

The Creative Industries and Cultural Professions in the 21st Century: A Background Paper

Margaret J. Wyszomirski

This background paper has been prepared for the 5th Barnett Symposium on the Arts and Public Policy: **The Creative Industries and Cultural Professions in the 21st Century**. Our topic is important, complicated and timely. Collectively, America's creative industries include not only the professional nonprofit art and cultural organizations and the commercial entertainment industries, but also a varied workforce composed of numerous occupations and professions. These industries are global players and have become the nation's leading exporters. They are a leading edge of what has variously been called the "new economy", the "information age" or "the creative economy." They are also a primary purveyor of America's image abroad and a source of mutual international understanding and misunderstanding. Yet the creative industries have little common identity and little public awareness of them as a collectivity. Without such an awareness, training, development, planning, and policymaking is not only difficult but also haphazard.

The 2003 Barnett Symposium is the first to be organized in a think-tank format. As a think tank, the participants have been gathered because each has a record—a body of work or extensive experience—relevant to the subject we will discussing over the next two days. This is not a conference where each of us tells the others and, presumably, an audience of interested spectators about what they have done or what they know. Rather we have claimed this time to think together.

Making the time to think about the "big picture" and the implications of change is difficult for many of the individuals at this forum—those who are busy on the demanding, and too often precarious, front lines of creating art, or teaching the arts, or managing public, private or nonprofit cultural organizations. Alternatively, for scholars, finding opportunities to "reality test" their ideas while broadening and deepening their understanding of practice is often difficult. Each of us has talked about aspects of this subject with colleagues in our separate, specialized "silos." Occasions for all of these groups to engage in sustained conversation together are rare. But it is hoped that the participants of this conference share a belief that the process requires perspectives from all these realms – bringing our specific knowledge and experience to bear on how our pieces relate to one another, how they contribute to a broader and common understanding, and what ramifications our ideas and analysis might hold for charting a course to better prepare cultural workers and leaders for the 21st century.

We propose that the following three lenses will bring our topic into clearer focus by helping to establish organic working definitions of key terms and relationships. Such an effort is not simply a matter of semantics, but rather determines the shape of subsequent conversation, and builds a common understanding upon which to premise analysis and to propose action.

1. The concept of a societal sector—**the Creative Sector**—may be useful to the task of finding the boundaries and parameters of what is to be included in such a sector and why. In turn, a working definition of the creative sector should help us see the scale, dimensions, variety, and interdependencies of the sector and its constituent parts.

2. The selection of three **key cultural professions** – Artist, Arts Educator, and Arts Administrator—is a device to help gain a manageable perspective on the scale, variety, problems, challenges, and inter-relations of the cultural workforce. Because of their range, they complement a sector perspective. As professions that cut across prevalent industry, field, and economic distinctions, it is hoped that using this lens will facilitate new thinking. And finally, because each of these professions is trying to cope, sometimes quite differently, with the forces of external change noted below, they give us some perspective on the pace and face of change and adaptation. Perhaps we will learn that there are other professional and occupation vantage points that are important to explore as well.
3. **Key external forces** are affecting the creative sector, its separate industries and its workforce. We identify four factors that are generally acknowledged to be shaping not only the creative sector, but the entire economy and society. Rapid technological advances, globalization, shifts in general population demographics, and a generational turnover in key professions and leadership have all dramatically changed the world we live in during the past decade. How do we assess the impact and ramifications of such recent and profound changes? What do we need to know about these forces and their effects on the creative sector? Are there other factors we should recognize as significant? Are these forces affecting the creative sector in ways that differ from their effects on other sectors of society and the economy? How much do such changes require us to change alter assumptions and common practices?

As the 20th century ended, thinking about the place of the arts and creativity in the US economy and society seemed schizophrenic. On the one hand, the arts were often thought of as a small, needy segment of the American socio-economy and public support for the arts was persistently opposed as “trivial” or “a frill.” The popular arts, although recognized as big business, carried the connotation of not being serious business. Likewise arts education has a long history in the U.S. of being extra-curricular, of not being a basic subject, of being one of the first subject areas cut when school budgets are tightened. Similar perceptions are apparent in other countries as well where the arts and culture can be dismissed “as ‘mere entertainment,’ or ‘candyfloss’”: most certainly not something of ‘real’ value.” (Venturelli, n.d.)

Conversely, some observers had begun to argue that “culture can be seen as the key to success in the Information Economy, because for the very first time in the modern age, the ability to create new ideas and new forms of expression forms a valuable resource base of a society...(Venturelli, n.d.) Exploring the link between cultural content and intellectual property, Wyszomirski pointed out that “...in the information age, intellectual property has become a key economic resource...” Artists, nonprofit arts organizations, and commercial cultural corporations are not only important generators of intellectual property, but also stewards of vast stockpiles of cultural content in the forms of museum collections, historical archives, and performing arts repertoire (Wyszomirski, 2002). The first view was more prevalent and seemed to underlie many education, labor, cultural and trade practices and policies, although the second perspective was evident in issues concerning international trade of cultural products like movies, recording and magazines, in union concerns about the immigration status of visiting foreign artists, and the pirating of music from the Internet.

As the 21st century begins, the first perspective seems increasingly outdated.

-First, the scale and significance of arts and cultural activity and production is far greater than is generally appreciated. If one conceives of a creative sector—one that includes nonprofit professional arts, popular art and entertainment industries, avocational/amateur artistic activity, as well as culturally specific activities and cultural heritage concerns—then the creative sector is one of the largest sectors of the U.S. economy. But the significance of these activities reaches well beyond their economic dimension. Speaking of the cultural industries, Hesmondhalgh (2002) offers three additional factors: (1) more than other types of production, they have an influence on our understanding of the world as well as help us constitute our inner, private lives and identities; (2) that they manage and circulate creativity; and (3) that they are not only increasingly important sources of wealth and employment in many economies, but also are increasingly central to social and economic life (Galligan & Cherbo, 2002).

- Second, in the new “knowledge economy” the creative sector is emerging as a leading edge sector—one that produces and capitalizes on the new natural resources of the 21st century: intellectual property and knowledge/ information content. Thus, the sizable creative sector occupies a more important position in the national—and global—economy today than it did just a few years ago. One analyst observed that, since the early 1980s, “the cultural industries have moved closer to the center of the economic action in many countries and across much of the world. Cultural industry companies can no longer be seen as secondary to the ‘real’ economy, where durable, ‘useful’ goods are manufactured.” (Galligan & Cherbo, 2002)

-Third, human capital is the key productive factor of the creative sector and technology is the key and magnifying distribution element. Human capital refers to the workers, and the skills, competencies, and talent that they bring to creation, production, presentation and preservation of cultural goods and services. The value of these cultural goods and services is notoriously difficult to measure, since they manifest properties as both public and private goods that have both economic and cultural value. The human capital feature is perhaps the least visible component of a still fuzzy perception of the U.S. creative sector, perhaps because of a tendency to think that creative work is largely a matter of innate talent or experience rather than of specialized knowledge or training. Other countries have recognized the creative potential of the knowledge economy and begun to invest in the development of their creative sectors.

In the post World War II period, the US emerged as a leading force in artistic innovation in fields as diverse as visual arts and dance. In the second half of the 20th century, the US became the leading global exporter of cultural products, capitalizing both on the scale and diversity of its domestic market and the prevalence of English as the “lingua franca” of international affairs. In the increasingly global economy of the 21st century, the U.S. starts with a leading position, but will be challenged by countries who can also take advantage of large domestic markets (e.g., India, the European Union, China) or by those who can also capitalize on the English language advantage (e.g., Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia).

THE CREATIVE SECTOR

The Idea of a Societal Sector.

By the term “sector” we mean a societal, rather than an economic, sector. A societal sector is broader than an economic sector. Conceptually constructing a societal sector draws not only upon economic ideas but also on community studies, human services systems, organizational theory, and public policy analysis. Moving from the general idea of societal sectors to the particular idea of a creative sector, one can call upon a progression of analysts who have been developing the concept. Scott and Meyer argue that a societal sector includes all organizations within a society supplying a given type of product or service together with their associated organization sets: suppliers, financiers, regulators, and the like (Scott & Meyer, 1983). Hirsch takes a similarly inclusive view that is both multi-level and interdisciplinary but calls it an industry system (Hirsch, 1985). In trying to discern an emergent new cultural policy paradigm, Cherbo and Wyszomirski (Cherbo & Wyszomirski, 2000) suggested possible components of a creative sector. O'Connor, in specifying what might be included in a widely conceived field of cultural production, implied that a creative sector would include “the full range of activities from ideas, primary creation, production, distribution, and consumption along with ancillary functions such as management, accountancy, legal services, promotion, marketing, etc.” He also suggests that there are informally organized infrastructures of knowledge and expertise that constitute a “soft” or “critical” infrastructure that includes cultural intermediaries and cultural entrepreneurs who operate across networks and use knowledge of these networks to generate their business or advance their work (O'Connor, n.d.). Hence, a societal sector is composed not only of a cluster of related industries (as in the case of an economic sector), but also includes related governmental organizations at various levels, of various types of infrastructure support systems (including funders and equipment suppliers, etc), and of education and training institutions and systems.

