As already mentioned in section 5.1.4, identifying art graduates’ professional decisions and destinations are also recommended topics for further research. It would be a worthwhile endeavour to track fine art graduates’ professional careers and outcomes for longer periods after course completion and to extend the research into their work situations in order to identify possible further key market challenges and success factors. This research is needed because the literature still lacks an explanation of which factors actually determine the success of practising artists in various art disciplines. The working model developed for the crucial ‘five plus two’ entrepreneurial skills was an attempt at making the research dilemma ‘handier’. However, this working model also needs to be critically reviewed and validated with the help of longitudinal research and multidimensional measures, based on qualitative and quantitative research approaches, since further factors may also have relevance for the entrepreneurial success of fine artists and of artists in other disciplines.

3. Additional research is recommended to reveal reasons why arts entrepreneurship education has still not been incorporated into the curriculum or extra-trainings. This research clearly shows that two key stakeholder groups in higher education, namely lecturers and students in fine art, definitely want it incorporated. If there are other reasons, for example, conflicts of interests between different stakeholder groups, then further research might reveal these.
4. Another valuable contribution to arts entrepreneurship education would be to investigate whether fine artists need specific pedagogical practices or teaching methods which best engender their entrepreneurial mindset and skills. This is of particular interest as fine artists are expected to have a more visual learning focus. Research in this field would help to better understand the learning processes of people with particularly strong senses and expressions.

5. Suggestions for further research also include society’s role in fine artists’ education, professional development, and career chances. Since literature and research findings exhibit evidence that society has enormous impact on practising fine artists’ professional success (see sections 3.2.2.3 and 5.1.2 for more details), further research could develop and demonstrate new approaches and exemplary practice in dealings between the two parties. The current situation in Western society that the arts sector is built on the principle that artists will make art and do not receive the economic support for their labour is deeply embarrassing for a modern and democratic society that stresses equality among human rights. Being a practising artist, independent of being commercially motivated or not, should have nothing to do with ‘oppression and modern slavery’ and receiving governmental subsidies to survive professionally. This circumstance is socially and economically worrying and calls for change. Individual artists are still a necessary, if not the most important, component of a thriving arts ecosystem. Creating a social environment in which practising artists can make a living without subsidies and multiple job holdings and thrive artistically with an appropriate social reputation is necessary to insure a sustainable and healthy art industry. In this context, two approaches are conceivable: Firstly, investigations could be carried out on how the arts could be recognised and protected as a profession. This approach should also embed an analysis of whether and how an art union could be beneficial for artists’ bargaining power, social reputation, and professional survival. This may contribute to establishing market entry barriers and finally to increasing artists’ chances of making a living. Secondly and in line with Hans Abbing’s (2002) claim to remove governmental subsidies for artists (see section 3.2.2.1.1 for more details), investigations could focus on the impacts a removal of subsidies might have on artists’ quality, professional development, and social reputation as well as on the art
market’s efficiency. If Abbing is right, the quality in the art market would increase as well as market prices and artists’ chances of making a living, while poor and average-quality artists would be sorted out. This more liberal approach would have severe consequences for art market’s forces, as described in section 3.2.1 of Chapter 3.

6. It is also recommended that future studies continue to investigate the impacts of the Internet and progressing digitalisation of the art market with particular focus on a possible shifting of market power from gatekeeping intermediaries, such as commercial galleries, to the producers and buyers of art online. Since the World Wide Web is able to change whole industries, as we have already seen in the 21st century, then the art market can be said to be relatively untouched in its primary structures and transparency. Research on power shifting in the arts could help identify the skills required to better prepare art students and practising artists for these changes and opportunities.

7. Further research into measuring and evaluating arts incubation programmes’ outcomes and impacts with specific focus on fine artists’ professional and entrepreneurial careers is expected to provide the needed contribution to knowledge in this field. Research could include comparative groups of non-client artists and client fine artists to provide interesting insights into the nature of professional and entrepreneurial success and its predictors. Considering this, research on virtual arts incubation approaches could help create new efficient programmes that are practically capable of overcoming the limitations of current arts incubation programmes (see section 5.3 for research findings), HEIs’ scarce arts entrepreneurship education (see section 5.2 for research findings), and fine artists’ challenging market barriers (see section 5.1 for research findings). This may help to reduce the current significance of the social phenomenon of practising artists’ suffering from hardly being able to make a living.

8. Finally, as briefly mentioned in section 3.1.6, further research is recommended to investigate the impact of the individual luck factor on practising fine artists’ chances for a successful professional future. The empirical evidence of a positive correlation between these factors would also contribute to a targeted professional education of art students in particular and of students from all other subjects in general.
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## Appendix A

### Definitions and Definitional Boundaries (Art, Entrepreneurship, Skills, Success)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Art, Artist, and Fine Artist            | There exists a variety of attempts to define the term “art” and its meaning; however, there is and probably will be no universally accepted definition of this term. Although the following attempt at defining art in a broad sense is simple, such a working definition already creates many opportunities for discussions. In the context of this study, the following **working definition** of art should be sufficient for a better understanding of art as a phenomenon.  

Art is created when an artist creates an object, or produces a stimulating experience that is considered by an audience to have artistic merit.  
Since the arts are not a protected profession by formal requirements, people can easily call themselves artists. In order to give a better indication of artists’ key characteristics, the definition of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), as cited by Paderno (1999, p. 3), will be used for this thesis.  

“All person who creates art or gives creative expression to, or recreates works of art, who considers his artistic creation to be an essential part of his life, who contributes in this way to the development of art and culture and who is or asks to be recognised as an artist, whether or not he is bound by any relations of employment or association.”  
A fine artist is therefore considered in the context of this dissertation as any person in the sense of the aforementioned definition who is involved in making paintings, drawings, sculptures, or photographs.  
| Temporal Classification of Contemporary Art vs. Modern Art | Critics, curators and historians define the exact meaning of contemporary art in varying ways. One of the reasons for the confusion is that "Contemporary Art" is preceded by "Modern Art", and there is no precise agreement on when "Modern Art" ended. To make matters even more complicated, a third term "Postmodernist art" is sometimes used as a synonym for "Contemporary Art."  
Postmodernism denotes the main style trend after Modernism, but it applies to dozens of other disciplines including architecture, music, film, literature, sociology, design, fashion, and technology, all of which have differing timelines, so it is hard to get a fix on exactly when postmodernism begins. Furthermore, it is not synonymous with contemporary art. The latter refers to an era (a time period) while postmodernism is more of an attitude and style within this period. Skipping the theoretical aspect, there are three main meanings or usages of the terms "Contemporary Art."  

- **Art produced after 1945**: This is the definition adhered to by most museums when defining their collections of contemporary artworks. However, most art historians now consider this to be outdated. |
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- **Art produced in our era or lifetimes**: This accords with the definition of "contemporary" used by general historians, yet it is too vague for the purposes of this study.

- **Art produced since the 1970s**: This definition is the one most commonly used by art critics, but disagreement persists as to the exact cut-off date. Is it 1975 or 1979? In this study, the 1970s are taken as marking the “official change-over” from Modern to Contemporary Art, although it is true to say that the decade included both types. This is why the year 1970 is used as the cut-off date because by then the transition was nearly complete.

### Consumption Value

According to Zeithaml (1988, p.14), consumption value can be defined as “consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given.” Sheth et al. (1991a, 1991b) suggests there are five consumption values, termed functional, social, emotional, epistemic and conditional values, while the three primary dimensions are relevant for artworks, since epistemic and conditional values are transient and less enduring than the other three consumption value aspects and are more relevant to single rather than repeat art consumptions (Sweeney et al., 1996).

Briefly, functional value is defined as "the perceived utility acquired from an alternative's capacity for functional, utilitarian or physical performance" (Sheth et al., 1991a, p. 160) and is thought to be generated by a product's salient attributes (e.g. reliability, durability and price) (Ferber, 1973; Sheth et al., 1991a). Traditionally, functional value has been presumed to be the key influence on consumer choice. This suggestion follows from economic utility theory that argues consumers are rational and make choices to maximise utility, constrained by prices and income. However, Sheth et al. (1991b) show evidence that functional value is not always the most important value dimension. While functional values may dominate the decision as to whether to consume specific daily-life products, social values and emotional reasons are suggested to be paramount in the decision to consume art. Social value is defined in this context as the perceived utility derived from the image relevant others develop of an individual by their using or physical possessing a product (e.g. Belk, 1988; Grubb and Grathwohl, 1967), such as artworks in general and of specific artists in particular. Their symbolic value stresses social belonging and cultural capital (see section 3.2.2.3.1). The emotional value is defined as the perceived utility acquired from specific feelings (Sheth et al., 1991a) when consuming art. These feelings are individual. However, in the context of this study, it is the type of experiencing or 'consuming' art that is relevant for emotional values' specifications. The physical experience or ‘consumption’ of paintings is associated with higher emotional values for fine art lovers than the online consumption of images. The same could be said for lovers of the performing arts. They are expected to emotionally value live events much higher than online events.

### Entrepreneurship, Arts Entrepreneurship, Enterprise, and Small Business

In order to provide an exact understanding of what this dissertation is about, the different terms “entrepreneurship”, “enterprise” and “small business” need to be clarified. Especially the terms “entrepreneurship” and “enterprise” are often used interchangeably in education. However, there are some nuances that need to be clarified. One fundamental source is the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher
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Education (QAA) in the UK. The QAA (2012, p. 8) defines the term ‘enterprise’

“(…) as the application of creative ideas and innovations to practical situations. (…) It combines creativity, idea development and problem-solving with expression, communication and practical action. This definition is distinct from the generic use of the word in reference to a project or business venture.”

The last sentence demonstrates the clear difference compared to the term ‘entrepreneurship’ which is defined

“(…) as the application of enterprise skills specifically to creating and growing organisations in order to identify and build on opportunities” (QAA, 2012, p. 8).

Hong et al. (2011) support this definition by stressing that “entrepreneurship denotes new venture creation, and enterprise denotes employability (…) and self-management” (Hong et al., 2011, p. 69).

Chang and Wyszomirski (2015, p. 11) define the term “arts entrepreneurship” in this context as a

“management process [that] involves an on-going set of innovative choices and risks intended to recombine resources and pursue new opportunities to produce artistic, economic, and social value.”

Entrepreneurship is therefore used in this study in relation to creative ideas that drive projects and businesses. Additionally, a clear distinction should also be made between “entrepreneurship” and “small business” and between being an entrepreneur and self-employed. According to Jacobson (2003) and Roberts (2013), an entrepreneur can be classified as an

individual who either already has a (business) idea and is actively seeking appropriate chances (‘opportunities’) to realise them on the market with an existent demand, or is an individual who recognises or creates new, innovative chances on the market by means of intuition and creativity, changing them into an innovative (business) idea to realise it on the market by means of business activities.

In this context, an entrepreneur organises, invests and coordinates resources, and brings them to a productive process by which new market requirements and demands are generated and satisfied. The entrepreneur always takes risks in terms of resources and is prepared to fail in the creation of new market demand. In contrast, small business owners are people whose businesses are seldom engaged in innovative practices. Their (business) idea already exists on the market, is not innovative, and does not require the creation of new market demand. It must not be forgotten that while all entrepreneurs are self-employed, not all self-employed individuals are entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship can therefore be defined in the
context of this study as the process of creating new business activity. Applied to fine artists, this definition includes all activities to promote, sell, and commercialise one’s own artwork in order to generate income. The foundation of a business organisation in a traditional sense, as often defined as a key criterion for being an entrepreneur, is explicitly not necessarily meant in this context.

| **Entrepreneurial (or Professional) Success** | In the context of this dissertation, the professional or entrepreneurial success of practising fine artists is considered in a broader sense to be the objective of making and sustaining a living in the arts without subsidies and/or multiple job holdings. This objective is highly individual, not measurable in financial figures. |
| **Entrepreneurial Mindset** | Mindset is an idea discovered by Stanford University psychologist Carol Dweck in decades of research on achievement and success. It describes a habitual or characteristic mental attitude that determines how someone will interpret and respond to situations. Basically, she distinguishes between fixed and growth mindsets. In a fixed mindset, people believe their basic qualities are simply fixed traits, e.g. their intelligence or talent. In a growth mindset, people believe that their most basic abilities can be developed through dedication and hard work. Brains and talent are just the starting point (Dweck et al., 2014). An entrepreneurial mindset, thus, is considered a growth mindset that can be developed by the means of training and learning (Carey and Naudin, 2006; QAA, 2012). With the help of an entrepreneurial mindset, people will be encouraged to develop self-awareness of their own enterprising and entrepreneurial qualities, as well as the motivation and self-discipline to apply these flexibly in different contexts to achieve desired results. The particular characteristic of a mindset is that it is hidden, which means people with the same skill set as others but with a more developed growth mindset could do more with their skills and learn new skills as well. According to QAA (2012) an entrepreneurial mindset includes, among other traits:
  • aspects of personality and social identity,
  • personal ambition and goals,
  • personal confidence and resilience (self-efficacy),
  • self-discipline and personal organisation,
  • open-minded thinking and curiosity,
  • understanding one’s own motivation,
  • ability to go beyond perceived limitations and achieve results (behaviour),
  • tolerance of uncertainty, ambiguity, risk, and failure (attitude),
  • personal values, ethical, social and environmental awareness. |
| **Skills** | In order to generate income, fine artists need to know how to promote their artworks, ideas, and even themselves. This knowledge of how to do something is closely linked with the term ‘skill’. The meaning of this term will be briefly explained in the following.

