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Dear Colleague,

We hope that this document will provide you with information about the situation of the individual artist living and working in the United States. It is an update, in four cities, of a study originally done in 1988. In this version, artists from Los Angeles, Minneapolis/St.Paul, New York and San Francisco offer information on some of the characteristics society uses to define professionals—income, education, time spent on work, professional affiliations; on the artist’s state of need in social service areas like health care, pension, credit, live/work space and insurance; and on certain contributions the artist makes to society—voting, volunteer time, advocacy.

Since we believe that data need relevant issues to support them, we spoke to artists, administrators, funders, policy makers and sympathizers in each city, and gathered relevant information about studies, support mechanisms, meetings and publications on artists there in the last decade before we surveyed 7,700 artists. This information has been used to create a context for the results of the study.

The results comprise an ongoing part of the only systematic information gathering on living artists in the United States. While they reflect the opinions of only the Research Center for Arts and Culture, we hope you will listen carefully for the artists’ voices as they speak about their needs, their realities and their contributions to American society.

Sincerely,

Joan Jeffri
Director
Research Center for Arts and Culture
"America needs its artists to help it obey that most ancient
of human admonitions, to know thyself."
(Robert MacNeil, American Creativity at Risk)

INTRODUCTION

In 1997 the Research Center for Arts and Culture (RCAC) at Columbia University returned to its 1988 national study on individual artists. The original study, INFORMATION ON ARTISTS(IAO-I), focused on artists’ work-related human and social service needs: health care, pension, welfare, credit, live/work space and legal and financial needs. It surveyed 10,000 artists in ten U.S. locations: Boston, Cape Cod, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Minneapolis/St. Paul, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and western Massachusetts. The original response rate was 42%, with the response from Chicago a high of 48%.

INFORMATION ON ARTISTS II (IOA-II) returned to four of the original ten locations: Los Angeles, Minneapolis/St. Paul, New York and San Francisco and surveyed 7,700 artists in two parallel surveys. For Study One, the first survey of 4,000 artists, we obtained artists’ names and addresses from the same organizations used in 1988. The survey instrument was the same, but added several questions on Community, Technology and Professional Status. The response rate for Study One was 31% (1254), with the response from New York a high of 36%. For Study Two, the second survey of 3,700 artists, we obtained new lists with a special effort to obtain names from organizations that represent artists more specifically in terms of race, ethnicity or cultural background. We used the identical questionnaire. The response rate for Study Two was 28% (1021), with the response from Los Angeles a high of 39%.

The aggregate response rate for the 1997 Study One and Study Two was 30% (2275).

The purposes of this study are:

- to provide an important comparative benchmark on the artist’s condition in the United States from 1988 to 1997;
- to facilitate better descriptions of artists in terms of their economic and professional status in different artistic disciplines and in different geographic locations;
- to cooperate and collaborate with local arts service and artists’ service agencies in each location to make this information usable and useful to them;
- to continue to demystify the survey process and data gathering mechanisms that will enable agencies in each location to make specific connections between data from the field and the creation of new programs and the modification of existing ones;
- to provide solid information, over time, to build a case for artists alongside other professionals.

SITE VISIT ISSUES

During the period 1988-1997, Salman Rushdie’s The Satanic Verses was published and his life threatened. Crises erupted at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington D.C. and the Contemporary Art Center in Cincinnati over an exhibition of photographs by artist Robert Mapplethorpe and over an art work by Andres Serrano supported indirectly by funds from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Other crises followed, including performances involving human blood by Ron Athey at the Walker Arts Center in Minneapolis/St.Paul. Revolt occurred in Tianenman Square in China where a model of our Statue of Liberty set the tone for the rebellion. Nelson Mandela was released from prison, shared the Nobel Peace Prize, and became the first black president of

---

1 Percentages often add up to more than 100% since respondents answered in more than one category even when otherwise instructed. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. The margin for error is plus or minus 5% and in certain questions, plus or minus 3%.

The full reports on each city, Actors’ Equity Association, and breakdowns by race are available from the Research Center.
South Africa. The Berlin Wall fell, the Americans with Disabilities Act passed into law, and countries in Central and Eastern Europe became emerging democracies grappling with concepts of a marketplace economy and a civil society. Riots tore South-Central Los Angeles after an acquittal in the Rodney King beating. Christo wrapped the Reichstag and the first Republican Congress since 1946 was elected in the United States.

And American cities, having received over thirty years of public as well as private and corporate support of the arts, boasted substantial and visible cultural infrastructures in the form of arts centers, cultural facilities, public art and public programs.

The visual art market rose to unprecedented heights and then descended, as art became a common buzzword touted in economic impact studies, cited for its leveraging ability both financially and internationally, as a public investment, as a communicator, pacifier and bridgebuilder to attract tourism, create equity and educate children.

By the 1980s, support for artists, according to a privately commissioned study, had fewer than ten percent of those foundations that contributed to the arts giving direct grants to artists. Later in the decade, the Foundation Center published a study attesting to the probability that even those would either remain steady or would terminate their gifts. By the mid-nineties, when the NEA abandoned its grants to individual artists, it had become clear that the leveraging factor from the NEA’s seal of approval was the major benefit.