The term, “societal sector” refers to the presence of society-wide structures that are, to some degree, functionally differentiated. Thus, the health care sector is distinguishable from the educational sector and from the creative sector. However, it must be realized that some societal functions are performed by multiple structural arrangements and, in turn, that particular structures may perform multiple functions. Hence arts educators can be seen both as a part of the educational sector and of the creative sector. The selection of the three key creative professions for this discussion represent elements of a common workforce from a societal sector perspective: artists and new media workers, as well as managers of entertainment companies and nonprofit cultural institutions all fall within the core creative industries. Arts educators cross public and private spheres, K-12 and higher educational levels and constitute a key associated creative profession. Similarly, the administrators of public arts agencies constitute an associated profession involving those who regulate and fund core creative activities.

In other words, the concept of a creative sector is more than simply a collection of related industries, fields, and disciplines; it also includes their associated support structures. Among these associated support structure are related governmental organizations at various levels, various types of support systems (including funders and equipment suppliers, etc), and education and training institutions and systems. It is not only a collection of industries and organizations, but an inter-related workforce composed of a variety of high-skilled professionals in a labor

intensive segment of the knowledge economy. Clearly, the term cultural industries is too narrow a concept for our needs, while the term “cultural ecological system” is too broad. “Creative sector” thus seems to be the emerging term of preference both in other countries and the US—with the exact definition and dimensions of this sector still under debate.

Seeing Fields and Industries Rather than a Sector

Moving toward a sectoral perspective will not be easy. Different components of a creative sector encounter different barriers to adopting a sectoral perspective. For example, in the United States, the popular or commercial arts never really adopted the term “cultural industries” that is common in many other countries. Instead, the commercial arts moved from a self-perception of distinct popular culture industries (i.e., film, broadcasting, sound recording, legitimate theater, and publishing) to two even more inclusive conceptions. One of these larger concepts is the “entertainment industries” (which include not only the above but gambling, electronic games, and sometimes a variety of other leisure activities like theme parks and sports). The second is the “copyright industries” which includes the entertainment industries plus advertising, computer software ...

Individuals in specific cultural occupations or in particular nonprofit arts fields face other identity problems. Although the various nonprofit arts fields have loosely forged a common identity of “the arts” largely for purposes of securing public funding, this identity has largely portrayed as being in opposition to that of the entertainment industries. Thus, bridging the separate identities of the nonprofit and for-profit components of a creative sector presents one major difficulty. Within the nonprofit fields and cultural workforce, at least four other obstacles to adopting a sectoral perspective also seem apparent.

First, few individuals in these occupations would consider themselves part of a common workforce (Cherbo & Wyszomirski, 2000). As Cunningham has observed with regard to this problem in the Australian context: “The arts, culture and creative industry sectors will need to get used to thinking of themselves and acting as part of a broader coalescence of interests encompassing the content-rich service industries such as education and learning, publishing, design, communications devices, and e-commerce. These sectors, says consultant and adviser Malcolm Long, are ‘notoriously non-collaborative with each other, living within their separate smokestacks’”(Cunningham, 2001).

Second, individually none of these occupations has sufficient mass necessary to attract sustained economic or political attention. Without a sectoral perspective, it is difficult to generate the kinds of information and understanding necessary to inform policymakers about measures that could support and advance the creative sector both in whole and in its parts.

“...there is a lack of strategic knowledge about the relationships and networks that enable and sustain the creative process in a knowledge economy. These relationships are enabled between the diverse contributors to the creative process towards the achievement of successful outcomes. These relationships are sustained in diverse communities of activity, from project-based/hybrid/virtual organizations to cultural quarters and digital media hubs...One of the key challenges for researchers and policymakers is thus to better understand these crucial dynamics so that insightful and supportive action may be taken.(Jeffcutt, 2001)

Third, within each occupational group, there are many sub-categories and it is these sub-categories with which workers tend to establish their occupational identity. For example, among artists, there are actors and poets, dancers and painters, directors and choreographers, etc. While all are artists, an individual artist's occupational identity tends to override whatever common interests he/she has with other types of artists. Similarly, art educators tend to think of themselves first and foremost as visual arts or music or dance or drama educators. The term arts administrator tends to apply to managers of nonprofit arts organizations and programs, yet there are also cultural/entertainment industry managers as well as public administrators of arts agencies and programs. The latter two groups are seldom included in discussion of arts administrators more generally. Furthermore, nonprofit arts administrators tend to segment and organize their professional identities according to field (i.e., museum directors, symphony orchestra managers, directors of theatre or dance or opera companies, etc.) or to cluster around common organizational functions (such as development directors, marketing directors, education program coordinators, etc.). Clearly, these many distinct occupational and field identities make it difficult to conceive of a single, broad, interdependent workforce and, in turn, impede constructive efforts to cultivate this workforce as a matter of explicit policy or planning.

Fourth, the difficulty of perceiving the pattern of a broad cultural workforce from the tapestry of distinctive occupational threads may have been unwittingly exacerbated by commonly used analytical categories and information gathering practices. Considerable research in many countries has focused on better defining and understanding the condition of individual artists. As David Throsby has noted: empirical research has generated increasing volumes of data, coverage by national statistical agencies has improved, access to such data has expanded, more powerful computers have made manipulation of such data easier, and methods of collecting and analyzing the data have been refined (Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), 2002). Thorny questions about over-counting, under-counting, how to define who is an artist or a professional artist, and which occupational categories to include in the count are well known to analysts in the field and seem to manifest in similar ways in many countries. Although statistics about artists are notoriously hard to collect and are still debatable, a consensus about what constitutes empirical accuracy is emerging. The same cannot be said about measurements of other creative professions such as arts administrators or arts educators.

Furthermore, in the effort to cast information about individual artists into high relief, research has tended to valorize the artistic occupation above all others in the creative sector. Granted, the individual artist is the fount of artistic creativity, but few artists can function effectively without the other occupations and infrastructure that constitutes the creative sector. Although some cultural workers—especially creators—find it hard to think of themselves as part of a chain of production, it “has become increasingly impossible to produce a cultural artifact alone without the intervention, assistance, guidance, collaboration or hindrance of other people” (Murdock, 2003).

From the established research perspective, it made sense to employ taxonomies that highlighted professional artistic workers and implicitly marginalized other occupational groups in the broader cultural workforce. In part, this may have been propelled by a romantic notion of the artist as hero and genius. (Alper, Galligan, & Wassall, n.d.) In another part, since public arts

funding for individual artists has always been precarious, politics has required extensive justification of the need and impact of support for artists. Hence, in research about the nonprofit arts, artistic or creative workers are explicitly juxtaposed with non-creative occupations (including administrative and technical personnel) (Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), 2002).

While focusing primarily on the commercial arts, Caves makes a three-way distinction even more sharply. On the one hand, he distinguishes between those who provide creative inputs and those who provide “humdrum” production inputs. In this comparison, he asserts that artists as creative workers care “vitally about the originality displayed, the technical prowess demonstrated, the resolution and harmony achieved in the creative act...” whereas other workers are essentially concerned with “humdrum commerce” and “are just in it for the money.” (Caves, 2000). Caves also identifies a set of cultural occupations that function as gatekeepers that link artists and the firms that provide humdrum inputs. This category includes agents, publishers, editors, and critics (Caves, 2000). It is unclear where Caves would put arts administrators. From these perspectives, administrators of cultural organizations and industries are relegated to a status of non-creative, gatekeepers or humdrum profiteers, while public managers of arts and cultural agencies as well as arts educators are nowhere to be found.

Other research about artists refers to non-creative occupations as arts-related occupational activity. Compared to non-creative or humdrum, arts-related is a less derogatory category that specifically includes arts management and teaching. However, from an artist-centered perspective, these occupational activities are frequently viewed as necessary means to supplement artistic wages or pale substitutes for creative individuals who are not talented enough, committed enough, or too old for some (particularly performing) creative careers. In other words, arts-related occupational activities are defined with reference to how artists may use them to self-subsidize their artistic endeavors and/or substitute for abandoned creative careers—in either case, such satisficing is hardly a positive image for these other creative sector professions. Obviously, such assumptions, caricatures, and categorizations can and do present obstacles to adopting a holistic creative workforce perspective.