  To start with, there is no consensus among the main social science disciplines of economics, sociology, and psychology about the meaning of the concept of skill (Green, 2011). However, due to the fact that the study at hand does not aim to find a broad and acceptable definition of skill for the different scientific disciplines, it is more focused on identifying those characteristics that are widely acknowledged in the literature and which help to achieve this study’s purpose. |
Skills are regarded as integrated routines or patterns of behaviour that combine knowledge and ability with practical application in a real-life environment (Boyatzis and Kolb, 1995; Klieme, et al., 2003). In this context, Mascolo and Fischer (1999) emphasise the fact that skills are largely defined by the specific contexts. They consider a skill development programme only as effective if it is tailored to specific contexts. This opinion is supported by Fischer and Bidell (2005) who define skill as a “capacity” to behave and act in an organised way in a specific context. A skill is, in their opinion, a form of translation of knowledge and ability into context-specific behaviour and action. Proctor and Dutta (1995, p. 18) also support this opinion by defining skill as a “goal-directed, well-organised behaviour that is acquired through practice and performed with economy of effort.” According to Winterton et al. (2006), skills show the following characteristics: they are learned; they develop over time and with practice; they are goal-directed; and finally the cognitive demands are reduced as skills develop.

The above briefly mentioned characteristics and approaches to define skill include various other terms, for example ‘knowledge’, ‘ability’, and ‘capacity’, which are also often used interchangeably when it comes to describe human development across different domains. Due to this, the term “skill” will further be briefly distinguished in the following from these and other terms to gain a better understanding of how this study employs these various designations.

### Difference between Skill, Knowledge, and Understanding

These three terms describe an individual’s competence. According to Green (2011, p. 25), knowledge is often viewed as the “result of an interaction between intelligence (capacity to learn) and situation (opportunity to learn).” While knowledge refers to learning concepts, principles and information with regard to a particular subject (“know-what”), understanding refers to a more holistic approach of transforming this knowledge into new contexts and processes (“know-why”). In contrast, skill refers to the ability of using that knowledge by practically applying it in a context (“know-how”) (Klieme et al., 2003). For example, there is a major difference between the knowledge of the importance and structure of business planning and the ability to carry this planning out accurately. In the first case, the acquisition of adequate business planning knowledge can be easily gained via books, media, academic institutions, and other sources. The knowledge is then only factual, declarative. In the latter case, however, the practical application necessarily requires practical exposure with more or less trial and error exercises which help to obtain practical experience. Factual knowledge converts into procedural knowledge or know-how (de Jong and Ferguson-Hessler, 1996; Garud, 1997; Green, 2011). This is the practical and contextual experience, the increasing proceduralisation of knowledge, that is converted to a skill (Klieme et al., 2003). The terms “know-how” and skills can therefore be used synonymously.

### Difference between Talent, Ability, and Skill

Abilities are the building blocks of skill. There is no such thing as general ability, but rather a group of abilities that are specific to a skill. For instance, the production of a portrait that is accurate in every detail requires body coordination and manual dexterity, an experienced eye, visual acuity, a feeling of human proportions, creativity, and concentration. The required abilities are therefore
varied and numerous, and they combine into groups to be the foundation for the development of specific fine art skills. Individuals inherit different natural abilities from their parents which can be enhanced through exercises. In this context, a talent is, per definition (Cambridge Dictionary), said to be a special ability to do something at a high level or at least at a level above average without prior experience or study. Talents like abilities can also be further developed and improved over time with training. Due to their innate characteristics, talents and abilities are enduring and more stable than skills. While abilities and in particular talent occur only in a limited number of individuals, and not everybody has access to them, skills can be learned by anyone. They are not innate. Having such skills can allow an individual to attain a higher level of performance, whereas the mere existence of abilities does not necessarily lead to exceptional performance. Abilities, therefore, need to be developed into skills to level up the performance.

### Difference between Capability and Competency

Both capability and competency are terms that pertain to an individual’s abilities and skills. They are often mentioned with regard to career opportunities, job descriptions, and personnel assessments. Capability describes the quality of being able to do something. It is therefore considered the condition that permits an individual to acquire knowledge and develop skills. Capabilities can be further developed into competence, meaning the degree of skill in the task performance or the quality or state of an individual’s work (Green, 2011). Competence therefore serves as the result of the application of improved capabilities and proven abilities.

After explaining and distinguishing between some important terms, it has become clear why skills are the focus of analysis in this study. The main characteristics of skills is that they describe the practically applied knowledge of how to do things, rather than abilities and talent which can be developed by anyone. Skills are not a privilege of some few fine artists; instead, they are “accessible” by every single fine artist at any time.
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Definitions, Definitional Boundaries, Typology of (Arts) Business Incubators, and other Entrepreneurial Service Providers

Business Incubator

A historical review of the “incubator concept” reveals the profound change in the basic concept over time. This had and still has consequences for the definition of the term “business incubator.” What was regarded as a business incubator in the 1970s or 1980s is no longer subsumed under this term nowadays. The first business incubator, Batavia Industrial Center, was founded in 1959 by Charles Manusco in Batavia, New York (Achleitner and Engel, 2001). Due to a high unemployment rate in this region, Batavia Industrial Center provided vacant buildings, spaces, and rooms to small-sized or young businesses at extremely low rental fees. In this way, the first business incubator was “born” (Handelsblatt Research Institute, 2015). Whilst the initial focus lay on providing working spaces at nominal costs – which would define this former incubation concept currently more as a real estate agent rather than an incubator - Manusco started by providing additional business consultancy. He pursued two basic objectives: first of all, he was interested in increasing his own income and, second of all, he wanted to ensure his clients’ economic success and thus the continuous renting of his spaces. Only since the 1980s has the number of business incubators grown significantly and continuously. New types of incubators have emerged since then with different service portfolios. This is why the definition of the term ‘business incubator’ has historically varied and will further vary in the future. In contrast to the early days of business incubation focused on infrastructural services, this phenomenon has become more complex due to different types of incubators and other emerging service providers.

One acknowledged attempt to define business incubators is provided by Hackett and Dilts (2004). They define business incubators as a “facility” that provides its clients with

“(…) a strategic, value-adding intervention system of monitoring and business assistance. This system controls and links resources with the objective of facilitating the successful new venture development of the incubatees while simultaneously containing the cost of their potential failure” (Hackett and Dilts, 2004, p. 57).

Another approach to define this term is undertaken by Achleitner and Engel (2001a). They define a business incubator also as a “service facility”, designed to assist entrepreneurs in developing and establishing their businesses during the start-up process (Achleitner and Engel, 2001a, p. 6). Instead of companies, however, these scientists discuss entrepreneurs who need support services to develop their business idea to an established business. This definition would allow at the very minimum the focus to be placed onto individual entrepreneurs.

Lewis et al. (2011) distinguish in their definition between business incubation programmes and the incubation manager. In their view, business incubation programmes

“(…) are designed to accelerate the successful development of entrepreneurial companies through an array of business support resources and services, developed or orchestrated by the
incubation program manager” (Lewis et al., 2011, p. 15).

In contrast, more recent definitions focus on the particular phase in which the services are provided to entrepreneurs. This is due to delimitation and assignment problems since different types of service providers emerge in the marketplace in order to support entrepreneurial businesses. A delimitation of business incubators to other service providers follows in the next section.

The International Business Innovation Association (InBIA), the world’s largest association of registered business incubators, classifies business incubators as “programmes” that

“(…) nurture the development of entrepreneurial companies, helping them to survive and grow during the start-up period, when they are most vulnerable.” (InBIA, 2015, Business Incubation FAQs).

These programmes support start-up companies and entrepreneurs in their early stages with tailored business support services and resources (Handelsblatt Research Institute, 2015; InBIA, 2015). This definition is followed by Al-Mubaraki and Busler (2013, p. 362) who define business incubators as a

“(…) social and economic program which provides the intensive support to start-up companies in their early stages, coaches them to start and accelerate their development and success through business assistance program.”

The UK Business Incubation (2015) and Khalil and Olafsen (2009) defines business incubators as a business support process that involves people and infrastructure in order to accelerate the successful and sustainable development of companies at their earliest stages by providing targeted resources and services (UKBI, 2015). In a similar yet deeper way, an incubator is defined by the Entrepreneur Magazine’s encyclopaedia as

“(…) an organization designed to accelerate the growth and success of entrepreneurial companies through an array of business support resources and services that could include physical space, capital, coaching, common services, and networking connections” (Entrepreneur Magazine, 2015, Encyclopedia Business Incubator).

Nevertheless, all of these more recent approaches aim especially at start-up companies as recipients of support services for their growth. This traditional understanding that entrepreneurship normally happens through start-ups companies is still widespread in the fields of entrepreneurship research. Business incubation is, in traditional understanding, primarily considered to comprise innovation and high-tech ideas realised by companies rather than by individuals due to their lack of required resources, capabilities, and skills. A broader definition in this context is used by the Information for Development Program (infoDev), a multi-donor program in the World Bank Group that supports growth-oriented entrepreneurs through a global network of business incubators. InfoDev defines business incubators as

“(…) a service provider that offers a comprehensive package of services (more than one) designed to support, facilitate and accelerate the growth of starting businesses” (infoDev, 2011, p. 22).
The term “business” in this sense refers equally to both individuals and companies.

**Arts Incubator**

In accordance with Kahn, arts incubators can be and should be regarded as “part of a larger universe of business incubators” (Kahn, 1995, p. 1). She defines arts incubators concretely as

“(…) facilities that create a nurturing environment for small and emerging arts organizations by offering low-cost or subsidized space and services.”

This understanding is, in principle, supported by Gerl et al. (2000), Gray (2015), and Essig (2014a). Essig states that

“(…) arts incubators are a platform that empowers artists and organizations to implement their business and artistic ideas” (Essig, 2014a, p. 171).

In Gray’s (2015, p.4) perspective,

“(…) arts incubators are intended to advance the current artistic climate through a provision of services, in the hope that this will lead to breakthroughs in established artistic practices.”

Gray’s perspective covers only one small part of the whole: the artistic dimension. In the context of this study, the artistic dimension of being an arts entrepreneur is an important and integrated part of the entrepreneur’s business idea. Besides this, further competencies are required in order to achieve arts entrepreneurs’ basic overall objective of being able to make and sustain a living in the arts. This economic dimension is missing in Gray’s approach to explain arts incubators’ intentions. More relevant is, however, Gray’s description of arts entrepreneurs’ environment for their professional development during the incubation process. Arts incubators are said to shield artists from the marketplace, allowing a “wider margin for error” (Gray, 2015, p. 4). Arts incubators’ intention is, in her interpretation, to create a controlled and protected (from external impacts) environment of peers, so that arts incubator clients have more time to focus on the business of making innovative art. The creation of the described environment for incubator clients’ development is actually or should be at least an incubator’s intention. The underlying reason for this is, however, not the business of making art but the business of being an arts entrepreneur, being prepared to make a living in the arts right after graduation from the programme.

Another attempt to define arts incubators is provided by the Polish Art_Inkubator (2016, “Home”). This multi-sectorial incubator describes itself as an

“(…) institution supporting companies, organizations and artists on their way to enter the market. It’s a start-up platform for business and artistic ideas.”

The statement clearly shows this incubator’s self-image of being a supportive platform for arts entrepreneurs’ market entry. Yet the definition provides no clear indication of the developmental status of the clients of this specific incubator, as the focus on market entry may also indicate late-stage arts entrepreneurs, which would mean that Polish Art_Inkubator is an accelerator rather than an incubator in the narrow sense of the term.
However, the use of the term “platform” in Essig’s (2014a, p. 171) and Art_Inkubator’s (2016, “Home”) definitions implicitly enables an incubator’s presence both physically and virtually and is inclusive for all kinds of incubator typologies.
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Typology of Business and Arts Incubators

According to Aaboen (2009), there are differences between business incubators, mainly in terms of their objectives, organisational structure, and means of funding. Different objectives clearly stress that “different incubators have different priorities” (Bøllingtoft and Ulhøi, 2005, p. 270). Grimaldi and Grandi (2005) explain the reason for these differences in incubators’ desires to adapt to the diversity of new businesses. A variety of approaches exist in the literature to classify business incubators on the basis of a wide variety of criteria, such as business focus / target groups, stakeholders, strategic objectives, or services provided.

Essig (2014a) focuses on incubators’ context by regarding them mainly as policy tools. Policy makers are interested in finding means to effectively address economic and cultural development, an increased regional or national vibrancy, entrepreneurship and employability as well as social wellbeing (Mian et al., 2016). Other business incubators have other strategic objectives, e.g. the development of technology start-ups for innovative and privately funded companies. Due to this, business incubators cannot easily be compared with one another on their level of added value and outcomes (Mian et al., 2016). This is why different approaches exist in the literature to define typologies of incubators in order to understand their business models. A uniform definition is therefore also still missing of what a business incubator exactly is (Bakkali et al., 2014), as already illustrated above.

This dissertation does not aim to present an exhaustive overview of the different types of business incubators since already so many researchers have attempted to find and combine new variables for new typologies. This study simply presents some of the most commonly found typologies in the literature. The presentation of the basic typologies shall enable a better understanding of the different types of existing incubation programmes, classified by their main objectives, stakeholders, provided services, funding, organisational structures, intention to make a profit (Temali and Campbell, 1984; Aernoudt, 2004; Jørgensen, 2014), or by their management of human resources (Bakkali et al., 2014). Some typologies focus merely on one criterion – for instance, incubators’ main objectives or provided services, while other approaches are more complex due to multiple criteria.

To start with typologies focused on one criterion, Grimaldi and Grandi (2005) as well as Carayannis and von Zedtwitz (2005) propose a typology based on specific business services. They use the principle of exclusion to find a definition for a business incubator. They emphasise, from their point of view, important and concrete support services that business incubators necessarily have to provide in order to be considered an incubator at all. Grimaldi and Grandi (2005), for instance, regard the provision of capital or the introduction of potential investors to emerging entrepreneurs as necessary to define structures, programmes or organisations as incubators.