What’s in a Name? Arts, Culture, Creative

Before we settle on the term, “creative sector,” we should consider the alternatives—which seem to be three: cultural, arts, or creative. Groping for terminology that is both descriptive and accurate to discuss a wide-angle view of arts and culture can easily err by being too broad to too narrow. Virtually all commentators on the topic begin with Raymond Williams’ observation that the word “culture” is “one of the two or three most complicated words in the English Language (Williams, 1981) p. 76-82.” Its meanings run from a general state or habit of mind to a general state of intellectual development in society as a whole; from the general body of arts to a whole way of life, material, intellectual and spiritual. The last meaning of the term is sometimes referred to as an anthropological sense of culture. The first is sometimes taken to mean “Culture” with a capital “C” and connotes a sense of elite participation and appreciation. Sometimes the two terms, “arts” and “culture”, have been used interchangeably. Sometimes “the arts” refers to a fairly identifiable subset of “culture”.

Culture. In many places, such as Canada or UNESCO, what we call the entertainment industries are referred to as the “cultural industries.” In some of these settings, cultural policy provides a conceptual and often structural umbrella under which artists, the arts, the cultural industries, and arts education could be related. Often both the “high arts” and the cultural industries of film, broadcasting, and book/periodical publishing were state subsidized (if not actually state owned) and operated. Sometimes this was an historical artifact: such institutions and industries had roots in monarchical charters and aristocratic patronage and thus were presumed to be state responsibilities. In other cases, cultural production was intimately tied to national identity, hence cultural industries not only produced consumer goods and services but these embodied and strengthened the public goods of national identity and social cohesion: as such, they fell under public jurisdiction. (Shapiro & Miller, 1999) Although not originally focused on a sectoral perspective, such cultural policies tended to effect an entire societal sector by including public money not only for major cultural institutions and those who worked in them, but also for activities such as public art education, conservatory training for artists, responsibilities regarding the preservation of cultural heritage as well as subsidy, regulation and protection of cultural industries, domestically and, increasingly, in terms of international trade issues.

Given the lack of parsimony in the anthropological sense of the term “culture”, combined with the elite connotations of “culture, and the international usage of the term “cultural industries” to virtually mean commercial cultural activities, it would be misleading to try to use the term “cultural sector” in the United States. Indeed, the term “culture” may carry so much baggage that to use it to describe a sector of societal activity and significance would be fraught with confusion.

The Arts. A second possible name might be “the arts sector.” This would seem to take up Williams’ third meaning of culture— as pertaining to the general body of arts. In effect, this would be to use the terms “arts” and “culture” almost inter-changeably. But to do so, then begs the question of finding a working definition of “the arts”. In the US, “the arts” generally refers to those arts that seem to be predominantly produced and presented by nonprofit organizations such as symphonies, museums, opera houses, etc. These “arts” are juxtaposed to “popular culture” or “mass culture” or “entertainment”. These distinctions were embedded in the legislation that constructed a federal policy of funding for the arts and humanities during the 1960s and has historically been implicit in tax law that classified nonprofit cultural organizations as tax-exempt with donations to them treated as tax deductible charitable contributions (Wyszomirski, 2004). The synonymy of “the arts” with the nonprofit arts initially encompassed the “high” or “fine” arts, all of which were prone to what the economists call the “cost disease” and market failure. These conditions, along with a demonstration of excellence and high professional standards, were then used to help justify direct public support for such activities and institutions. Gradually “folk” art and culturally specific art was incorporated into this policy and legal understanding as well.

Given this arts-focused definition, nonprofit arts and public arts policy had two priorities: to increase the opportunities for citizens to participate in the arts largely through a strategy of increasing the supply and national distribution of live arts activities and to expand the number, size and distribution of nonprofit arts organizations by providing financial support to treat the

“cost disease.” The nonprofit arts were concerned with audience development and public participation even as they pursued a supply-side strategy of institutional capacity building. Arts education was focused on issues like student competency and demonstrating the effect of the arts on educational performance. Tax policy also facilitated individual charitable donations to all sorts of nonprofit activities, including arts and educational organizations. In effect, the commercial entertainment industries were not considered part of this policy domain.

In contrast, the commercial cultural industries are, of course, market-driven. The popular arts and entertainment had a clear market value and profit-generating capacity. They were also presumed to aim at a mass audience, adhere to lowest common denominator standards, and exhibit the ephemerality of passing popularity. Public policy concerning the commercial arts and entertainment industries has tended to be indirect, involving either telecommunications regulation, copyright and intellectual property protections, or trade and union agreements. Underpinning policies concerning both the arts and the entertainment industries was a restraint of government activity in deference to the first Amendment’s freedom of expression provision—one of the few unifying elements in the American context. Thus, the entertainment industries of the US seem to have been regarded as a wholly different category of phenomena from the arts. While “the arts” are the core part of this sector, they are not its totality. Hence usage of the term, “the arts” would seem to be too narrow.

Creative. The third alternative is to name the sector, the “creative sector.” Indeed, this is beginning to gain usage both in the U.S. and abroad. For example, Caves defines the “creative” industries as those that “supply goods and services that we broadly associate with cultural, artistic, or simply entertainment value. They include book and magazine publishing, the visual arts (painting and sculpture), the performing arts (theatre, opera, concerts, dance), sound recordings, cinema and TV films, even fashion and toys and games” (Caves, 2000, p.1). But this term also has its critics, some of whom point out that creativity is not restricted to the arts and culture, but can be found in other endeavors such as science.

Colin Mercer argues that use of the term “creative sector” (Mercer, 2001) turns on the “recognition of creativity...as a universal human capacity that has a special though by no means exclusive, relationship to the cultural sector...These connections position the creative industries *strategically* as crucial components of the strongly emergent ‘knowledge economy’ and as, importantly, an industry like no other that generates products and values that have a significance far beyond their economic currency.” In the U.S., creativity seems to be replacing “excellence” as a key standard for assessing artistic merit as well as becoming a desirable trait in the general workforce. In the United Kingdom, an entire policy plan has been developed and is in process concerning the “creative industries.” Since “creative” seems the term of preference and of the future, using it to refer to the sector in question seemed the most descriptive and the least confusing. Hence, we settled on a discussion of the “creative sector.”

An Emerging Sectoral Perspective

The National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council on Competitiveness Task Force on State Leadership in the Global Economy (State Leadership in the Global Economy Task Force, 2002) displayed a proto-sectoral approach and combined it with elements of a workforce focus.

Rather than use the term “sector”, the NGA discussed a cluster-based approach to economic development that included consideration for programs and policies for building a 21st century workforce and for maximizing public leadership in promoting international trade. The NGA defined a “cluster” as a “network of competing and cooperating firms, suppliers, service providers, and institutions in a state and regional economy”(p. 8). In general, the economy of the 1990s and beyond was characterized by increased “churning” (high turnover) and other developments that made workers more responsible for their own career advancement, including keeping their knowledge and skills current.

Meeting this new responsibility to become “career entrepreneurs” (Jeffcutt, 2001) becomes difficult because “post-secondary education, student financial aid, training programs, and consumer info are not changing fast enough to meet the expanding needs of working adults” (p. 7). This phenomenon is particularly evident in the “new economy” which focuses on “high-value products rich in knowledge and innovation which, in turn, require an educated, adaptive and skilled workforce. Generally, this shift is related to the proportion of the workforce that has some post-secondary education. And this, in turn, is a matter of both education and demographics. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that by 2020, there will be a 22% increase in the number of jobs requiring some post-secondary education, yet during the next 20 years, the American workforce will lose 46 million skilled workers as the baby boomers retire (p. 11).

It might be argued that the creative sector has been experiencing churning—the constant creation and elimination of jobs—for the past 40 years. The causes of such churning are many: rapid proliferation of nonprofit arts activities and organizations; dramatic ups and downs in the various elements of a mixed funding system; prolonged educational reform efforts; a rapid pace of technological change; an increasingly competitive, risky, and international marketplace for cultural and leisure goods; significant changes in population demographics; communications convergence and wholesale telecommunications reform; an apparent decline in social capital and rising expectations of accountability and performance value. Furthermore, mergers and the conglomeratization of the entertainment industries, the growth and retrenchment of nonprofit arts and cultural organizations, strained school budgets, and the high incidence of small business and freelance artists also meant that there were relatively few resources available for organizationally supported training and professional development.

Additionally, even before the projected retirement of the baby-boomers, generational change has been churning the creative workforce from the passing of artistic icons (like Martha Graham, George Balanchine, and Joseph Papp) to the retirement of a key cohort of art education innovators, to the high turnover of public and nonprofit arts administrators who piloted the post-war arts boom. In response, the creative workforce and workplace has churned: jobs have expanded and contracted, institutional memory and experience have both been lost and sometimes been an obstacle to change; skill demands have grown and new competencies have arisen; work conditions have often been unstable and relentlessly challenging.

Concurrently, another shift is occurring that some refer to as the emergence of the “new economy.” This “new economy” has been described as involving rapid and significant advances in information technology, a globalizing economy, and a new premium on the skills and creativity of individuals, particularly those who have been variously labeled “symbol

specialists”, “symbol analysts”, “knowledge workers,” “content providers”, or “creative workers” who bring intellectual capital (in the form of skills, knowledge and flexibility) and often intellectual property to the table (Healy, 2002).

This shift is linked to the rapid pace of technological change that: demands new skills; has given new importance to creating, managing, and accessing intellectual property; and is changing the way we think about virtually everything including teaching and learning, marketing and management, preservation and creativity, and politics and policymaking. Some analysts have expanded the focus from particular skills, occupations, and professions to an entire class—alternately called the “knowledge class” or the “creative class”—that seems to consist primarily of computer technicians, scientists and engineers. Artistic and cultural workers are seldom included in these discussions, or if they are, they are treated almost as an amenity that contributes to a quality of life that otherwise innovative workers are drawn to (Florida, 2002).

This expansion and growth of the creative workforce is not just an American phenomenon. Countries such as Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and many other European nations report similar growth in the number of creative workers (although just what each is counting may vary from place to place) and the size and economic impact of the creative sector to their national and regional economies. Indeed, a number of countries have explicitly developed what might be called cultural development policies focused on the creative workforce and sector, using a variety of educational, labor, export trade, and cultural strategies. To illustrate how a creative sector approach has worked in practice, effecting education, training, research, practice, and public policy, a short description of the “Creative Industries Initiative” in the United Kingdom is presented below.

***A Sectoral Approach in Action:
the United Kingdom’s Initiatives on Culture and Creativity***

Initially, the effort was spurred by a concern for economic and trade development that recognized the importance of artists and creative industries to the national economy, to future prosperity in a knowledge economy, and to optimizing the UK’s international competitiveness. In this regard the first studies and recommendations dealt with issues such as:

- having a cultural figure accompany the Prime Minister and other senior officials on international visits to personify and raise the visibility of British culture;
- urging the British Council to better represent the creative industries at international trade fairs;
- addressing information gaps for the performing arts concerning overseas market intelligence;
- or feeding back information between past tours and planned touring venture, and developing a generic promotion resource for the range of performing arts offerings (CIEPAG (Creative Industries Export Promotion Advisory Group), 1999).

But the vision and agenda has expanded considerably from this starting point. For the past five years, the government has pursued an explicit effort to put creative development on the national agenda, to undertake a series of research and consultation projects to identify problems, to build resources, and launch specific projects and programs. Taking a sectoral approach has allowed the UK to develop a systemic or ecological approach to development of the creative sector and has encouraged it to

evolve an ambitious, integrated approach that builds “creative partnerships” within the national government; between national and regional governments; between the subsidized arts community, voluntary arts and cultural organizations, and the commercial cultural industries; between education (including basic, higher and vocational) and culture; and between trade, education, and culture policies. The processes of issue identification and coalition/network development have been complex and extensive. Policy design and implementation, in many cases, is quite recent; hence it remains to be seen how effective and long-lasting these initiatives will be. A few highlights of this case will inform our discussions of the future of the cultural workforce in the United States.

In 1997, Prime Minister Blair established the Creative Industries Task Force as an interagency group chaired by the Secretary of State for Culture. It brought together representatives from across government to investigate strategies of sustainable growth in the creative industries. The creative industries were seen to include both commercial and subsidized (nonprofit) activities and organizations. For example, the large performing arts category includes opera, dance and theater, and the theater group includes both nonprofit and Broadway-like musical theater. The exact definition is

“...those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property. This includes advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, television and radio (Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), 2002).”

In sketching major characteristics of the creative sector, the DCMS (Malone, 1988) notes that:

- although the subsidized and the commercial components are often seen as separate, “the two...do not work in isolation...both...share a common talent pool and pre-vocational training, and, in some cases, professional development activities.”
- the majority of arts and entertainment companies are small to mid-size enterprises or micro-enterprises (with fewer than 10 employees).
- the sector is heavily dependent on self-employed freelancers, short-contract workers, and volunteers. It is increasingly dependent on workers having ‘portfolio’ careers and holding more than one job.
- workers in cultural occupations account for 1.6% of the total economically active population and the creative industries are projected to be the fastest growing job sector between 1998 and 2006
- two contradictory job skill trends are apparent: an increasing specialization (both as to particular skill/function and as to discipline application) of job roles (especially among freelancers) and a need for ‘magnificent generalists’ (people with high-level skills and experience across boundaries). This means that arts workers must both constantly update their specialist artform knowledge while also keeping abreast of broad environmental conditions such as government policy and new technology.

The United Kingdom faced an information problem and a problem of fragmentation (both among the creative industries and among government agencies). To address these, additional studies and structural mechanisms were established. The Department of Culture, Media, and Sport (DCMS) commissioned a pair of “Creative Industries Mapping Documents” (one in 1998 and another in 2001) to assemble information about the size, dimensions, and export activities of industries within the creative sector. Another mapping exercise to update this information is under consideration. In addition, four Culture Groups were created as part of a Creative Industries Export Promotion Advisory Group. Representatives from across each of these industry groupings—content, design, heritage and tourism, and performing arts—were brought together and asked “to identify what help and information already exists; what is needed to add value to the export

effort; and who should be providing this added value.”(CIEPAG (Creative Industries Export Promotion Advisory Group), 1999) In 1999, Cultural Consortia were established in each of eight regions outside London to bring together a broad range of stakeholders with an interest in the creative industries, including representatives from local governments, private industry, the DCMS and its sponsored bodies, recreation and educational institutions.

A comprehensive strategy was put forth in 2001 in a long-range planning document entitled Culture and Creativity: The Next Ten Years. (Healy, 2002) This policy vision was premised on a belief that “in the years ahead, people’s creativity will increasingly be the key to a country’s cultural identity, to its economic success, and to individuals’ well-being and sense of fulfillment” (p. 5). It continued to identify fragmentation as a central problem: “The systems for supporting creativity were fragmented, with inadequate connections between local, regional and national funding bodies. The structures also tended to emphasize false divisions between sections of the creative landscape—reinforcing, for example, the separation of the commercial and the subsidized, the regional and the metropolitan, the live event and the recorded or digital experience—even though artists and audiences move freely between these worlds” (p. 6). It also noted that “the creative industries had not been acknowledged in the world of public funding at all” and that artists and cultural organizations had tended to feel “marginal to the thinking of Government” and “excluded from the very structures which were meant to support their development—both in education and in their professional life” (p. 6). The goal of the report was to “join up the policies which range across education, economic development and culture to create for the first time coherent pathways for individuals to develop their creativity in culture and media” (p. 5). This was not presented as a policy of interest only to the creative workforce, but rather as one that would help achieve four key public interest objectives: to sustain and encourage excellence in the arts and culture; (2) to maximize public access to cultural quality; (3) to ensure that artistic creativity was a central part of the formal and lifelong education process; and (4) to develop the creative economy as an increasingly vital part of the UK national economy (pp .6-7).

With regard to the cultural workforce, the Culture and Creativity report speaks of creative workers—artists, teachers, and youth workers (p. 12)— or of “individual artists, arts managers and cultural entrepreneurs” (p. 14). It’s focus on creative workers is evident throughout, although it speaks primarily of “creative individuals” and of a shift in policy focus to individuals, in contrast to a past concentration of funding and support mechanisms on arts organizations. (p. 14)

The report frequently is attentive to the potential and necessity of employing information and interactive technology. For example, it emphasizes the development of “Culture Online” which will use interactive technology, become one of the larger commissioners of content in Europe, will make educational material and entertainment available through on-line performances, workshops, exhibitions, and classes (p. 14). Culture Online is conceived as having three major components: the creation of high quality, interactive learning materials; the development of a network to link together the digital resources of the cultural sector and make them easier for users to use; and to provide multiple points of access to this material (p. 20).