Allen and McCluskey (1990) focus their typology on incubators’ sponsors or stakeholders. This approach enables them to identify four different types of incubators: for-profit, non-profit, academic, and for-profit seed capital incubators. Peters et al. (2004) use a similar typology, however, without any linkages between the organisational form and stakeholder impacts on the incubators’ outcomes, as Essig (2014b) critically notes.

Representatives of an incubator typology based on competitive scope and strategic objectives include von Zedtwitz (2003), Carayannis and von Zedtwitz (2005), and Grimaldi (von Zedtwitz and Grimaldi, 2006). Carayannis and von Zedtwitz classify the different incubator models according to their competitive scopes and distinguish in this context between the following four types:

- **Vertical scope**: This scope deals with business incubators’ competitive market environments as they are in business along with venture capital organisations, business angels, consulting companies, real estate agents, or institutional networks and investors.
- **Segment scope**: This scope is related to incubators’ target group of incubation clients. There are significant differences between the incubators due to their varied key stakeholders and primary objectives.
- **Geographic scope**: This scope describes incubators’ geographic field of action. Some incubators are regionally focused, while others have a national, international, or even global focus.
- **Industry scope**: This scope is closely linked to incubators’ professional preferences and competencies.

With the help of these four scopes associated with the question of whether incubators offer their services for profit or not for profit as a strategic objective, von Zedtwitz (2003) defines five unique incubator models:
1. Regional business incubators;
2. University incubators;
3. Independent commercial incubators;
4. Company-internal incubators; and
5. Virtual incubators.

This typology is widely acknowledged and often cited in the literature as basic typology. The first two types of incubators, the regional and university incubators, are designated as non-profit incubators since their main objective lies in economic and technological development, respectively. Virtual incubators are an increasing phenomenon in the digital age of the Internet due to the diminishing importance of working spaces for entrepreneurial success online. The term "virtual" stands, according to infoDev (2011, p. 20), in the context of business incubation for “not bricks”, which refers to the main distinction between the traditional physical incubator that “offers its services within the walls of the incubator building and uses the physical concentration of incubatees as a tool for improving incubation outcomes” (infoDev, 2011, p. 20). In contrast, a virtual incubator and its services are not bound by a physical building and physically present clients. Virtual incubators offer their services, “at least to a significant extent” (infoDev, 2011, p. 22), to a dispersed group of non-resident clients, i.e. independent of the location of the incubator and/or its clients. Consequently, virtual incubators do not offer working spaces for their clients, although they may have a central office to house their staff and management, to coordinate their services, to network contacts, and to meet with their clients.

The question of which services are relevant to a business incubator is answered by Carayannis and von Zedtwitz (2005). Both stress the importance of five specific services that need to be provided by incubators in order to define them as such: 1) access to physical resources, 2) access to financial resources, 3) access to networks, 4) administrative, sectorial services, and 5) assistance with start-up procedures. Both scientists classify the status of being considered an incubator merely on the number of provided services. Only the provision of all five aforementioned services would classify incubators as incubators in the strictest sense, while those offering less than four of these services lack many crucial elements and should therefore no longer be considered incubators (Carayannis and von Zedtwitz, 2005).

The Information for Development Program (infoDev, 2011, p. 27) classifies business incubators on the basis of the service intensity, distinguishing between three types of service concepts:

- **hand-holders**: incubators that offer business development services, emphasising training and mentoring, as opposed to access to finance and networking, even though these are typical parts of their service spectrum;
- **network boosters**: incubators whose main aim is to bring entrepreneurs, investors, and service providers together and facilitate them in providing added value to each other’s businesses rather than focusing on delivering business assistance services themselves; and
- **seed capital providers**: incubators focused on providing seed capital, combined with mentoring support.

Further typologies based on the provided service spectrum include the work of the European Commission (CSES, 2002), the incubation report by Ernst & Young (2003) as illustrated by Bakkali et al. (2014), and the approach by Aernoudt (2004). The European Commission classifies incubators on the basis of two main criteria: the level of assistance provided and the level of technological specialisation with three different levels of specifications each. As a result, nine different types of incubators are classified, ranging from the “Industrial Estate”, a pure work space providing organisation with low levels of assistance and technology specialisation to the “Technology Centre” that reaches the maximal specificity in both classification dimensions (CSES, 2002, p. 6). A much simpler structure in this context is provided by Heinrichs et al. (2014) who define three types of technology incubators, namely of “Lessor”, “Intermediate”, and “Full-Service Provider”, depending on what services there are. The focus on technology specifications is historical because the technological development has been seen as the foundation of social welfare and national economies’ global competitiveness. According to Bakkali et al. (2014), the incubation report by Ernst & Young was the first that delivered a true diversity of typologies on account of the fact that the management consulting company combined three different criteria: 1) position of incubators in the chain of promotion/creation (encompassing the specifications: promotion of technology, local development, and mixed); 2) sector of activity of their clients (encompassing: general, multi-sector, and specialised); and 3) evaluations of incubators carried out by incubators’ clients (encompassing: homogeneous profile, plan of
action profile, and dilemma profile). This approach enables the identification of different business incubation specifications and their perceived quality levels. With the help of an evaluation criterion, the clients’ perspectives are integrated into the process of incubator classification. The quality of an incubator’s effectiveness is thus explicitly illustrated because incubators pursue different objectives and target industries, and they also have own capabilities (evaluated capabilities). It is quite easy to define several target objectives and industries as an incubator; however, it is much more complicated to create appropriate organisational structures and define crucial services in order to properly achieve these specific objectives.

Bakkali et al. (2014) also present another approach by Albert et al. (2003). The latter create a typology by combining the three criteria with two specifications each, as follows: final aim (for profit or non-profit), dominant activities (general or high tech), and aims (economic development or promotion of technology). Their matrix of incubator types defines four distinct categories of incubators: economic development incubators, academic incubators, business incubators, and private investments incubators.

Another widely acknowledged and frequently cited multi-criteria approach is provided by Aernoudt (2004). He creates a variety of business incubator types with different philosophies (depending on their main stakeholders), target groups, and objectives. In this way, he identifies five types of incubators: 1) mixed incubators (interested in all sectors, yet with the main objective of creating start-ups and employment and the philosophy of closing the business gap to nurture economic development), 2) economic development incubators (all sectors; regional development; regional disparity gap), 3) technology incubators (technology sectors; entrepreneurship creation; entrepreneurial gap), 4) social incubators (non-profit sector; integration of social categories; social or cultural gap), and finally 5) basic research incubators (high tech sector; fundamental research; discovery gap).

Table: Key Typologies of Incubators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Classification Criteria</th>
<th>Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; McCluskey 1990</td>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td>4 typologies: 1) for profit, 2) non-profit, 3) academic, and 4) for-profit seed capital incubators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission 2002</td>
<td>two criteria: 1) level of assistance provided and 2) level of technological specialisation</td>
<td>9 typologies: varying from &quot;Industrial Estate&quot; (lowest levels; pure work space provider) to &quot;Technology Centre&quot; (highest levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert et al. 2003</td>
<td>three criteria: 1) final aim (for profit or non-profit), 2) dominant activities, 3) aim (economic development, technology, etc.)</td>
<td>4 typologies: 1) economic development, 2) academic, 3) business, 4) private investment incubators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst &amp; Young 2003</td>
<td>three criteria: 1) position of incubators in the chain of promotion/creation, 2) sector of activity, 3) evaluations incubators (by their clients)</td>
<td>9 classification types without mentioning synonyms for the different typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Zedtwitz 2003</td>
<td>strategic objectives</td>
<td>5 typologies: 1) regional, 2) university, 3) virtual, 4) independent commercial, 5) corporate incubators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aernoudt 2004</td>
<td>three criteria: 1) stakeholders, 2) target groups (sector), 3) objectives</td>
<td>5 typologies: 1) mixed, 2) economic development, 3) technology, 4) social, 5) basic research incubators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carayannis &amp; von Zedtwitz 2005</td>
<td>business scopes</td>
<td>4 typologies: 1) vertical, 2) segment, 3) geography, 4) industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information for Development Program 2011</td>
<td>business services</td>
<td>3 typologies: 1) hand-holders, 2) network boosters, 3) seed capital providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own illustration

These various one and multi-criteria approaches open the way for other additional and more detailed multi-criteria approaches. Basically, the more diversity is created, the more that new incubation models might be discovered and created. Diversity should only be created, though, in a few meaningful specifications and not as an end in itself. In alignment with Bakkali et al. (2014), the different typologies suffer mainly from two basic limitations: Firstly, there still does not exist a uniform definition for an incubator. This means that all typologies are based on their different understandings of the underlying foundation. Special care must be taken when dealing with them. It seems necessary to verify the appropriateness of typologies in the context of their specific application. Secondly, typologies that focus on incubators’ structures feature limited diversity since structures and processes are quite similar among the different incubators.
In light of this, a combination of Kahn’s (1995) definition with von Zedtwitz’s (2003) and Aernoudt’s (2004) typologies can, however, be considered an appropriate foundation for classifying arts incubators regardless of their different stakeholders, objectives, and organisational structures – basically as a subset of business incubators with a focus on arts and crafts as a special target industry.

It is Essig (2014a) who classifies arts incubators by their key stakeholders. More precisely, she focuses on those stakeholders that are the primary target of incubator’s stated objectives and “so is used as proxy for the objectives themselves” (Essig, 2014a, p. 173). Kalers (2002, p. 91) calls this group of stakeholders the “claimant stakeholders” who have “some kind of claim on the services of the organisation” or incubator in that case. In relation to the aforementioned working definition of incubators and in accordance with Essig, it can reasonably be stated that the “primary objective of arts incubators is to support artists and art-making organisations” (Essig, 2014a, p. 173). In this particular context, artists and claimant stakeholders are identical. Yet Essig (2014b) is correct in pointing out that most organised arts incubators are tools of public policy, with the main objective to support the community’s economic and social development, as (Carizzozo Works, 2015, “Mission and Goals”) duly noticed: “[…] to improve the quality of life in Carrizozo, NM, and the surrounding area through careful planning, education and open communication so as to encourage community development, economic growth, and cultural diversity.” Such objectives do not necessarily target the individual artists rather than the total outcome of development in a specific community. The claimant stakeholder of those arts incubators that have those community-related primary objectives as their mission is the community and not the individual artist. The case at university-based incubators is similar. Their primary objectives are to nurture the university’s reputation as a leading research and knowledge institution, the acquisition of new students, or technology (in the case of technology incubators) rather than the individual student clients. As a result of her analysis based on the primary objectives and claimant stakeholders, Essig (2014a) classifies the following four different arts incubator models that have been utilised for the research in this thesis:

- “arts incubators” in a strict sense with individual artists and arts organisations as claimant stakeholders and target objective,
- “community development incubators” with the community as claimant stakeholder and the development of the community as main objective,
- “student incubators” with the university as claimant stakeholder and the university’s reputation as the primary objective, and
- “commercial incubators” with the owner of the privately organised incubator as claimant stakeholder and the maximisation of profit as the stated objective.
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Conceptual Delimitation of Entrepreneurial Service Providers

Since the business concept of business incubators has not been clarified, the terms "business incubator", (creative) "hubs", "accelerator", "science and technology parks", "business angels", "venture capital/pre-seed companies", and "coworking spaces" must be distinguished from one another, although the idea behind each term is unique. In accordance with the InBIA (2015), Handelsblatt Research Institute (2015), CSES (2002), and Achleitner and Engel (2001a,b), the following conceptual delimitations can in principle be made (Table 5.2-1):

Table 5.2-1: Conceptual Delimitations of Entrepreneurial Service Provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Business Angel</th>
<th>Pre-Seed Company</th>
<th>Research Parks</th>
<th>Accelerator</th>
<th>Coworking Space</th>
<th>(Creative) Hub</th>
<th>Business Incubator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>wealthy individuals</td>
<td>institutional investor</td>
<td>public facility</td>
<td>private institution</td>
<td>public institution or private individual</td>
<td>public or private platform</td>
<td>public or private platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Objectives</strong></td>
<td>return on investment (early stage); personal mentoring</td>
<td>return on investment (early stage); business assistance</td>
<td>technology development; economic development</td>
<td>shorten time-to-market of later-stage ventures</td>
<td>creating collaboration opportunities</td>
<td>economic development of a community</td>
<td>clients' development from idea to market (early stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Focus</strong></td>
<td>&quot;smart&quot; money, e.g. capital and expertise</td>
<td>capital and consultancy</td>
<td>accommodation and training</td>
<td>training and networking</td>
<td>providing working space</td>
<td>providing working space, networking, business support</td>
<td>business assistance, networking, facilities, infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The term “hub” is normally used with regard to the creative industries where creative hubs are regarded as a model for business support of creative entrepreneurs. The term is, however, not clearly defined (British Council, 2016b). The London Development Agency (LDA, 2003) defined hubs generally as places providing working spaces for entrepreneurs as well as opportunities for knowledge sharing, collaboration, networking, and skills development. In line with this understanding, the British Council (2016b) calls (creative) hubs a venue using parts of its available space for networking, organisational, and business development. Virani (2015) and the British Council (2016a) state in this context that hubs can take on a number of forms, such as business incubators, co-working spaces, training institutions, or service centres for businesses. Hubs are therefore used as an umbrella term subsuming different typologies of service providers that operatively provide business support services, as follows:

Business incubators in the sense of the aforementioned working definition typically provide their clients with training programmes, further business development services, working space, and network contacts. These services are similar to accelerators. Yet the key distinction between the two concepts is that business incubators start to support entrepreneurs at their early stages, while accelerators are focused on start-ups in later stages to support their market entry above all. Incubator clients thus usually join incubation programmes for up to three years. In contrast, accelerators are structured more like schools for start-up companies (InBIA, 2015). Their programmes last only between three and six months and focus on an accelerated development of products and services in order to enter the market very quickly. Accelerators are therefore considered “late-stage incubators” (Lewis et al., 2011, p. 17) and interested in technology start-ups with already well developed business ideas, products, and services that only need short-term financing and limited consulting (Handelsblatt Research Institute, 2015).