Education seems to be the fulcrum of the long-term plan. It asserts that “creativity should be at the heart of education”, offers a pledge of equal creativity education for all children, and sets teachers and schools at the center of a system of creative partnerships in which “actors, writers, musicians, and cultural entrepreneurs all have skills which can complement the work of teachers. They [artists] can be mentors, offer expert coaching, lead participative workshops, inspire the disaffected” (p. 14) Among the policy instruments and initiatives proposed are:

- greater efforts to partner and build on the expertise of artists and cultural institutions in the development of children's creative talents (p. 21);
- opportunities and targets for teacher professional development in the arts;
- training for teachers and librarians in new technology use;
- attention to media literacy as well as cine-literary;
- school/work program options including modern apprenticeships that involve greater collaboration between teachers, cultural organizations and creative industries; and
- more resources, materials and guidance to support teacher trainers and trainees in key areas of creativity (pp. 23-8).

Their education vision also extends to devising programs that "provide expert industry guidance to young people looking to use their music skills in developing their careers" (p. 27) and integrating "specialist arts colleges" into the training system for artists and raising the general level of art education. Hence "culture and creativity" is as much about educational policy as it is about cultural policy or creative industry development policy.

Moving on to expand the policy forum to creative industry development, the report notes that "artists, arts managers and cultural entrepreneurs are a vital part of [the] country's social, cultural and economic life." It offers proposals "designed to remove many of the obstacles that currently frustrate their development and to create a more supportive structure which will free their creative potential" (p. 31), making it easier for individual artists and small business to gain access to funding, expert advice, protection of intellectual property, facilities, networking with similar organizations, and skills development are components of the plan. Identifying the need for business and career start-up assistance immediately after art students leave college, it proposes a Graduate Incubator Grant fund to provide up to L10,000 in investment funding" (p. 33). It also announced the establishment of Regional Venture Capital funds to improve the access of cultural entrepreneurs to venture capital and investment financing (p34) It looks for ways to improve ease of access to government business support and makes a new small business incubator fund available to creative industries and cultural entrepreneurs. In recognizing the increasing value of intellectual property assets, it seeks new ways for intellectual property to be better managed for the public good in perpetuity just as museums, archives and the National Trust currently hold and manage physical property as stewards of the nation's cultural heritage (p. 33).

The report focuses on small and mid-size arts organizations and new ventures of cultural entrepreneurs. It notes, but does not have much to say about, the managers of large arts/cultural organizations or of large cultural enterprises. It is also silent about public administrators of arts and cultural agencies. However, it does recognize that the job of the arts manager is "increasingly complex" because of "the challenges created by: the Lottery; the plurality of funding sources and levels of accountability; the development of Government policies towards excellence, education, access and social inclusion objectives; and the increasingly sophisticated and competitive leisure marketplace" (p. 37). The report points out that, due to the lack of an established training culture in the creative sector, managers often do not get the training and professional development support their need.

A Creative Industries Higher Education Forum draws together members of government, creative industries and higher education to develop a shared vision on the interrelationship of the creative industries, education and research. The development of new partnerships between particular creative industries and education and training providers is encouraged and is being channeled through the creation of sector skills councils (SSCs). For example **Skillset** is licensed to operate as the Sector Skills Council for Broadcast, Film, Video and Interactive Media. As such, the organization works with industry and government to determine training and skill needs for these industries, to

advance appropriate training programs to advise government on education and training policies and to raise awareness of the need to invest in training. It has undertaken studies of the workforce and necessary skills in the computer games industry, journalism, animation and freelancers in the audio-visual industries. **Metier** is the designated the National Training Organization for arts and entertainment.

THE CREATIVE WORKFORCE AND FORCES OF CHANGE

If the creative sector is indeed a leading component of the new economy, then the education and development of the creative sector workforce is an important economic and policy concern. If the activities, products and services of the creative sector also contributes to the generation of social capital which, in turn, sustains identity, social cohesion, tolerance, and trust, then the preparation and effectiveness of creative sector workforce is also socially significant. However, the creative workforce is seldom treated as a whole—partly because the sector itself has not been perceived and partly because most research and discussion of cultural workers has focused on one type of worker: the artist. In this second part of our exploration, a second analytical lens must be used—one that explores the creative workforce by looking at three key cultural professions: artist, arts educator, and arts administrator.

Background on The Creative Workforce

In the U.S., artists, arts educators, and arts administrators are generally considered to be poorly paid, precarious, and somewhat eccentric occupations. While a small number of artists achieve “star” status and some few managers of major arts institutions are accorded elite stature, most artists, arts educators, and art administrators work in relative anonymity and for modest financial rewards. A variety of specific problems have been identified as concerns to each occupation. Artists worry about securing workspace, a living wage, and worker benefits like healthcare insurance and pensions. As Galligan observes:

...the arts are not easy professions to pursue as careers. Too little professional training and business skill development opportunities exist. The lack of social recognition and financial stability present barriers to long-term careers. In addition, issues of copyright and global marketing and distribution now join longstanding issues of housing, health insurance, and workplace conditions as problems for working artists.(Galligan, 2001)

Arts educators are concerned with new curriculum and student performance requirements as well as school funding constraints that often reduce teacher positions and provide few classroom resources. Nonprofit arts administrators face the challenges of a dramatically changing funding environment, of shifting audience demographics and tastes, and worry about burnout and leadership succession (Illinois Arts Alliance, 2003). Commercial art producers feel threatened by piracy and are trying to rethink business models in the face of rapid technological change and globalized markets. Three central issues for new media workers have been identified: a continuing need to acquire and update their skills, an informally structured employment system that is project oriented, and a lack of long-term security and job benefits.(Batt, Christopherson, Rightor, & Von Jaarsveld, 2001)

All of these occupations are seeking to adjust to an increasingly global marketplace, to the impact and opportunities that technology offers, to general demographic shifts, and to an

increasingly ethnically diverse worker pool and potential audience. Each is also in the midst of what amounts to a generational change and frequently complains about a dearth of leadership, public support, and insufficient resources. Each of these groups of workers has been the subject of recent research and convenings in the U.S. but these specific perspectives have not yet been integrated. Other countries have begun to take a wide angle lens or to explore certain creative professions in more detail and moved toward action in policy, in partnership and coalition building concerning education and training, professional development, and further research.

Estimating the Size of the Creative Workforce

This workforce is large, highly skilled and well-educated. Broadly defined, people who work in what is variously called the creative, cultural, copyright, or arts and entertainment industries constitute one of the fastest growing, most dynamic segments of the emerging “knowledge economy.” They are the creators, presenters, producers, managers, and conservators of cultural and artistic content and those who train future generations in such skills and capabilities. Snippets of information reveal that these workers are a significant component of the U.S. workforce, but no clear or complete picture is currently available. Alper, Galligan, and Wassall report that between 1940 and 1998, the number of artists working in all sectors of the general economy (public, commercial, and nonprofit) grew at a rate roughly two and half times faster than that of other types of workers (Alper et al., n.d.) The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) categorizes artist occupations among the “professional speciality occupations” that also include careers in engineering, science, the clergy and law. The artist occupations include eleven groups.¹ According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2.1 million people were employed as artists as their primary job. The total represented an increase of 72,000 in just the one year since 2000. The total also includes 45,000 arts education teachers, but this is not a full count of all individuals whose primary occupation is that of art educator. (National Endowment for the Arts, 2002)

From another measurement perspective, Americans for the Arts, the leading arts advocacy organization in the country, reports that there are approximately 40,000 nonprofit arts organizations that, together, employ 2.09 million workers (which includes artistic, administrative and technical jobs). Museums alone reported that they employed almost 150,000 people, nearly two-fifth of whom were part-time and also relied on the services of almost 377,000 volunteers. (American Association of Museums, 1994) From yet another vantage point, the International Intellectual Property Alliance reports that in 2001, core copyright industries employed 4.7 million workers or 3.5% of the U.S. workforce.(Siwek, 2002) In one region of the country alone, the New England Council estimated that the productivity of creative industries and individuals supported more than 245,000 jobs.

These are impressive figures but they do not “paint” a clear picture. Note that the BLS figure for artists at 2.1 million and the AFTA figures for the nonprofit arts of 2.09 million seem to be quite consistent, but, in actuality, they are counting quite different collections of workers, and that the IIPA is counting yet another set of workers. The AFTA study counts all employees—artistic, administrative, and technical--of nonprofit arts organizations, whereas the BLS counts only artistic workers, but they might be employed in the commercial, nonprofit or informal arts

¹ These eleven groups include: actors/directors, announcers, architects, dancers, designers, musicians/composers, painters/sculptors/craft artists, photographers, teachers of art/drama/music and those not elsewhere classified.

cultural industries. As a further contrast, the IIPA counts virtually none of the workers counted in the AFTA study, an unknown number of artistic workers captured in the BLS data, but also adds technical and administrative personnel employed in the music recording and publishing industries, film, broadcasting, and legitimate theatre as well as those employed in computer software and advertising industries.

Similarly, there are no good figures about arts educators—a category that includes both public and private instructors, K-12 and higher education teachers. Historically and associationally, each of these groups has tended to cluster themselves into separate professional groups. Arts educators also segment according to art discipline categories: with visual art and music teachers being the most numerous and well organized. For example, the National Center for Education Statistics, reported that, in the 1999-2000 school year, music instruction was available in 94% of the nation's public elementary schools and the visual arts in 87%. In contrast, dance instruction and theatre/drama instruction were relatively rare, available in 20% and 19% of public elementary schools respectively. For secondary public schools, the figures were 90% for music, 93% for visual arts, 14% for dance and 48% for theatre/drama instruction available.

The “availability of instruction” does not, however, easily translate into the number of teachers who provide that instruction because it is common for a single arts specialist to split their time between different grades and even between different schools, or that arts instruction might be provided by a non-art specialist teacher. We can report that there are 108,500 public elementary school visual arts and music teachers, but figures are not available for the number of arts educators in the nearly 53,000 public secondary schools, the over 7,000 fine art schools, or in higher education.(Carey, Kleiner, Porch, & Farris, 2002)

Nor are there definite figures for the number of teachers who provide private instruction. While professional associations can provide some insight as to this last group, their members are often a mix of individuals coming from various levels of the educational system and sometimes mix individual with organizational members. For example, the American College of Musicians reports 31,000 members who are piano teachers. Yet the Music Teachers National Association claims only 24,000 members who are independent and collegiate teachers of all instruments including voice. The number of dance teachers/educators could be somewhere between 6,000 and 56,000² depending on who is included and how many might be foreign members. Meanwhile the College Arts Association which is primarily an association of higher education art educators, claims 13,000 members: 11,000 of these are individual members such as artists, art historians, scholars, curators, collectors, art publishers and other visual arts professionals; 2,000 are institutional members such as art and art history departments, museums, libraries, and other professional and commercial organizations. While a figure for higher education art educators could probably be extracted from this membership list, it is not readily apparent what that number would be. A similar sorting process would have to be undertaken in other discipline based associations to obtain numbers for arts educators in higher education.

² The Dance Educators of American reports 6,800 members; the Professional Dance Teachers Association reports 1,000, the US Ballroom Branch of the Imperial Society of Teachers of Dancing claims 550, and the World Congress of Teachers of Dancing reports 56,300 members. We don't know to what extent these memberships might overlap, how many are student or associate members, and how many might be international members from outside the U.S.

Human Capital and Three Key Cultural Professions

If knowledge, information, intellectual property, and creativity are the currency of the new economy, then the workforce and the institutions that shape it--education, training, and professional associations—are the assets that underwrite the value and availability of that currency. Nearly two decades ago, the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness identified improvements in human resources and technology as the most crucial prerequisites of national competitiveness (Salamon, 1991) (p. 3). Focusing on the creative workforce brings us to the concept of human capital. "Human capital refers to the acquired skills, knowledge, and abilities of human beings" and presumes that efforts to improve human capabilities can be thought of as investments that increase productivity. Education – in the broad sense of various forms of training, knowledge acquisition, life-long learning, and professional socialization – is a primary form of human capital investment – and is the factor most directly affecting worker capacity.³

For the purposes of discussion at this symposium, we have chosen to focus on three key professional groups of the creative sector – artists, art educators, and arts administrators (both public and private). This focus is distinctive in a number of ways. First, we are concerned primarily with workers who are creative professionals and not with the creativity of all workers. This is a different than the concern found in reports such as the SCANS report of the early 1990s and in the work of Ken Robinson in the UK. (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS), 1992; Robinson, 2001). Such studies are concerned primarily with K-12 education, which surely has an effect on other aspects of creative human capital. It affects the likely size and composition of the potential creative sector workforce and indirectly it affects the prospects for worker productivity because it helps shape (or mis-shape) public attitude toward and participation in creative sector services and products. In contrast, we are more likely to be concerned with post-secondary education, professional development and life-long learning because that is where our three types of creative professionals tend to acquire their specialized skills.

Second, by focusing on these three professional groups, we can explore both the processes of, challenges to, and ramifications of professionalization in the creative sector. For example, if the hallmarks of professional status are specialized knowledge, control over entry into the profession, autonomy or discretion in one's work, and a sense of social service (Goldstein, 1984) (rather than simply a profit motive), which occupations of the creative sector exhibit these professional characteristics? The distinction between professional artist and amateur is important to individuals in the field, but just what does professional mean and how is that status established? Conversely, there has been criticism of the nonprofit arts as having over-professionalized (Larson, 1997; Wyszomirski. Margaret J., 1995) (and indeed such a concern seems common across the entire nonprofit sector (Salamon, 1997), an interesting phenomenon considering that the service and civic aspect of the arts is stronger here than in the cultural industries). Alternatively, Brante suggests that there are five types of professionals: free, capital

³ Salamon identifies three kinds of human capital investments: those that affect the size and composition of the workforce (such as migration patterns, birth and death rates, etc); those that affect worker capacity (include education, training, skill development); and those that affect worker productivity (such as motivation, job and geographic mobility, etc) See pp. 9-10.

(or organizational), political, state, and academic.(Brante, 1990) If one takes a sectoral perspective, could one hypothesize that a sector is likely to include professionals from each of these groups and without a full array, the sector is likely to be missing key workforce components? How does the creative workforce array across these five types of professionals and what might this tell us about the capacity of the sector? And do individuals migrate across such categories or remain in a single category? Or to use yet another workforce taxonomy, if the entire workforce might be categorized into four major groupings: proletarian workers, skilled workers, vocational occupations, and professionals (Beckman, 1990), how does the creative workforce distribute among these groupings? Does such an analysis begin to provide insight into the image of creative work as poorly paid, unstable, and often lacking in social status? And again do creative workers move between these occupational groupings and is that an indication of career progression?

Third, by taking a sectoral perspective, we can begin to recognize the inter-relatedness of what have heretofore been seen as separate occupations while also clarifying our awareness of what the creative sector is. For example, Batt, Christopherson, et. al note that successful development of new media industries will require strategies that are both workforce oriented and sectoral.(Batt et al., 2001) Similarly, Galligan hints at a sectoral perspective when she notes that “there are ‘disconnects’ in the US between the development of arts and humanities education, education in general, and the development of workplace policies...”(Galligan, 2001)

Arts Education and Art Educators

Historically, arts education policy has tended to straddle the arenas of public arts funding and general education policy. One strong theme in American education policy has been that the goal of education is job preparation. Observed from abroad, Ken Robinson noted that “Americans generally view job preparation as the principal reason for schooling and knowledge not obviously related to job skills as relatively unimportant.”(Robinson, 2001) Yet job preparation of the creative workforce has not been a prominent theme in arts education advocacy or policy formulation. Indeed, reports like Toward Civilization side-stepped the workforce development perspective when it offered “four reasons why arts education is important.”(National Endowment for the Arts, 1988) These were

1. to understand civilization
2. to develop creativity
3. to learn the tools of communication, and
4. to develop the capacity for making wise choices among the products of the arts.

Each was discussed in terms of making arts education essential for all students and largely in terms of its value to individuals. Similarly and more recently, the Champions of Change report(Fiske, n.d.) presented extensive evidence that arts education (both in-school and informally/after-school) can change and improve the learning environment for young people, can reach students who are not otherwise being reached and in ways that are different from other learning approaches, yet it also challenges traditionally successful students. Both reports allude to the role of education in “preparing “ students, to be generally productive and informed citizens, but don’t connect education—and specifically arts education—to job related preparation or the potential of working in a leading sector of the economy.

Conversely, SCANS focused on the general workforce skills that the arts help to develop, such as teamwork, complex thinking, and problem-solving. Such an approach is not limited to the U.S. It can also be seen in the U.K. in reports such as All Our Futures. For the sake of clarity and distinction, let us call this the “creativity and the workforce” perspective. In other words, the “creativity and the workforce” perspective views arts education as a general workforce development mechanism. It essentially parallels the arts education impact on the general learning environment argument mentioned above. Again, the focus was not on the potential role of arts education in developing the creative sector’s workforce, not even its key education professionals.