Research parks, sometimes also called science parks or technology parks, are property-based ventures consisting of research and development facilities for technological and scientific companies. Such technology and science parks often promote community economic development and technology transfer. Unlike business incubators, research parks normally do not offer networking and comprehensive business services (CSES, 2002; Handelsblatt Research Institute, 2015; InBIA, 2015).

Business angels are wealthy individuals investing in start-ups (Achleitner and Engel, 2001). They normally act as investor and personal mentor at the same time and provide their start-ups with further
consultancy and networking contacts. Quite often, business angels are successful entrepreneurs with deep market knowledge as well as understanding of the entrepreneurial challenges. They are able to transfer their entrepreneurial knowledge to their clients as well as to help them develop the required entrepreneurial mindset and skills. In contrast to business incubators, business angels normally do not provide their clients with infrastructure and working spaces. Business angels could therefore complement incubators very well (CSES, 2002; Handelsblatt Research Institute, 2015).

Venture capital and pre-seed companies are institutional investors of start-ups. The difference between these concepts is that pre-seed companies invest and provide business assistance at early stages of their clients, beginning at the stage of roughly defined business ideas, while venture capital companies are drawn more to later-stage start-ups which already have well developed and market-proven business concepts. Their clients require financing for growth and market entry. Due to the early-stage focus of pre-seed companies, they are comparable with business incubators in that they deliver business assistance and networking. The key difference between incubators and pre-seed companies is, however, the primary investment objective of pre-seed companies. While incubators provide mainly non-financial services, pre-seed companies are focus mainly on financial issues. It is a necessary condition for clients’ further assistance and development. In practice, the boundaries between pre-seed financing and incubation become blurred; more and more privately organised for-profit incubators, particularly with a business focus on high-margin technologies and healthcare products, act similarly as pre-seed investors. In light of this, the later-stage focus of venture capital companies does not therefore allow the interchangeable use of the terms business incubator and venture capital company (Handelsblatt Research Institute, 2015). Venture capital companies could be, though, the next logical step for incubation clients to prepare them for the exit out of the incubation programme.

Business incubators and co-working spaces alike create an atmosphere that fosters entrepreneurship by connecting people facing similar opportunities and challenges. However, business incubators do differ from co-working spaces in that they provide formal programming and business services, set goals and support their clients in their development to be able to survive on their own. Co-working space is therefore more of a style of work than a structured environment with an educational and developmental programme (InBIA, 2015).
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Appendix C

Structured Interviews with Practising Fine Artists

Structured Interviews – Interview Schedule

In total, nine working unestablished newcomer artists who were not represented by galleries or other supportive art networks until the interview were randomly selected and interviewed (see Appendix 1), from which seven out of nine artists at the Berliner Liste 2015, a fair for contemporary art from the 17th of September to the 20th of September 2015 in Berlin that consciously enables artists not yet represented by galleries the chance to show and sell their work to a cosmopolitan, art-savvy audience. The other two fine artists were identified by researchers’ personal network contacts. Their interviews were conducted by telephone on the 21st and 22nd of September 2015. Six out of nine interviews were tape recorded with artists’ permission, while three interviews were conducted only by notes due to too noisy and distracting interview environments at the Berliner Liste 2015 (this applies to one interview) and on explicit request of the two interview partners who were interviewed by telephone. Table: Interview Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length (hrs:min:sec)</th>
<th>Type of recording</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 September 2015</td>
<td>00:17:12</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 September 2015</td>
<td>00:52:28</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 September 2015</td>
<td>00:40:12</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:23:43</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:22:21</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Swiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:20:00</td>
<td>hand-written notes</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 September 2015</td>
<td>00:18:05</td>
<td>tape recording</td>
<td>Berliner Liste 2015</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 September 2015</td>
<td>00:20:00</td>
<td>hand-written notes</td>
<td>Studio Braunschweig</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22 September 2015</td>
<td>00:20:00</td>
<td>hand-written notes</td>
<td>Studio Nice</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 2.4-1, Chapter 2, Methodology

Interview Questions

#1: We are at The Berliner Liste 2015, an art exhibition that enables newcomer artists not yet represented by galleries the chance to show and sell their work to an international audience. What do you think about it?

#2: Is it stressful for you to promote yourself, negotiate prices, and sell your artwork?

#3: Are you currently able to make a living from your art?

#4: How important is it for you to make a living from your art?

#5: What do you think would increase your chances to make a living in the arts?

#6: How difficult is it to find a gallerist?

#7: Let’s get down to details and look at some core activities and tasks of working fine artists. One everyday task challenge is the procurement and purchasing of your materials. Do you order your materials only for yourself or together with other artists?

#8: This means that joining purchasing groups in order to realise price advantages for materials is not a serious option for you?

#9: How satisfied are you with your visibility in the marketplace and level of attention?

#10: What do you think about using expert partners in marketing, promotion, and networking to increase your visibility and market attention – internationally?
#11: Do you think to be equipped with all the skills to successfully meet the commercial and business related challenges as working artist?

#12: What do you think about individual on-site coaching and mentoring to further develop and accelerate your professional career?

#13: What do you think about meeting artists virtually from all over the world, exchanging ideas, discussing art and business related issues with them?

#14: What part of your professional working life is estimated for administrative issues, such as market research, tax, legal, insurance, funding, and pension issues – roughly in percentage points?

#15: What do you think about the opportunity of getting access to professional administrative services that handle all of these issues for you, like a personal assistant would do?

#16: How important is the physical presence of artworks. As you mentioned you use the internet to promote your artworks as well. Could that be a complete substitution of the physical presence of art?

#17: What other activities in your life as working artist would provide benefits and additional advantages for you by outsourcing them?

#18: What do you think about collaborating with the personal assistant virtually via the internet or other social media tools, available 24 hours, 7 days a week?

#19: Would you join an online art community to further develop your art career?

#20: How about a virtual network only for artists and people interested in arts such as gallerists, art collectors, curators and others?
## Interview Categories and Generalised Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Category</th>
<th>Sub Categories</th>
<th>Generalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction</td>
<td>artists are not satisfied with their visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for not being visible and requirements to become visible</td>
<td>lack of exposure to new audiences and ways to continue to exhibit their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for not being seen</td>
<td>means that have not been used to promote their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation, cost, and efforts</td>
<td>advertising material is important to remain in people's memory, for example through calendars, flyers, and business cards, which are high cost and can be challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>sponsorship often caused by emotions related to giving support in the form of personal encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements on service partners</td>
<td>high demand on partners, they need to prove their experience and quality and must be feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Living (Influences)</td>
<td>Current situations</td>
<td>interviewees are not always making a living from their art due to unpredictable income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel training</td>
<td>utilised skills for making a living from their art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meanings</td>
<td>means that are increased through higher visibility of personal achievements and through more public exhibitions, more events in exhibitions, and other intensified marketing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callance</td>
<td>Motives</td>
<td>callance are needed to inform and attract target groups to exhibit, promote and market work, and finally to convert it for all other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>market guidance is difficult when artists lack visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>being motivated as a main process as outputs are needed to be visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness for collaboration</td>
<td>can be made a profit if collaboration is utilised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>high demand for collaboration offered that help to get mentors and support feedback important for further professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Aids (Outsourcing)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>high demand for outsourcing offers that help to get mentors and support feedback important for further professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration work</td>
<td>administration work is considered a 'necessary evil' and needs to be seen beyond as an opportunity to increase their visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>artists usually spend up to 50% of their time on administration, not on creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client support</td>
<td>it is seen, only by the clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assistant (PA)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>PA is a necessary welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>high demand for ‘marketing’ support including sales organisations as well as for ‘administration’ and ‘marketing and exhibition organisation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements on PA</td>
<td>involved relationship to PA and need for a full-time PA is increasing, can also be affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile/Muscle</td>
<td></td>
<td>need for affordable working and exhibition space, marketing and marketing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td>need for affordable space, marketing support, and marketing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Working</td>
<td></td>
<td>need for affordable working and exhibition space, marketing and marketing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with online platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td>experience with online platforms, such as Facebook, LinkedIn, or Instagram Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas for improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>high demand for platforms with structured navigation categories and copyrights services for artists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's own illustration
Appendix D

Lecturer Survey in the UK and Germany

Schedule Online Questionnaire Survey Fine Art Lecturers, UK and Germany

1. Are you teaching Fine Art or single subjects (Painting, Drawing, Graphic Design, Crafts, Photography, Sculpture, Visual Arts, etc.) full- or part-time?
   - full-time
   - part-time
   - part-time, guest lecturer

2. What type of higher education institution (HEI) do you teach at?
   - University
   - University College
   - College
   - Private Institution

3. What is the name of your HEI?
   (the name of your HEI is exclusively required to prevent the distortion of data in the context of this survey; the name of the HEI will not be disclosed)

4. How many years of experience do you have in teaching courses in Fine Art?

5. Are you a practising artist?
   - Yes
   - No

6. How many students do you supervise (on average) per year of study?

7. In your opinion what does it exactly need to become a successful practising fine artist?
   (success is defined economically in this context as being able to make a living in the arts exclusively by commercialising / selling intellectual property/ artwork)

8. What is your understanding of being a self-employed practising fine artist?
   - being a practising fine artist is a profession equal to others
   - being a practising fine artist is a choice of lifestyle/vocation
   - being a practising fine artist is both profession and choice of lifestyle/vocation
   - I do not know

9. In your opinion what key market barriers need to be overcome to make a living in the arts?
10. Will your fine art students be prepared to successfully overcome these key barriers after graduation?

□ Yes, entirely
□ Yes, with limitations
□ No
□ I do not know

11. If your answer was "Yes, with limitations" or "No", what educational adjustments should be concretely made?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. Do you think entrepreneurial skills are crucial to successfully make a living as practising fine artist?

□ Yes
□ No
□ I do not know

13. Please rank the relevance of the following skills to successfully make a living as practising fine artist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>skills</th>
<th>is not important at all</th>
<th>is of little importance</th>
<th>is of medium importance (= is always useful)</th>
<th>is very important</th>
<th>is crucial and of highest importance</th>
<th>evaluation is not possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>selling skills (incl. marketing and promotion)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership skills (ability to set goals, to define a vision to get others enthusiastic about it)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic thinking (planning) skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business planning /venturing skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art specific, technical skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea and creativity skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity skills (ability to recognise or create and realise (business) opportunities)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finance skills (cash management and funding)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art industry knowledge</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication and presentation skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem solving skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project and time management skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team working / collaboration skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social Media / IT skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Can you imagine implementing the following teaching methods in the regular fine art curriculum to develop entrepreneurial skills of your students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Methods</th>
<th>already implemented</th>
<th>in preparation</th>
<th>in principle conceivable but no plans for preparation</th>
<th>currently unimaginable</th>
<th>evaluation is not possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>real-life simulation/ role plays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from Peers (students teach students incl. feedback)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning methods (twitter, blog, video lectures, wiki, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal mentoring by external practising fine artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you see the need for adjustments of the regular fine art curriculum towards more market orientation and entrepreneurship education?

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ I do not know

16. If "Yes", what adjustments should be concretely made?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

17. Will you be informed of in-house extracurricular courses in Entrepreneurship or Art Management?

- □ Yes, by the art department/faculty
- □ Yes, by other faculties/departments of the HEI
- □ Yes, by both art faculty and other faculties/departments
- □ No

18. If "Yes", do you promote or inform of these offerings in your class to your students?

- □ Yes
- □ No

19. If "No", why not?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

20. Do you think to have sufficient time for a proper consultation with your students regarding their needs, personal development, career perspectives, and feedback?

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ I do not know

21. If "No", what should be changed to increase the supervision time?

- □ more lecturers per class
- □ smaller class sizes
- □ both more lecturers and smaller class sizes
- □ use of teaching methods that increase supervision time for lecturers
- □ others
- □ I do not know
22. If "Others", please put your ideas in concrete terms

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

23. Are you regularly trained in entrepreneurship education by your HEI?
   □ Yes
   □ No

24. Do you privately look for external training opportunities to develop your teaching skills in entrepreneurship for artists?
   □ Yes
   □ No

25. Do you see the need for tailor-made training programmes to develop entrepreneurial skills of fine artists?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

26. If "No", why not?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

27. Have (fine) art specific training programmes in entrepreneurship already been implemented at your HEI?
   □ Yes, exclusively by the art department/faculty
   □ Yes, in collaboration with other faculties of the HEI
   □ Yes, in collaboration with external institutions
   □ No
   □ I do not know

28. Is your art department/faculty decentrally managed with regard to decision making and taking responsibility for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>... recruiting fulltime lecturers?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... using innovative teaching methods in the regular fine art curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... making adjustments to the regular fine art curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... collaborating with other faculties to create art-specific training programmes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... engaging with HEI's stakeholders (for example, community, industry partners, art organisations, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... acquiring alumni/graduated students as mentors for art students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... art faculty's funding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... acquiring practising fine artists as mentors for art students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you recognise a substantial embeddedness of entrepreneurial engagement and education?
   □ Yes, exclusively in the art department/faculty
   □ Yes, but only in other faculties
   □ Yes, across HEI's campus
   □ No
   □ I do not know
30. Does your HEI offer financial support or incubation services (mentoring, coaching, networking, business coaching and development, etc.) to graduated art students?
   - Yes, financial support
   - Yes, incubation services
   - Yes, both financial support and incubation services
   - No
   - I do not know

31. Is there anything else you would like to comment or share with me about fine art education?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

I sincerely thank you for all of your support!