Even though focused on the arts education system and its reform, the report Toward Civilization (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988) did not provide much information on art education professionals or their preparation and skill needs. It reported on the percentage of elementary schools served by teachers who were visual arts or music specialists, not on the number of teachers. It also noted that few states certified specialists in theater and dance; none had teacher certification programs in design or media arts. The report advocated expanded content requirements for arts specialists, going beyond performance to history, critical analysis, aesthetics and philosophy of arts. This expansion of substantive knowledge has been embedded in the DBAE/CAE model that has continued to develop in the intervening years. Although the report called for the establishment of comprehensive and systematic programs for continuing education and professional development opportunities for arts educators, it did not elaborate on this point. Of course, it should be remembered that when Toward Civilization was released in 1988, even a dawning awareness of an American creative sector was still nearly a decade in the future. Similarly, when the SCANS reports were issued in the early 1990s, the “knowledge economy” was still only emergent.

Clearly the knowledge base expected of K-12 arts educators as reflected in certification requirements has been expanding over the last decade and a half. Freedman and Stuhr discuss the shift in substantive knowledge from a fine arts focus to a visual culture focus (Freedman & Stuhr, 2001). Hence as the medium changes and the role of visual phenomenon in our society changes, a shift to a broader competence is required of art educators. Others point to the need for a broader cultural diversity in the scope of visual art, music, dance and theatre knowledge as a response both the changing domestic demographics and to increasing globalization. Technology has also opened up new teaching methods and materials for arts educators through the use of computers, web-based sites, and distance education. Policy in the form of new arts education curriculum standards has increased the competency expected of K-12 arts educators. Each of these developments has expanded the specialized knowledge required of arts education professionals. And, in turn, requires higher education programs and faculty training future generations of teachers to master and teach this material. It also creates a need for on-going professional development as teachers in the field try to update and augment the knowledge and skills they acquired at the post-secondary level.

Hence changes in society and expectations of K-12 education have changed the knowledge and skills required of arts educators. In turn, the focus on K-12 art education policy has neglected the need for higher education attention to the training of cultural professionals—whether self-managing artists, arts educators, arts administrators, or cultural policy makers and analysts.

However, without recognizing the size and significance of a creative sector it is difficult to even see these higher education and professional training issues.

Change and Arts Administrators

Numerous scholars and observers have drawn attention to various forces of change that are affecting the creative sector and its workforce. In turn, these external forces, are influencing the environment in which creative professionals work and the skills and competencies they require. We have identified four to start with: globalization, technological change, demographic change, and generational turnover in the creative professions.

Studies and reports have begun to appear that examine how particular aspects of these forces are effecting arts administrators. Various effects and challenges of globalization are explored in reports such as “Going Global,”(Lawson & Wyszomirski, 2000) The Ford Foundation /Arts International set of reports on international arts collaborations, NEFA’s report on international touring (DeNatale, Rosenthal, & Fong, n.d.), or the National Governor’s Association issue brief on international trade and the arts (CIEPAG (Creative Industries Export Promotion Advisory Group), 1999).

Another set of reports explores aspects of technology and new media work in the creative sector and details how these forces are adding new demands and requiring new skills from arts administrators. Examples of these include: a series of four reports from the Creativity and Culture Program at the Rockefeller Foundation, (Century, 1999; Jennings, 2000; Twombly, 2002; Wallach, 2003) and a paper by Andrew Taylor (Taylor, 2001). Indeed, technology and intellectual property issues have become one of the most obvious new knowledge areas for all cultural professionals. Many of the definitions of the sector refer to the link between the creative sector and the intellectual property character of creative products and services. The UK Skillset report argued that “...knowledge of intellectual property law will become increasingly critical...(Skillset, 2002). While each profession and individual industry/field will have variable intellectual property concerns, all are discovering that they need to know more about rules, regulations and practices that govern the protection and development of these rights. Yet knowledge about intellectual property, what rights are, how to protect and develop them is seldom part of the training of creative sector professionals. Only in very recent years have books even begun to appear that help to develop this knowledge and make it available to individual practitioners. These include publications such as A Museum Guide to Copyright and Trademark (Shapiro & Miller, 1999) or Introduction to Managing Digital Assets,(Zorich, 1999). A two-year study of the implications and challenges raised by the intersection of intellectual property and technology development was the subject of a two year study that culminated in the 2002 American Assembly on “Art, Technology and Intellectual Property.” (American Assembly, 1997) Professional associations also present sessions on intellectual property issues at their annual meetings as a form of in-service training for current professionals. A recent Kenan Institute report, Preparing Performing Artists for the 21st Century (Booth, Lotitch, & Overman, 2002), called on service organizations to provide young artists with better information about career opportunities.

Yet another study visits the issue of succession (Illinois Arts Alliance, 2003), while Canadian reports on their creative management project (Harvey, 2002) are primarily concerned with generational change among arts administrators in the US and Canada respectively. A report from the National Arts Administration Mentorship Program was concerned with mentoring the next generation of arts administrators working in small and mid-sized artist-centered organizations. (Atlas & deNobriga, 2002) A recent monograph from Americans for the Arts details the relatively low salaries of nonprofit managers in general and of nonprofit arts managers in particular. Indeed, the salary level almost undermines their professional status, when one realizes that the median salary for an executive director of an arts organization is \$31,000—below that of computer programmers, construction managers, and dental hygienists. (Twombly, 2002) Similarly, the title of a recent article in ARTnews illustrates another kind of problem facing museum curators in the midst of change: demoralization, resentment, anxiety, stress. (Wallach, 2003)

Most of these studies about the challenges and demands on arts administrators and on the career development and self-management needs of artists emphasize the significance and magnitude of changes and tend to focus on a similar set of forces of change. And the same kinds of changes and challenges are facing the creative workforce internationally. A recent study by Skillset, the U.K. Skills Council for Media industries, identified the global knowledge economy, digitisation, and demographic change as the three primary forces of change shaping these industries and their workers (Skillset, 2002). Patricia Dewey's (Dewey, 2003) research examines how arts administrators in three countries (US, Hungary, and Austria) are dealing with shifting funding systems, blurring boundaries between art fields and industries, changing policy agendas and environments, and globalization. Paul Jeffcutt, Director of the Centre for Creative Industry in Belfast, sees another set of "key dynamics that are shaping this contemporary manifestation of creativity in the knowledge economy:" (Jeffcutt, 2001)

-*intersectoral* convergence: The creative industries are shaped by convergence between the media-information industries and the cultural/arts sector

-*interprofessional* convergence: The creative industries are shaped by convergence between diverse domains (or forms) of creative endeavor (i.e., visual art, craft, print, video, music, etc) that are brought together by new opportunities for the use of digital media technologies

-*transgovernmental* convergence: the creative industries as a policy field (at whatever level) brings together a complex network of stakeholders—departments of culture and departments of industry, trade, professional and educational bodies, —to try to do effective 'joined up' governance. (p.10)

Similarly, many in the US have pointed to the blurring of boundaries between art forms and between the nonprofit, commercial, and craft/folk arts. Others have pointed to the convergence prompted by a growing common reliance on digital media technologies to distribute arts, culture and entertainment offerings and the repurposing of creative products as they flow across segments of the creative sector. Hence Americans would recognize the phenomena of both intersectoral and interprofessional convergence.

In contrast, it might be argued that transgovernmental convergence has been somewhat less prevalent in the US. Certainly one sees a complex interplay of policy stakeholders on the issue

of arts education as well as cultural tourism. However even in these issue areas, there is still further convergence that could be productively developed, particularly at the national level. One could also point at many efforts at the local and state levels to cultivate transgovernmental convergence on issues ranging from international exchanges to regional development. This is also occurring in the creative sector as documented in a recent report on advocacy collaboration at the state level.(Dwyer & Frankel, n.d.) Furthermore, the transgovernmental area suggests that creative professionals may need to know more about public policy as it affects their work conditions and environment and more about how advocacy can effect a wide range of policies by governments at any level.

Indeed, the fact that change is generating similar challenges for workers across the creative sector is itself an indication of yet another change that is developing, namely that interdependence among creative workers in different occupations is becoming more prevalent in the 21st century. Xavier Greffe (Greffe, 2002)notes that

“this shift from dependent production organizations to more independent production organizations has compelled us to revise our understanding of the skills required for artistic production. They extend from artistic skills to technical and management skills, in the field of plastic arts as well as in the fields of heritage conservation and audio-visual communication. A person must have the skills of a legal expert, a financier and a manager to make the most of his own artistic talent.”