Best Regards,
Marco Thom
### Appendix D

**Lecturer Survey in the UK and Germany**

Table: Lecturer Survey: Crucial Skills to Make an Economic Living as Practising Fine Artist, UK Findings (n=139)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Assessment Categories (number of namings by category)</th>
<th>UK (n=139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is not important at all</td>
<td>is of little importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea / Creativity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling / Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Specific Technical Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking / Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Industry / Market Know how</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Working / Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media / IT Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Planning / Venturing Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table: Lecturer Survey: Crucial Skills to Make an Economic Living as Practising Fine Artist, German Findings (n=65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>GER (n=65)</th>
<th>Assessment Categories (number of namings by category)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is not important at all                  is of little importance is of medium importance</td>
<td>is very important is crucial and of highest importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea / Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Specific Technical Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling / Marketing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Industry / Market Know how</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / Presentation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking (Planning)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Working / Collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media / IT Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Planning / Venturing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Allocation of Participating Lecturers to HEIs in the UK and Germany**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Number of Participating Lecturers in Fine Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aberystwyth University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arts University Bournemouth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barkin &amp; Dagenham College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bath Spa University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Birmingham City University</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blackpool and the Fylde College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bournemouth University</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire New University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canterbury Christ Church University</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Bristol College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Colchester Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doncaster College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Exeter College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grimsby Institute and University Centre Grimsby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Havening College of Further and Higher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hereford College of Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hull College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>K College, Kent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kirklees College</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lakes College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of HEI</td>
<td>Number of Participating Lecturers in Fine Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Leeds College of Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>London Metropolitan University 2012 Merger with The Cass (The Sir John Cass Faculty of Art, Architecture and Design)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Loughborough University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University Faculty of Art and Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Middlesex University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New College Stamford</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Northbrook College Sussex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Norwich University of the Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nottingham Trent University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Open College of the Arts</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Plymouth College of Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Plymouth University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rotherham College of Arts and Technology</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Number of Participating Lecturers in Fine Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>St Helens College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Staffordshire University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Birmingham Metropolitan College (06/2013 merged with Stourbridge College)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sunderland College</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Teesside University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The Glasgow School of Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The University of East London</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>University College for the Creative Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>University of Bolton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>University of Bradford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>University of Brighton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>University of Chichester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>University of Cumbria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>University of Derby School of Art and Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh College of Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>University of Gloucestershire</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of HEI</td>
<td>Number of Participating Lecturers in Fine Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>University of Lincoln</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>University of Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>University of Roehampton</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>University of Southend School of Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>University of Sunderland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>University of Arts London</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>University of Arts London</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>University of Arts London</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>University of West London</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>University of Wolverhampton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Warwickshire College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Weymouth College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>York St John University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Name of HEI | Number of Participating Lecturers in Fine Art
---|---
1 Akmadie Bildende Künste München | 9
2 Alanus Hochschule für Kunst und Gesellschaft | 4
3 Bauhaus Weimar | 3
4 Folkwang Universität der Künste | 3
5 Hochschule der Künste Berlin | 2
6 Hochschule der Bildenden Künste Saar | 3
7 Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden | 2
8 Hochschule für Bildende Künste Hamburg | 3
9 Hochschule für Gestaltung Berlin | 2
10 Hochschule für Kunst, Design und Populäre Musik Freiburg | 2
11 Hochschule für Künste im Sozialen Ottersberg | 1
12 Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst Leipzig (Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig) | 8
13 Kunstakademie Braunschweig | 2
14 Kunstakademie Kolbermoor | 1
15 Kunstakademie Reichenhall | 8
16 Kunsthochschule Berlin (Weißensee) | 4
17 Kunsthochschule Frankfurt | 4
18 Kunsthochschule Kassel | 2
19 Kunsthochschule Mainz | 6
20 Muthesius Kunsthochschule Kiel | 1
21 Staatliche Akademie der Bildenden Künste Stuttgart | 2
22 Universität Greifswald | 1
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Student Survey in the UK and Germany

Schedule Online Questionnaire Survey Fine Art Students (Undergraduates), UK and Germany

1. Are you studying Fine Art or single subjects (Painting, Drawing, Graphic Design, Crafts, Photography, Sculpture, Visual Arts, etc.) full- or part-time?
   □ full-time
   □ part-time

2. What type of higher education institution (HEI) are you studying at?
   □ University
   □ University College
   □ College
   □ Private Institution

3. In which year of study are you currently?

4. What do you currently intend to do directly after graduation?
   □ studying for a post-graduate degree (Master)
   □ being a self-employed fine artists
   □ being an employee in an art organisation (gallery, museum, etc.)
   □ being an employee in a non-art organisation
   □ other activities
   □ I do not know

5. In your opinion, what does it exactly need to become a successful practising fine artist?
   (success is defined economically in this context as being able to make a living in the arts exclusively by commercialising / selling intellectual property/ artwork)

6. What is your understanding of being a self-employed practising fine artist?
   □ being a practising fine artist is a profession equal to others
   □ being a practising fine artist is a choice of lifestyle/vocation
   □ being a practising fine artist is both profession and choice of lifestyle/vocation
   □ I do not know

7. In your opinion what key market barriers need to be overcome to make a living in the arts?

8. Do you think to be prepared to successfully overcome these key barriers after graduation?
   □ Yes, entirely
   □ Yes, with limitations
   □ No
   □ I do not know

9. If your answer was "Yes, with limitations" or "No", what educational adjustments should be concretely made?
10. Do you think entrepreneurial skills are crucial to successfully make a living as practising fine artist?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

11. Please rank the relevance of the following skills to successfully make a living as practising fine artist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>skills</th>
<th>is not important at all</th>
<th>is of little importance</th>
<th>is of medium importance (= is always useful)</th>
<th>is very important</th>
<th>is crucial and of highest importance</th>
<th>evaluation is not possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>selling skills (incl. marketing and promotion)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership skills (ability to set goals, to define a vision to get others enthusiastic about it)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic thinking (planning) skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business planning / venturing skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art specific, technical skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea and creativity skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity skills (ability to recognise or create and realise (business) opportunities)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finance skills (cash management and funding)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art industry knowledge</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication and presentation skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem solving skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project and time management skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team working / collaboration skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social Media / IT skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many fine art students are currently in your class?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

13. Are you satisfied with the current student-to-lecturer ratio in your class relating to the availability of your lecturers when support and feedback is needed?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

14. If "No", what should be changed?
   □ more lecturers per class
   □ smaller class sizes
   □ both more lecturers and smaller class sizes
   □ use of teaching methods that increase supervision time for lecturers
   □ others
   □ I do not know
15. If "Others", please put your ideas in concrete terms
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

16. Are you informed of in-house extracurricular courses in Entrepreneurship or Art Management?
   □ Yes, by the art department/faculty
   □ Yes, by other faculties/departments of the HEI
   □ Yes, by both art faculty and other faculties/departments
   □ No

17. If “Yes”, do you attend these courses?
   □ Yes, regularly
   □ Yes, rarely
   □ No

18. If “No”, why not?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

19. Do you see the need for adjustments of the regular fine art curriculum towards more market orientation and entrepreneurship education? of fine artists?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

20. Do you expect to be educated on how to become successfully self-employed after graduation?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

21. If “No”, please specify your reasons
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

22. Do you see the need for tailor-made training programmes to develop entrepreneurial skills of fine artists?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

23. If “No”, why not?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

24. If “Yes”, would you regularly attend these tailor-made training courses?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

25. If “No”, why not?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

26. Is there is anything else you would like to comment or share with me about fine art education?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Table: Student Survey: Crucial Skills to Make an Economic Living as a Practising Fine Artist, UK Findings (n=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>UK (n=16)</th>
<th>Assessment Categories (number of mentions by category)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea / Creativity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Industry / Market Know-how</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Specific Technical Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Identification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales / Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Time Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Planning / Venturing Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking (Planning) Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / Presentation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media / IT Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work / Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table: Student Survey: Crucial Skills to Make an Economic Living as a Practising Fine Artist, German Findings (n=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>GER (n=27)</th>
<th>Assessment Categories (number of mentions by category)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is not important at all</td>
<td>is of little importance</td>
<td>is of medium importance</td>
<td>is very important</td>
<td>is crucial and of highest importance</td>
<td>evaluation is not possible</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea / Creativity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication / Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Specific Technical Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Industry / Market Know-how</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales / Marketing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking (Planning)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Planning / Venturing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work / Collaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media / IT Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Schedule Online Questionnaire Survey Commercial Fine Art Galleries, UK and Germany

1. How long have you been working as gallerist/gallery owner (in years)?

2. In which city is your gallery located?

3. How many fine artists are actively represented by your gallery?

4. How many art collectors and art buyers are you currently serving (existing customer base)?

5. How many permanent employees are currently working in your gallery?

6. What sales categories are achieved through the following sales activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Activities</th>
<th>0 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>1-50 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>51-100 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>101-250 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>251-500 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>501-1,000 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>more than 1,000 thousand GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>online sales</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art fairs</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallery sales</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other activities</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What exhibition space (in square meters) do you have available in your gallery?

8. Where do your represented fine artists come from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>0% of your artists</th>
<th>1-15% of your artists</th>
<th>16-25% of your artists</th>
<th>26-50% of your artists</th>
<th>51-75% of your artists</th>
<th>76-100% of your artists</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from the region</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the UK</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Europe</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. Where do your most important customers come from (measured in sales revenues)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0% of sales</th>
<th>1-15% of sales</th>
<th>16-25% of sales</th>
<th>26-50% of sales</th>
<th>51-75% of sales</th>
<th>76-100% of sales</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from the region</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the UK</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Europe</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the USA/Canada</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Asia/other countries</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What is the average price range for the works of your represented fine artists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>up to 1,000 GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>1,001-5,000 GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>5,001-10,000 GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>10,001-50,000 GBP (Euro)</th>
<th>more than 50,000 GBP (Euro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>average price range</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How many visitors do you have in your gallery per week on average?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

12. How many artworks do you sell per week on average?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

13. What is the principal task of a commercial contemporary art gallery?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

14. Do you think the gallerists’ principal task could be taken on and accomplished by fine artists themselves or other marketing and artists’ agencies successfully?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>... the fine artists themselves</th>
<th>... other experienced individuals/organisations</th>
<th>... the gallerist exclusively</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gallerists’ principal task could be successfully taken on and accomplished by ...</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Why do you think only gallerists could deal with this task successfully?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
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16. In your opinion what are the key market challenges and barriers a fine artist needs to master or overcome in order to become and remain successful?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

17. In your opinion what are the key market challenges and barriers a profit-oriented gallerist needs to master or overcome in order to become and remain successful?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

18. Do you think entrepreneurial skills are crucial for profit-oriented gallerists to become and remain successful?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

19. Do you think entrepreneurial skills are crucial for fine artists to become and remain successful?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ I do not know

20. What does it need to be discovered and represented by your gallery?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

21. What is your understanding of quality art?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

22. How can quality art be best sold/commercialised?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

23. Looking into the future, how do you see the work of profit-oriented galleries in the next 10 to 20 years?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Analysis of Arts Entrepreneurship Education at 87 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the UK and Germany

Table: Variety and Allocation of Degree Programmes in Fine Art for Undergraduates at University Level, UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Years of Study (full-time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Fine Art</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND Fine Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Fine Art Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Painting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Fine Art &amp; Professional Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine &amp; Applied Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) in Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Art Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Art for Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Fine Art, Critical and Curatorial Practices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Digital Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Fine Art Photography</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (Hons) Photography for Digital Media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degree Professional Photography</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degree Fine Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degree in Contemporary Arts Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND in Photography</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum (n=75) | 75 | 100.0 |

Source: Author’s own illustration
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Table: Key Findings on Institutional Level, UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree (Accreditation)</th>
<th>UCAST Code</th>
<th>Workload (ECTS Credits)</th>
<th>Graduates' employability</th>
<th>ENTREPRENEURSHIP/ENTERPRISE</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aberystwyth University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arts University Bournemouth</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art (BA) (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barkin &amp; Dagenham College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma (HND) in Fine Art</td>
<td>W9809</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bath Spa University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art (BA) (Hons)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Birmingham City University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art (BA) (Hons)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blackpool and the Fylde College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art and Professional Practice BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>leadership in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canterbury Christ Church</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine and Applied Arts</td>
<td>W900 V</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Bristol College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Foundation Degree Professional Photography</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

### Table of Undergraduate Courses in Fine Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Offered Course</th>
<th>UCAS Code</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>Workload (in Hours)</th>
<th>Intended Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Colchester Institute</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>BA (Hons) in Art and Design Fine Art</td>
<td>W191</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Colchester Institute's purpose is to meet the needs of customers through effective learning, teaching and development of skills</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doncaster College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>W617</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Meeting learner needs and aspiring to excellence</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Exeter College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Foundation Degree</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To be regarded as an outstanding college within our community, realising opportunities through partnership and innovation</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grimsby Institute and University Centre</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art Practice BA</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our Mission is to deliver accessible, high quality, education and training to all our communities</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Harrow College of Further and Higher Education</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>The mission is to deliver high quality education and training that responds to the needs of employees and individuals</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hartlepool College of Arts</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>The college's mission is to provide outstanding education and employability in the creative arts</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hull College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>BA (Hons) Fine Art</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Innovative and enterprising people enabling excellent learning for employability and social fulfilment</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>K College, Kent</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Foundation Degree in Fine Art Practice (2y) + Bachelor Top-Up</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Learning to succeed - providing high quality education</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kirklees College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art for Design BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Creating Opportunity - Changing Lives</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lakes College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
<td>Fine Art HND</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Working in partnership to increase the skills and economic prosperity of our communities</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>up to 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The difficulty of practising fine artists in making a living: Why arts entrepreneurship education is important

### Appendix H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Offered Course</th>
<th>UCAS Code</th>
<th>Workload (ECTS credits)</th>
<th>Workload (hours)</th>
<th>Intended Learning Outcome Provided Course</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>The University's mission is to pursue research at the highest international level, to create a stimulating and innovative learning environment for all students and staff and, in international, interdisciplinary and regional collaborations, to enhance economic, cultural and social well-being.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Leeds College of Art</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>We are an influential, world-facing, creatively driven institution where professional educators, practitioners and researchers work together to develop and value excellence. We aim to provide distinctive, critically informed and relevant practice in order to support economic growth and cultural advancement.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To engage in teaching and research of high quality and of value to society, so as to enhance the greatest number and the client variety of people to develop the capability to shape their future and to contribute to the development of their organisations and communities.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Home) Fine Art</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Liverpool Hope University's mission is to: - provide opportunities for the well-rounded personal development - educate the whole person in mind, body and spirit - be a national provider of a wide range of high quality programmes responsive to the needs of students, including the education, training and professional development of teachers. To contribute to the educational, religious, cultural, social and economic life of Liverpool.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>London Metropolitan University 2012 Merger w ith The Cass (The Sir John Cass Faculty of Art, Architecture and Design)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>London Metropolitan University's mission is to: - provide opportunities for the well-rounded personal development - educate the whole person in mind, body and spirit - be a national provider of a wide range of high quality programmes responsive to the needs of students, including the education, training and professional development of teachers. To contribute to the educational, religious, cultural, social and economic life of Liverpool.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Loughborough University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Providing an outstanding education and research</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 20</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University Faculty of Art and Design</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To be the UK's leading University for world class professional.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Middlesex University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is: - to inform us about the rapidly and radically we have throughout our history. - the focus for now and for the future is on equipping our students with the skills they need for work and for life, developing our campus, (...) - to meet the demands of our students with the skills they need for work and; to support others where we can. For students around the globe to study and gain a Middlesex degree wherever they live.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New College Stamford</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Foundation Degree in Contemporary Arts Practice</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Education Excellence for All in a Sustainable Environment (All Round Excellence)</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>up to 10</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Art BA (Home)</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to: - be a world-class research-intensive University - deliver outstanding and challenging learning at the highest quality - play a leading role in the economic, social and cultural development of the North East of England.</td>
<td>leadership in research</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree <em>(Bachelor/Optma)</em></th>
<th>Offered Course</th>
<th>UCAS Code</th>
<th>Workload (ECTS credits)</th>
<th>Workload (in hours)</th>
<th>Intended Learning Outcome Provided Course</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement (Guest Lecturers per academic year)</th>
<th>(Mentoring Programmes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Northbrook College Sussex</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To be a centre of excellence for vocational and personal learning, helping people succeed and achieve their potential</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>NUFU is a centre of excellence for the benefit of individuals, communities and the economy. Through excellent research, teaching and innovation we transform lives, making a powerful contribution to cultural and economic development and regeneration, in the City and Region, nationally and globally.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Norwich University of the Arts</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>NUA's mission is to be the best specialist university for arts, design and media study in Europe, producing graduates of the highest quality and inspiring students and staff to achieve excellence in the creative and cultural spheres.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nottingham Trent University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to deliver education and research that shape lives and society</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Open College of the Arts</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To support and nurture creative talent is however it is found</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Plymouth College of Art</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons) Fine Art, Critical and Curatorial Practices</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>providing high-quality education for the future</td>
<td>leadership in teaching, [30 ]</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Plymouth University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>enterprise</td>
<td>Our enterprising approach will further develop our reputation as an enterprising University, and our enterprise culture will deliver sustainable innovation and international impact. We are also the knowledge as a centre to transform lives. We will achieve this through our enterprising culture, excellence in teaching and learning, making our enterprise culture sustainable and transformative.</td>
<td>entrepreneurship/enterprise</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Digital Photography BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W640</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Developing trained individuals and leading edge businesses through learning, skills, applied research, enterprise and innovation</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rotherham College of Arts and Technology</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
<td>HND in Photography</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Providing the people of South Yorkshire with the highest quality education and training, and ensuring that all sections of the local community are represented</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>up to 5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor BA (Hons)</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Providing high-quality inspirational teaching and applied research to transform individuals, organisations and communities</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of HEI</td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>Offered Course</td>
<td>UCAS Code</td>
<td>Workload (ECTS credit)</td>
<td>Workload (in hours)</td>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome Provided Course</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Guest Lecturers per academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>St Helens College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art Painting BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To provide outstanding education and training for individuals and employers</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Staffordshire University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons) Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100/ W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Transforming people and communities by delivering accessible, high-quality, higher education through partnership-working with our students, our customers and our staff</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Birmingham Metropolitan College (09/2013 merged with Stourbridge College)</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
<td>HND in Fine Art</td>
<td>001W</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Unlocking Talent, Creating Futures</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sunderland College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
<td>HND in Fine Art</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>enterprise</td>
<td>Providing opportunities, driving enterprise - delivering excellence - seeking partnerships with wider individuals and organisations to achieve their potential through high-quality learning, research and knowledge transfer</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Teesside University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W040</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>being internationally recognised as thought-leaders in our key areas of research and scholarship</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The Glasgow School of Art</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons) Photography</td>
<td>W040</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>being internationally recognised as thought-leaders in our key areas of research and scholarship</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 30</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The University of East London</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to: - promote academic achievement for all, particularly for those who seek to succeed against the odds; - deliver innovative research and teaching that is intellectually stimulating; - promote and provide employability skills; - provide an outstanding student experience; - maintain the social and wider financial benefits of business development, employer engagement and social exchange for individuals, communities and society</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 30</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>University College for the Creative Arts</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To excel as a University for the arts which fosters creativity through local connections and global aspirations</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>University of Bolton</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&quot;Making knowledge work! We are a provider of high-quality teaching, informed by internationally recognised research and issue-led transfer which enables students to achieve their educational aspirations and aims to enhance their careers in a whole-inclusive, supportive and sustainable environment&quot;</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 8</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>University of Bradford</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Photography for Digital Media BA (Hons)</td>
<td>WP/03</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&quot;Making knowledge work! We are a provider of high-quality teaching, informed by internationally recognised research and issue-led transfer which enables students to achieve their educational aspirations and aims to enhance their careers in a whole-inclusive, supportive and sustainable environment&quot;</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### The difficulty of practising fine artists in making a living: Why arts entrepreneurship education is important

### Intended Learning Outcome Provided Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Offered Course</th>
<th>UCAS Code</th>
<th>Workload (ECTS credits)</th>
<th>Workload (hours)</th>
<th>Intended Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement (Guest Lecturers per academic year) (Mentoring Programme)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>University of Brighton</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art Painting BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our research and teaching transform lives and benefits communities worldwide</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>We provide an outstanding learning experience for every student. We value and promote equality of opportunity, transparency and fairness. We work in partnership with business, the community and other educators. We encourage and promote research, innovation and creativity.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to provide access to higher education and foster a culture of innovation and enterprise. We value and promote equality of opportunity, transparency and tolerance. We work in partnership with business, the community and other educators. We encourage and promote research, innovation and creativity.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>University of Chichester</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to provide an outstanding learning experience for every student. We value and promote equality of opportunity, transparency and fairness. We work in partnership with business, the community and other educators. We encourage and promote research, innovation and creativity.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>University of Cumbria</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to provide an outstanding learning experience for every student. We value and promote equality of opportunity, transparency and fairness. We work in partnership with business, the community and other educators. We encourage and promote research, innovation and creativity.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>University of Derby School of Art and Design</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>To be the learner’s first choice University for quality and opportunity</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh Edinburgh College of Art</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Painting BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W120</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to create, disseminate and curate knowledge and understanding for the benefit of individuals and societies. We foster the development of the communities in which we live and work.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>University of Gloucestershire</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to provide access to higher education and foster a culture of innovation and enterprise. We value and promote equality of opportunity, transparency and tolerance. We work in partnership with business, the community and other educators. We encourage and promote research, innovation and creativity.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>University of Heriot-Watt</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>enterprise</td>
<td>An innovative and enterprising university, challenging individuals and organisations to excel</td>
<td>entrepreneurship/enterprise</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (Hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>We are a contributing, growing, shaping and supporting the regions in which we operate by investing in our research and intellectual values in these regions, by employing our intellectual and international competences, and by developing our students and staff as professional and enterprising leaders in order to address the needs of the regions, so that we may have a positive impact regionally, nationally and internationally.</td>
<td>graduates' employability</td>
<td>up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of HEI</td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>Offered Course</td>
<td>UCAS Code</td>
<td>Workload (in ECTS credits)</td>
<td>Workload (in hours)</td>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome Provided Course</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement (Guest Lecturers per academic year) (Mentoring Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Our Mission is to make an exceptional impact on business and society globally through leadership in research and teaching</td>
<td>graduates’ employability &gt;30 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>University of Lincoln</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>“A University locating in the future’ in here we serve and develop our local, national and international communities by creating purposeful knowledge and research, confident and creative graduates and a dynamic and engaged workforce”</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 20 no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>University of Reading</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Our mission is to educate talented people well, to conduct outstanding research, and to promote the responsible application of new knowledge</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 12 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>University of Roehampton</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>W0640</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Challenging, inspiring and supporting students to grow as individuals and to be responsible citizens and leaders in a complex world</td>
<td>graduates’ employability no information yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>University of Southampton Winchester School of Art</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Containing academic excellence with an innovative and entrepreneurial approach to research and supporting a culture that engages and challenges students and staff in their period of learning</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 30 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>University of Sunderland</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Providing of life-changing opportunities, delivering a high-quality student experience, and working in partnership at a local, national and international level</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 15 no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Camberwell College of Arts</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>BA (Hons) Painting</td>
<td>W120</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>The Centre will take a leading role in developing and delivering University of the Arts London’s Learning and Teaching Strategy and make a significant contribution to: - providing high quality support to staff in their teaching and support learning that is appropriate and responsive to their needs - quality enhancement of the UCL - constructing and sustaining communities of practice, built on and extending scholarly and empirical understandings of pedagogy and e-learning</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 30 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central Saint Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>The Centre will take a leading role in developing and delivering University of the Arts London’s Learning and Teaching Strategy and make a significant contribution to: - providing high quality support to staff in their teaching and support learning that is appropriate and responsive to their needs - quality enhancement of the UCL - constructing and sustaining communities of practice, built on and extending scholarly and empirical understandings of pedagogy and e-learning</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 30 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Chelsea College of Art and Design</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W101</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>The Centre will take a leading role in developing and delivering University of the Arts London’s Learning and Teaching Strategy and make a significant contribution to: - providing high quality support to staff in their teaching and support learning that is appropriate and responsive to their needs - quality enhancement of the UCL - constructing and sustaining communities of practice, built on and extending scholarly and empirical understandings of pedagogy and e-learning</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 30 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Wimbledon College of Art</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art (BA)</td>
<td>W121</td>
<td>180 3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>The Centre will take a leading role in developing and delivering University of the Arts London’s Learning and Teaching Strategy and make a significant contribution to: - providing high quality support to staff in their teaching and support learning that is appropriate and responsive to their needs - quality enhancement of the UCL - constructing and sustaining communities of practice, built on and extending scholarly and empirical understandings of pedagogy and e-learning</td>
<td>graduates’ employability up to 30 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of HEI</td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>Offered Course</td>
<td>UCAS Code</td>
<td>Workload (in ECTS credits)</td>
<td>Workload (in hours)</td>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome Provided Course</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>University of West London</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Photography BA (hons)</td>
<td>W042</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>To raise aspiration through the pursuit of excellence’</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>up to 8 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>University of Wolverhampton</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Our mission: To be an employer-focused university connected with our local, national and global communities, delivering opportunity and academic excellence’</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>&gt;30 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Warwickshire College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Warwickshire College is committed to becoming an Enterprise College with entrepreneurship at its heart’</td>
<td>entrepreneurship</td>
<td>up to 8 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Weymouth College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
<td>Fine Art HND</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>Our mission is: - To be within the top 10% of Further Education colleges in England. - To be recognised by stakeholders as a Centre of Excellence in meeting the priorities of local and regional communities. - To be delivering tangible business benefits for employers. - To be a leader on sustainability within the Further Education Sector</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>up to 15 no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>York St John University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Fine Art BA (hons)</td>
<td>W100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>York St John is committed to the provision of excellent, open and progressive higher education that embraces difference, challenges prejudice and promotes justice, and is shaped by York St John’s Church Foundation</td>
<td>graduates’ employability</td>
<td>up to 8 yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Key Findings on Institutional Level, Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate (Bachelor)</th>
<th>Undergraduate (Diploma)</th>
<th>Bachelor Code</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree</th>
<th>Undergraduate (Master)</th>
<th>Master Code</th>
<th>Master Degree</th>
<th>Criteria on Institutional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alanus Hochschule für Kunst und Gesellschaft</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Arts BA</td>
<td>no information up to 12</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: developing artistic creativity and art personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hochschule der Bildenden Künste Saar</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Arts BA</td>
<td>no information up to 6</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: developing artistic competences through interdisciplinary teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildende Künste Hamburg</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Arts BA</td>
<td>no information up to 8</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: inter-disciplinary teaching to create artistically outstanding art personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildende Künste Hamburg</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Fine Arts BA</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: developing artistic creatitivity and art personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hochschule für Gestaltung Berlin</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Photography</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: developing artistic creatitivity and art personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hochschule für Studiengänge und Buchkunst Leipzig (Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig)</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Diplom Malerei/Grafik</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: Applied research and scientific reflexion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hochschule für Kunst, Design und Populäre Musik Berlin</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Bildende Kunst</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: interdisciplinary teaching to create artistically outstanding art personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hochschule für Musik, Theater und Medien Berlin (HMTM)</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Performance</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: interdisciplinary teaching to create artistically outstanding art personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hamburg</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Performing Arts</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: interdisciplinary teaching to create artistically outstanding art personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hochschule für Musik und Theater Zürich</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule</td>
<td>Bachelor Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>no information up to 15</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>no information</td>
<td>Focus on: interdisciplinary teaching to create artistically outstanding art personalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix H