Similarly, a recent British study of skills required of new media workers observed:

“...Technological changes have already created a raft of new occupations. In the area of content production, a specific feature is the interdisciplinary, team-based nature of much work, often requiring a combination of technical, creative, and business skills. This cuts across traditional professional and training demarcation lines...previously distinct job roles are converging and...workers are expected to master a much wider range of tasks, both within their core competencies and in their subsidiary skill repertoires...Many of these new jobs require hybrid skills whose development is not currently accommodated by higher and further education provision.” (Skillset, 2002) (p. 28-9)

Thus, the bottom line is that not only within their individual professions are cultural professionals being challenged to develop new skills and master more knowledge, but that they are also being challenged to become more diversely skilled and to master teamwork at a pervasive and integral level.

Some Final Thoughts

This background paper has only scratched the surface of exploring the forces of change that are affecting the creative sector. However, it is impossible to talk about either the state of the creative workforce and professions or the parameters of the sector without alluding to the forces of change. Likewise the information presented can only begin to raise questions about the needs and challenges involved in the task of bettering preparing the creative sector workforce for the 21st Century. Considerable time was spent on the idea of a creative sector because it is the foundation upon which subsequent analysis builds. Likewise substantial attention was paid to examining problems of identifying and measuring the creative sector workforce and some of the forces and processes of professionalization buffeting it. Trying to bridge our separate “silos” of knowledge and experience on this complex topic will give all of us much to “think” upon at the

symposium.

Reference List

- Alper, N., Galligan, A., & Wassall, G. (n.d.). "Policy Perspectives for Bettering the Working Conditions of Artists in America". Unpublished background paper prepared for the Center for Arts and Culture.
- American Assembly. (1997). *The arts and the public purpose: Report of the 92nd American Assembly May 29-June 1, 1997*. New York: American Assembly.
- American Association of Museums. (1994). Museums Count. Washington DC: AAM.
- Atlas, C., & deNobriga, K. (2002). Report to the field: A record and reflection of value-based learning. New Orleans, LA: National Performance Network.
- Batt, R., Christopherson, S., Rightor, N., & Von Jaarsveld, D. (2001). Net working: Work patterns and workforce policies for the new media industry. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Beckman, S. (1990). Professionalization: Borderline authority and autonomy in work. In M. Burrage, & R. Torstendahl (Eds), Professions in theory and history : rethinking the study of the professions (pp. 115-138). London : Sage Publications.
- Booth, E., Lotitch, L., & Overman, S. (2002). Preparing performing artists for the 21st century. Winston-Salem, NC: Kenan Institute for the Arts.
- Brante, T. (1990). Professional types as a strategy of analysis. In M. Burrage, & R. Torstendahl (Eds), Professions in theory and history : rethinking the study of the professions (pp. 75-93). London : Sage Publications.
- Carey, N., Kleiner, B., Porch, R., & Farris, E. (2002). Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1999–2000. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).
- Caves, R. E. (2000). Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Century, M. (1999). Pathways to Innovation in Digital Culture. Montreal, Quebec: Centre for Research on Canadian Cultural Industries and Institutions.
- Cherbo, J. M., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2000). Mapping the public life of the arts in America. in J. M. Cherbo, & M. J. Wyszomirski (eds.), The public life of the arts in America . New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- CIEPAG (Creative Industries Export Promotion Advisory Group). (1999). Creative industry exports: Our hidden potential. London, England: Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).
- Cunningham, S. (2001). From cultural to creative industries: theory, industry, and policy implications. Culturelink, (Special Issue), 19-32.
- DeNatale, D., Rosenthal, A., & Fong, E. (n.d.). Developing An Effective System for the Commissioning and Touring of International Work. Boston, MA: New England Foundation for the Arts.
- Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (2002). Creative industries fact file. London: DCMS.
- Dewey, P. (2003). Training arts administrators to manage systemic change.
- Dwyer, C. M., & Frankel, S. (n.d.). Policy Partners: Making the Case for State Investments in Culture. The Pew Charitable Trusts.

- Fiske, E. B. (n.d.). Champions of change. Washington DC: PCAH/AEP.
- Florida, R. L. (2002). The rise of the creative class : and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life . New York, NY : Basic Books.
- Freedman, K., & Stuhr, P. (2001). Visual Culture: Broadening the Domain of Art Education.
- Galligan, A. M. (2001). Creativity, culture, education, and the workforce. Washington, DC: Center for Arts and Culture.
- Galligan, A. M., & Cherbo, J. M. (2002). Financial support for individual artists in the United States. A Report to the National Endowment for the Arts:
- Goldstein, J. (1984). Foucault among the Sociologists: The "Disciplines" and the History of the Professions. History and Theory, 23(2), 170-192.
- Greffe, X. (2002). The artist as an entrepreneur of his talents. In X. Greffe Arts and artists from an economic perspective . Paris: UNESCO/Editions Economics.
- Harvey, J. (2002). Final Report on Phase 1: Creative management in the arts and heritage: Sustaining and renewing professional management for the 21st century. Canadian Conference of the Arts.
- Healy, K. (2002). What's new for culture in the new economy? The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, 32(2), 86-103.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1985). The study of industries. Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 4, 271-309.
- Illinois Arts Alliance. (2003). Succession:Arts leadership for the 21st century. Chicago, Illinois: Illinois Arts Alliance.
- Jeffcutt, P. (2001). Creativity and Convergence in the Knowledge Economy: Reviewing Key Themes and Issues. Culturelink, (Special Issue), 9-18.
- Jennings, P. (2000). New media arts: New funding models. Creativity and Culture, The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Larson, G. O. (1997). American canvas : an arts legacy for our communities. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Lawson, W. P., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2000). Going Global: Negotiating the maze of cultural interactions. Columbus, OH: OSU APA/OAC.
- Malone, G. D. (1988). Political advocacy and cultural communication: Organizing the nation's public diplomacy. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Mercer, C. (Guest Ed). (2001). Convergence, creative industries and civil society:The new cultural policy. CultureLink, (Special Issue).
- Murdock, G. (2003). Back to Work: Cultural Labor in Altered Times. A. Beck (ed.), Cultural Work: Understanding the Cultural Industries (pp. 15-36). London/New York: Routledge.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (1988). Toward civilization. Washington DC: NEA.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (2002). Research Note 80. Washington DC: NEA.
- O'Connor, J. (n.d.). The definition of 'cultural industries'.

- Robinson, K. (2001). Out of our mind: Learning to be creative. Oxford, England: Capstone Publishing Limited.
- Salamon, L. M. (1991). Overview: Why human capital? Why now? in D. W. Hornbeck, & L. M. Salamon (Eds), Human capital and America's future : an economic strategy for the '90s (pp. 1-39). Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Salamon, L. M. (1997). Holding the center: America's nonprofit sector at a crossroads . New York: The Nathan Cummings Foundation.
- Scott, W. R., & Meyer, J. W. (1983). The Organization of Societal Sectors. In Meyer, John W, Scott, W Richard (with the assistance of Brian Rowan and Terrance E. Deal)'s Organizational Environments: Ritual and rationality (pp. 129-153). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). (1992). What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000. Washington DC: US Department of Labor.
- Shapiro, M. S., & Miller, B. I. (1999). A Museum Guide to Copyright and Trademark. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.
- Siwek, S. E. (2002). Copyright Industries in the U.S. Economy: The 2002 report. Washington, DC: International Intellectual Property Alliance.
- Skillset. (2002). Skills for Tomorrow's Media. Available at www.skillset.org/research/home.asp:
- State Leadership in the Global Economy Task Force. (2002). A governor's guide to creating a 21st century workforce. Washington DC: National Governor's Association.
- Taylor, A. (2001). Pandora's bottle: Cultural content in a digital world. In V. B. Morris, & D. B. Pankratz (Eds), The arts in a new millenium: Research and arts sector . Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Twombly, E. C. (2002). Executive Compensation in the Nonprofit Sector: A Focus on Arts and Cultural Organizations. Washington, DC: Americans for the Arts.
- Venturelli, S. (n.d.). From the Information Economy to the Creative Economy. Washington, DC: Center for Arts and Culture.
- Wallach, A. (2003). Demoralization, Resentment, Anxiety, Stress. ARTnews, 112-114.
- Williams, R. (1981). Culture . London: Fontana.
- Wyszomirski, Margaret J. (1995). Federal cultural support: Toward a new paradigm? The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, 25(1), 69-83.
- Wyszomirski, M. J. (2002). Arts and Culture. In L. Salamon (ed.), The State of Nonprofit America . Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Wyszomirski, M. J. (2004). From public support for the arts to cultural policy. Policy Studies Journal, forthcoming.
- Zorich, D. (1999). Managing digital assets: Options for cultural and educational organizations. CA: Getty Information Institute.