## Analysis of Arts Entrepreneurship Education at 87 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

### Table: Key Findings on Course Level (KPIs), UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness” (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI “Employability” (in % of current students)</th>
<th>KPI “Compulsory Work Experience” (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI “Real Life Entrepreneurial Experience” (in % of total teaching staff on the course)</th>
<th>Extra-Curricular Trainings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aberystwyth University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>The Money Tree Entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arts University Bournemouth</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Enterprise Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bath &amp; Dagenham College</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Executive MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bath Spa University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Learning from guest speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Birmingham City University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Concept Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blackpool and the Flyde College</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Birkenhead University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Symbolic Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Buildingbridge New University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canterbury Christ Church University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Bristol College</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Colchester Institute</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doncaster College</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Exeter College</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Glendyce Institute and University Centre Grimsby</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Haringey College of Further and Higher Education</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Heriot-Watt University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hull College</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>K College, Kent</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Keele University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lakes College</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>&quot;Entrepreneurial Skills&quot; (%) of workload</th>
<th>&quot;Employability&quot; (%) of course duration</th>
<th>&quot;Continuous Work Experience&quot; (%) of course duration</th>
<th>&quot;Real Life Entrepreneurial Lectures&quot; (%) of course duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds College of Art</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Metropolitan University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex Metropolitan University Faculty of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College Stamford</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional College of Chester</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Trent University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University of the Arts</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open College of the Arts</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth College of Art</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensbourne College of Arts and Technology</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Institute of Art</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>&quot;Entrepreneurial Skills&quot; (%) of course</th>
<th>&quot;Employability&quot; (%) of course</th>
<th>&quot;Continuous Work Experience&quot; (%) of course</th>
<th>&quot;Real Life Entrepreneurial Lectures&quot; (%) of course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster University Business Start-up incubation schemes</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University Business Start-up incubation schemes</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Metropolitan University</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough University</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex Metropolitan University Faculty of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex University</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College Stamford</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional College of Chester</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Trent University</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University of the Arts</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open College of the Arts</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth College of Art</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth University</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensbourne College of Arts and Technology</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Institute of Art</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>&quot;Entrepreneurial Skills&quot; (%) of course</th>
<th>&quot;Employability&quot; (%) of course</th>
<th>&quot;Continuous Work Experience&quot; (%) of course</th>
<th>&quot;Real Life Entrepreneurial Lectures&quot; (%) of course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster University Business Start-up incubation schemes</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan University Business Start-up incubation schemes</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Metropolitan University</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough University</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex Metropolitan University Faculty of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex University</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College Stamford</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional College of Chester</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Trent University</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University of the Arts</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open College of the Arts</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth College of Art</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth University</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensbourne College of Arts and Technology</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Institute of Art</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### UNDERGRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Entrepreneurial Fitness&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Employability&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Entrepreneurial Work Experience&quot; (in % of total teaching and extra-curricular course)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Real Life Entrepreneurial Experience&quot; (in % of total teaching and extra-curricular course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>St Helens College</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Staffordshire University</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Birmingham Metropolitan College (2002 merged with Stourbridge College)</td>
<td>122.5, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sunderland College</td>
<td>120, idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Trentside University</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>240, idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The University of East London</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>University for the Creative Arts</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>University of Bedford</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>University of Brighton</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>University of Chichester</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>University of Constance</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>University of Derby School of Art and Design</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>240, idea</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>University of Gloucestershire</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>University of Hertford</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POST-GRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Entrepreneurial Fitness&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Employability&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Entrepreneurial Work Experience&quot; (in % of total teaching and extra-curricular course)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Real Life Entrepreneurial Experience&quot; (in % of total teaching and extra-curricular course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>University of the Arts</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>University of Bradford</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>122.5, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>120, idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Trentside University</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>240, idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>University of Chichester</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>University of Constance</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>University of Derby School of Art and Design</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>240, idea</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>University of Gloucestershire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>University of Hertford</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>180, idea</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXTRA-CURRICULAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type of Extra-Curricular Trainings</th>
<th>External Extra-Curricular Trainings</th>
<th>Undergraduate (n=715)</th>
<th>Post-Graduate (n=46)</th>
<th>Extra-Curricular (n=42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
<td>Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Staffordshire University</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>122.5, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>120, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Trentside University</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>240, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>University of Chichester</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>University of Constance</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>University of Derby School of Art and Design</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>240, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>University of Gloucestershire</td>
<td>University of Gloucestershire</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of Hertford</td>
<td>University of Hertford</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>University of Hertford</td>
<td>180, idea - networking</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>Workload &quot;Entrepreneurial Skills&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>Workload &quot;Employmability&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>Workload &quot;Entrepreneurial Experience&quot; (in % of curriculum duration)</th>
<th>Workload &quot;Real Life Entrepreneurial Experience&quot; (in % of total learning with extra-curricular)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Entrepreneurial Fitness&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Employability&quot; (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Compulsory Work Experience&quot; (in % of course duration)</th>
<th>KPI &quot;Real Life Experienced Lecturers&quot; (in % of total teaching staff on the course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing, finance</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>Leeds Enterprise Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>University of Lincoln</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>Free Trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>University of Reading</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>Henley Business School University of Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>University of Roehampton</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>University of Southamption Winchester School of Art</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>University of Sunderland</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>A) Tailor Made Courses at Chelsea College of Art and Design B) Short Courses at CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>A) Tailor Made Courses at Chelsea College of Art and Design B) Short Courses at CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>A) Tailor Made Courses at Chelsea College of Art and Design B) Short Courses at CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>A) Tailor Made Courses at Chelsea College of Art and Design B) Short Courses at CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing, finance</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing, finance</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea, marketing</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>University of the Arts London Central St Martins College of Arts and Design</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

### Analysis of Arts Entrepreneurship Education at 87 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the UK and Germany, Academic Year 2013/14

#### Table: Key Findings on Course Level (KPIs), Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of HEI</th>
<th>Workload (in ECTS credits)</th>
<th>KPI “Entrepreneurial Fitness” (in % of workload)</th>
<th>KPI “Employability” (in % of course duration)</th>
<th>KPI “Compulsory Work Experience” (in % of course duration)</th>
<th>KPI “Real Life Experienced Lecturers” (in % of total teaching staff on the course)</th>
<th>Type of Extra-Curricular Courses actively offered in the field of Business &amp; Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alanus Hochschule für Kunst und Gesellschaft</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>idea / funding</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Folkwang Universität der Künste</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildende Künste Saar</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildende Künste Hamburg</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildende Künste Leipzig</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hochschule für Gestaltung Berlin</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildung und Kunst Leibniz (Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kunst. Design. Land Populäre Musik Freiburg</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>idea, networking</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hochschule für Bildende Künste im Kreisolfen (Oelde)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kunsthochschule Berlin (Höhere Bildung)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>idea, self-promoting (marketing) / funding</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Staatliche Akademie der Bildenden Künste (Kassel)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Universität Osnabrück</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>idea, self-promoting (marketing)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Investigation of Arts Incubators

Table: Business Models and Service Spectrum of Arts Incubators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incubator</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Incubation Type</th>
<th>Business Models</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Service ( _n )</th>
<th>Incubation After-Marketing</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Audience Building</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>Sales Financing</th>
<th>Premature Closure</th>
<th>Premature Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA 1</td>
<td>The Arts Center</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 2</td>
<td>ArtServe</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 3</td>
<td>Business of Arts Center</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 4</td>
<td>Center for Cultural Innovation</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 5</td>
<td>Denver Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 6</td>
<td>Z Space</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 7</td>
<td>Flight School</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 8</td>
<td>Project Row Houses</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 9</td>
<td>Montana Art to Market</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 10</td>
<td>EC Media Arts Initiative</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 11</td>
<td>Public Art Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 12</td>
<td>Arts Incubator of the Rockies</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 13</td>
<td>Creative Capital</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 14</td>
<td>Logan Arts</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 15</td>
<td>Springfield for the Arts</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 16</td>
<td>Intersection Incubator</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 17</td>
<td>Houston Arts Alliance</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 18</td>
<td>Baltimore Arts</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 19</td>
<td>Vermont Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 20</td>
<td>Arts Incubator of the Rockies</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 21</td>
<td>New Jersey Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 22</td>
<td>Nor Cal Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 23</td>
<td>B. Moore Village</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 24</td>
<td>Carranza Woods</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 25</td>
<td>Common Wealth</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 26</td>
<td>Spireworks</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 27</td>
<td>Shire &amp; Mount Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 28</td>
<td>Blue Moon Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 29</td>
<td>Agile Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 30</td>
<td>University of Design</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 31</td>
<td>Detroit Creative Corridor</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 32</td>
<td>Playhouse Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 33</td>
<td>New York City Business Center</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 34</td>
<td>CDC Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 35</td>
<td>Centre Creative Arts</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 36</td>
<td>CRI Steep</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 37</td>
<td>KC Business</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>University Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>University Incubator</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 38</td>
<td>Asheville Arts Council</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>University Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>University Incubator</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 39</td>
<td>Brooklyn Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>University Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>University Incubator</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China 40</td>
<td>Yuxi Art Council</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Arts Organisation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China 41</td>
<td>Flatwoods</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China 42</td>
<td>Appalachian Arts Council</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China 43</td>
<td>Arts Incubation</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China 44</td>
<td>Chinese Arts Center</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 45</td>
<td>Incubator Creative Group</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA 46</td>
<td>The Incubator for Global Design &amp; Business</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difficulty of practising fine artists in making a living: Why arts entrepreneurship education is important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Iconic Arts</th>
<th>Arts Organisation</th>
<th>Arts Incubator</th>
<th>Community Development Incubator</th>
<th>Mixed physical regional</th>
<th>Global Incubator</th>
<th>Physical Incubator</th>
<th>Virtual Incubator</th>
<th>Incubation (number of mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Young Alice</td>
<td>Arts Incubator</td>
<td>Community Development Incubator</td>
<td>Mixed physical regional</td>
<td>Global Incubator</td>
<td>Physical Incubator</td>
<td>Virtual Incubator</td>
<td>Incubation (number of mentions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 82 73 72 28 77 7 3 7 10 12 18 376
### Appendix J

**Gallery Study by Resch (2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Germany (n=317)</th>
<th>Austria (n=25)</th>
<th>Switzerland (n=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Operating Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(year of foundation)</td>
<td>(in % of galleries)</td>
<td>(in % of galleries)</td>
<td>(in % of galleries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1990</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2008</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of art sold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Art</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Art</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gallery Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cities</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Downtown</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Peripheral Location</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gallery Size</strong></td>
<td>(in m²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on average)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td>(full-time)</td>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>(in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of own Exhibitions per year</strong></td>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>(in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Units</strong></td>
<td>(ranking: Top 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rent (gallery space)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fee for art fairs/exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advertising/Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buyers Structure</strong></td>
<td>(ranking: Top 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Art Lover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Occasional Buyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Corporate Collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealer-Collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mixture of investor and dealer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Investor (speculator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues per year</strong></td>
<td>(in Euros)</td>
<td>(in % of galleries)</td>
<td>(in % of galleries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;100.000)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.000-500.000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.000-1,000.000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1,000.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit Margins</strong></td>
<td>(in % of revenue)</td>
<td>(in % of revenue)</td>
<td>(in % of revenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10 to 0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix K

Skills of Higher Order

Figure: ‘Five plus two’ Entrepreneurial Skills of Higher Order

Source: Author’s own illustration
Appendix L

Market Barriers and Gatekeepers

Thurnhofer (2014, p. 9) claims that “it does not exist the one unified art market, but many art markets and the permeability is infinitesimally between the markets.” He provides a detailed overview of the structure of the contemporary art market that can be classified in his opinion as strictly hierarchically structured like a pyramid with explicit barriers between them (Figure 1). The five different levels or market segments mainly differ in their degrees of visibility and market organisation including matching of supply and demand.

![The Art Market Pyramid and Barriers](image)

**Figure 1: The Art Market Pyramid and Barriers**

*Source: Adapted from Thurnhofer (2014, p. 11)*

Fundamentally, there are no formal requirements such as diplomas needed “to practice art or to call oneself an artist” (Abbing, 2002, p. 278). The barriers for entering the art market at its lowest level are therefore quite low. From an artistic point of view, the open market access is necessary in order to protect the arts’ “autonomous imago” (Abbing, 2002, p. 278). In this context, Thurnhofer (2014, p. 22) describes the base of the fifth segment as “sandy”. Failed artists would land relatively softly. The institutions or networks providing access to the local public include local cafes, school buildings, bank branches, medical practices, public libraries, and the streets themselves. Potential buyers are neighbours, relatives, friends as well as guests and passers-by. The network structures on this market segment are normally small in size and less powerful. This market segment experiences a relatively low level of structural and organisational process of matching current supply and demand. Artists of all kinds are able to enter the fourth market segment by having acknowledged and outstanding success in the fifth segment, for example, through attracting attention and demand on fairgrounds or Christmas markets that trend in social media. This attention leads to the market barriers to segment four of the art market pyramid and they are, though, relatively high for artists with limited resources, small and powerless networks, and unappealing artwork (Thurnhofer, 2014).

The network structures of commercial galleries and art dealers are considered gatekeepers (Velthuis, 2003; Currid, 2007; Byrnes, 2009; Foster et al., 2011; van Overdam, 2011; Siltia, 2012) to the third segment of the art market pyramid and form a relatively high market barrier for emerging artists. The market power of these gatekeepers highly depends on their ability to control the information required for
potential buyers to assess the quality of a particular work of art (Foster et al., 2011; van Overdam, 2011; Siltala, 2012).

According to Thurnhofer (2014) and the Institut für Strategieentwicklung (IFSE, 2013, p. 37), the business relation between commercial galleries and their most relevant clients, the art collectors, "ranges from partnership to financial dependence." Some commercial galleries are mainly financed by and financially dependent on art collectors. Consequently, some gallery networks are considered intense and powerful, depending on their financiers’ reputation and financial wealth. Considering this, artists who want to establish themselves sustainably on the third level of the art market pyramid are required to become part of those powerful but restricted networks.

One way for artists to achieve this could be regular attendance at local, national, and international exhibitions to show presence and product quality. However, every art exhibition is an individual market barrier for both galleries and artists, since each exhibition has its own standing in the art world and thus access requirements. The costs for attending middle class exhibitions are within a middle four-digit US Dollar range including standing costs, shipping, insurance, and accommodation (Thurnhofer, 2014). Yet there are several hundred international art exhibitions, 200 of which enjoy high market reputation, while art fairs like Art Basel or ARCO Madrid are considered the world’s most famous art exhibitions, according to ArtVista (2016), an information provider specialised in art exhibition. The higher the standing of art exhibitions in the international art world, the higher the access barriers for galleries and artists. For established artists, this consequently means that their own reputation mainly depends on their galleries’ reputation and access to quality exhibitions. To enter the second segment of the art market pyramid, established artists need to become part of a highly reputable and very powerful network of galleries with high financial resources, one’s own outstanding brand; network contacts to a wide range of important and successful market participants, and art collectors that are able to set them up for highly reputable exhibitions that cost up to one hundred thousand US dollars. These informal barriers are very steep and only very few artists are able to overcome them.

To enter the Olympus of the international art market, the top artists in segment two need not only to attract high prices at the international auctions organised by the two leading auction houses of Sotheby’s and Christie’s in New York (Thurnhofer, 2014). Both these auction houses control the tertiary trading level and share almost 90% of the market between them (Boll, 2011). A further significant market barrier for entering the Olympus is also the leading museums for contemporary art, for example, the Museum of Modern Art, Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, all in New York, the Tate Gallery, Saatchi Gallery, and Whitechapel Gallery in London, Musée d’Orsay in Paris, and Neue Nationalgalerie in Berlin. Every exhibition in an international museum bolsters artists’ awareness and attractiveness in minds of the public and collectors. Curators of museums do not want to run any risk by exhibiting unknown artists, so they select only the best of the best in order to attract as many visitors as possible (Thurnhofer, 2014). An exhibition at the Guggenheim is in his opinion considered the greatest event among artists. Although that does not mean the entrance to the Olympus, it is at least the way into its atrium. The exhibiting artists have then the guarantee to belong to the top 100 artists of their country with the assurance not to fall back to the lower levels (Thurnhofer, 2014). Consequently, successful and famous artists with their powerful networks are also considered market barriers for their peer artists (Abbing, 2002).
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Appendix M

Personality Traits and Thinking Styles of Artists

It is notable in this context that the listed personality traits are neither exhaustive, nor are they bindingly applicable to all artists. These personality traits are observed tendencies and/or measured indications of artists’ personality characteristics. In addition, some listed traits may be simple mentioned counterparts of others or even inconsistent.

Table: Personality Traits and Thinking Styles of Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compared to non-creative people, artists tend to be</th>
<th>less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• creative</td>
<td>• functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• imaginative</td>
<td>• controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• aesthetic</td>
<td>• self-integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• curious and open-minded to uncommon ideas</td>
<td>• open for external structures or externally conformable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• original</td>
<td>• cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• radical</td>
<td>• rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• change seeking</td>
<td>• reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• socially autonomous or non-conforming</td>
<td>• socialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• independent and norm-doubting</td>
<td>• conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sensitive</td>
<td>• conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• intelligent</td>
<td>• rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• intrinsic motivated and disciplined</td>
<td>• team-minded or collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• orderly and ambitious</td>
<td>• emotionally stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• experimenting and adventurous</td>
<td>• optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tender-minded or compassionate and idealistic</td>
<td>• extroverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• self-confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• self-accepting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and also more

• schizophrenic
• manic-depressive
• aggressive
• egoistical
• narcissistic
• hostile
• impulsive
• dominant
• autistic
• guilt-prone
• anxious
• reserved or introverted
• non-moralistic
• easily bored
• tense or overwrought
• non-conforming
• isolated from human contact
• suspicious

Source: Author’s own illustration
Appendix N

Artists’ Roles in Society Over Time

According to Alexander (2016) and the University of Wisconsin Green Bay (UWGB, 2016), fine artists’ role in society in the Ancient World was that of being slaves, conducting skilled labour of technical and aesthetic competence. They were therefore considered craftsmen (artisans), since the concept of the artist in the sense of our contemporary understanding did not exist. Formal schooling for the artisan did not exist and little or no attention was paid to their artistic self-expression and personal feelings.

The professionalisation of the artist has made its largest steps of development in the Middle Ages – under the organised master craftsmen of the Medieval Guilds. The individual artists were still largely anonymous and affected medieval life only in their collective capacity as a guild through its ability to manufacture and distribute essential goods. Formal apprenticeship system with exacting standards of quality occurred. The master craftsmen in Medieval Europe were regarded as decent, honourable, responsible members of society, because of their educational functions of craftsmen and leading guild function. They were freemen, no longer associated with the slave class. Although they were not considered gentlemen and member of the upper class, some of them were able to make enough money to associate with the upper classes. But, as with the ancient artisan, the stamp of the individual medieval artist was seen to be unimportant. The social value and significance of the guild was overshadowing its individual members.

With the Renaissance, the individual artists experienced higher levels of societal attention. The rise of the artist in society was facilitated by wealthy merchants, people of power, educated, cultivated and hosting all kinds of skilled individuals: poets, philosophers, mathematicians, and scholars. Into this world the most privileged artists were admitted; artists gained status in the eyes of the social elite. Artists were allowed to make art, to express new ideas and creativity. A great artist was therefore considered in society as a great personality. During the following epochs rulers of every country required images of themselves to celebrate their victories, inspire loyalty, impress their people, maintain a sense of presence, and to set an example of power and authority. The political function of this type of art seems to be the same regardless of the culture: to unite the prevailing idea of authority with a ruler’s idealised image. To create that image, an artist had to have access to the ruler, having physical contact, often for sustained periods of time. The so-called Court Artist became a courtier – one who belonged or aimed to belong – to the social circle surrounding a monarch. The definitive form was the Baroque Court Artist phenomenon that emerged in the 16th and 17th centuries in the places of monarchs ruling by divine right. Consequently, there was a continuous competition among talented artists seeking court positions and places in the houses of aristocrats and clergy.

When artists belonged to the artisan class, the themes of their work were primarily controlled by people who wanted to express their ideology to maintain and expand the status quo; artists’ self-expression was not demanded. Art was descriptive – showed everyday scenes. The artist could only participate in the transformation of society by using visual images. By turn of the 20th century, the function of the society painter was to create images that were simultaneously living likenesses, signs of good taste, symbols of fashion, and evidence of wealth. While rarely courtiers, the ‘Nouveau Riche’ (Cambridge Dictionary, 2017), the class of people from a low social class who have recently become very rich and like to show this publicly, had to be portrayed as if they belonged at court. For example, American millionaires were made to look like English Dukes and Duchesses. Society painters were necessary to highlight and visualise those peoples’ power in society. Artists became agents of social progress, including the diffusion of aesthetic, cultural, and social power. In this time art became also more and more a means of critical reflection of society. Since it was shown that art is a product of independent thought and inquiry the way was open for society and all of its institutions to become the objects of such inquiry. Genuinely critical or ‘revolutionary’ art occurred when artists realised that they could play a role in the shaping of history. One representative group of revolutionary artists is the Bohemian artist. More details of their key characteristics were highlighted earlier in section 3.1.3.2. As social radicals their lives are a personal protest against the social order and the cultural establishment. Protest may not take artistic form – but it does take behavioural form. Lack of possessions, contempt for social expectations – their lives must express contempt for everything the middle class holds dear with the powerful desire to tear down symbols of society. Ironically, bohemian
The difficulty of practising fine artists in making a living:
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Appendix N

artists are almost always a product of the educated middle class. Those artists are often socially recognised to end up unproductive and unable to deal with life.
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Appendix O

Obstacles to Higher Art Education

If art education is considered that socially important and valuable, then it should be generally accessible and available for as most people of all ages as possible and for prospective art professionals in particular. However, higher art education as social component shows some obstacles.

- **Access:** The traditional direct access to higher education is the possession of an upper secondary qualification. However, meeting those standard entry requirements does not guarantee access. Typically, students compete for a limited number of places and are selected on the basis of their level of achievement in the upper secondary qualification and/or an additional entrance examination. Special admission requirements usually applied to arts are numeros clausus, interviews, and a high-quality portfolio of artworks (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015).

- **Fees and Financial Support:** The perceived costs of higher education are likely to influence the decision of prospective students and their families whether to start studying at higher education level or not. The existence of fees and financial support are important criteria to consider. While various countries in Europe (for example, Germany, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Greece or Turkey) and abroad either charge no or relatively very low fees of less than 5% of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita, other countries and social systems like the UK or U.S. charges extremely high fees of up to 36% of GDP of capita (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015; OECD, 2015, 2016). To be more precisely, bachelor degrees in any subjects cost up to 27,000 British pounds in the UK or 25,000 US dollars in the U.S., while the same degrees cost nothing to only a few hundred euros in Norway, Germany, France or Sweden (OECD, 2015, 2016). The share of total expenditure for tertiary education institutions from household funding has continuously increased between 2005 and 2011 from 25% to 61% in the UK, while this share similarly decreased from 5% to 3% in Germany or Austria in the same time (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015). The changes in the UK are mostly due to the raise of the tuition cap in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland in academic year 2006/2007, but also reflect a decrease in public expenditure for higher education between 2010 and 2011. However, those countries and social systems that require students to cover high rates of expenditure for higher education also show the strongest tendency to provide financial support to them (OECD, 2016). For example, the public support through subsidised loans or grants to students in higher education in the UK increased from 26% to almost 45% of public expenditure on tertiary education between 2005 and 2011, while the percentage in Germany increased ‘only’ from 19% to 22% in the same time (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015, p. 136). Consequently, it is not surprising that students in social systems with high fees face serious financial difficulties and depend on additional support by their families or own earnings along with public support to a relatively large extent (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015; OECD, 2015, 2016). Findings show evidence that half of the enrolled students, for example in Ireland or Georgia where high tuition fees are charged, confirm to have serious financial difficulties, while serious difficulties are only confirmed by a relatively low proportion of 15% of the students in Germany, where no fees are charged (Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2015).

- **Teaching Availability and Quality:** As mentioned earlier in section 3.1.5.2.1 students in Europe predominantly call for a teaching quality that helps them to be best prepared for their art profession (Voss et al., 2007; Tomlinson, 2008; Bridgstock and Cunningham, 2016). However, they not only face difficulties in having access to quality institutions as just described above in this section, they also suffer from a systematic remove of art education in elementary schools to higher education institutions as a result of increased fees and decreased public spending in higher education that in turn leads to a continuous cut of high-cost art education programmes (Smith, 2009; Ewing, 2010; Brown, 2015; OECD, 2015, 2016; Shaw, 2015; Warwick Commission, 2015).

To sum up the findings at this point, the review of literature shows evidence that children and prospective art students generally face various barriers and inequalities in having access to high quality art education due to various reasons. The key barriers identified are increased fees for studying quality art programmes...
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associated with decreased public spending in education that in turn consequently lead to a cut of high quality art education programmes in elementary schools as well as in secondary and tertiary education levels. The financial burden for students in tertiary education is a barrier that facilitates social inequality, despite the fact that financial support exists. Loans that need to be fully repaid or repaid when a certain income level is achieved, for example, as provided in Australia and in the UK (Chapman and Ryan, 2002, OECD, 2015, 2016), do not mitigate this social injustice, since income statistics of professional artists (see sections 3.2.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1.2) clearly show that these fees or loans are hard to repay by them. That seems to be art graduates' massive dilemma of being practising artists: high financial obligations and low income perspectives. Even if they could repay their loans or redeem their investments in education, their pressure to become commercially successful as fast as possible may be expected to be very high right from the beginning of their career. For those art graduates that totally reject commercial success the pressure of repaying their loans is expected to be even higher. That is particularly expected for Bohemian artists who are characterised by not wanting and having regular jobs and incomes. If art education is that valuable for society's wellbeing, high quality art education should be both an essential part of young peoples' educational development and accessible for prospective art students without financial obligations that are hard to meet. Any selective access to education due to financial strength or by imposing high financial obligations on art students prevents them from receiving appropriate treatment according to the universal human right of education. This is bad for business and bad for society.
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