Artists were faced with a changed, charged landscape. In view of the turbulence of the decade, the visits we conducted in each city prior to the survey were an important mechanism for us to hear from artists directly.

1. **Public Perception of Artists**

In addition to the usual definitional problem (“Who is an artist?”), both the artist’s self-worth and his relationship to society emerged again and again. Economic value systems, artists as entrepreneurs were aspects of this issue, and in Los Angeles and San Francisco there was a sense that artists needed to learn to take care of themselves by creating or identifying new financing schemes, cooperative relationships and resources. Artists spoke of shifting public focus from their needs to their contributions in the community—as employers paying taxes, for example.

2. **Copyright and Intellectual Property**

Artists from all sites were particularly concerned with protecting and licensing their work in relation to the new technology and some were concerned about the distancing and distortion of art communicated through technology.

3. **Live/Work Space**

Artists’ housing and gentrification have become embroiled in legal hassles, sometimes over ordinances that exist but are not upheld. Unique space and equipment needs were discussed as well as investigation into new kinds of spaces for artists (i.e. military bases). In some cities, open studio events to promote art and greater public access are unintended invitations to city inspectors seeking building code violations. In others, corruption has resulted in artists’ housing complexes with almost no artists.

4. **Advocacy**

Artists discussed the need to be advocates for themselves and their work and included references to involvement in local politics, collective advocacy and lobbying, and voting. Some artists lamented the lack of a unified voice. They asked for copies of relevant information from this study to use in advocating for themselves.
5. Geographic and Definitional Distance

Physical distance between artist communities was seen as a challenge in Los Angeles, as was the distinction between art and entertainment. In New York, this manifested itself as the difference between art and popular culture.

6. Recognition as a Professional

Tied to the public perception theme, professional recognition by the public included providing that public with a broader view of artists, what they do and the amount of training they have. The idea of a handbook of professional practices and standards was suggested, as well as licensing and certification of artists. Tied to this was the very difficult situation of aging artists who, under-valued by society, have serious problems with health care and survival needs as they grow older.

7. The Arts Environment

The idea of creating a healthier arts environment added resonance to the site visits and echoed other publications and meetings around the country. This was often a response to the image of the artist as target, and the artist’s life as translated into a debate about morals. Too, it was a reaction against the plethora of economic impact studies that, to some artists, justify the arts and artists in purely economic terms.

PROFESSIONALISM

In all Research Center surveys, we have pursued the idea of how artists define themselves as professional artists. It is interesting to note that, of 12 categories, artists in both surveys chose the same ones to define themselves in terms that apply to them and that apply to others. It is also interesting that while the category of “inner drive to make art” has declined, the category “makes a living as an artist” has increased.

We have compared the 1997 results from Study One to data from our 4 cities in IOA-I(1988). We obtained artists’ names and addresses in these two surveys from the same organizations.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important reasons in considering someone to be a professional artist:</th>
<th>IOA I</th>
<th>IOA II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person has an inner drive to make art.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person considers him/herself to be an artist.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person makes his/her living as an artist.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important reasons as they apply to you:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have an inner drive to make art.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself an artist.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make my living as an artist.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEALTH COVERAGE

79% in Study One had some form of medical coverage, as compared with 1988, when 82% had some form of medical coverage.

Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Insurance (Study One)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HMO or PPO 47%

Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Insurance (Study Two)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HMO or PPO 42%

INCOME²

Respondents’ mean gross individual income was $34,146 in Study One, and $48,584 in Study Two. The medians were $30,000 and $25,000.

With adjustments for inflation, artists earned about the same in 1996 from their art. Sixty percent (64% in 1988) earned under $7,000 from their art, and 45% (49% in 1988) earned under $3,000 from their art. In 1996 an average of 8% earned over $40,000 from their art, compared to 7% in 1988. Comparisons by cities appear below.

Figure 4 Artists' Income from their Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artists' Income from their Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² While the study was conducted in 1997, economic figures are for fiscal year 1996.
Figure 5 - Income from Art Study One

1996 Total Income from Work as an Artist (Study One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Study One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than $40,000</td>
<td>$13,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $39,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $29,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Income from Work as an Artist
Mean: $13,301
Median: $5,000

Figure 6 - Income from Art Study Two

1996 Total Income from Work as an Artist (Study Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than $60,000</td>
<td>$16,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $69,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $59,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $39,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $29,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Income from Work as an Artist
Mean: $16,056
Median: $5,000

Figure 7 - Total Gross Income Study One

1996 Total Gross Income (Study One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Study One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than $60,000</td>
<td>$34,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $69,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $59,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $39,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $29,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Gross Income
Mean: $34,146
Median: $30,000

Figure 8 - Total Gross Income Study Two

1996 Total Gross Income (Study Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than $60,000</td>
<td>$48,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $69,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $59,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $39,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $29,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Gross Income
Mean: $48,584
Median: $25,000

LEGEND
The following legend applies throughout this study:
ST1EQ  Study One, Actors' Equity Association
ST1AL  Study One, Aggregate Response
ST1SF  Study One, San Francisco
ST1LA  Study One, Los Angeles
ST1NY  Study One, New York
ST1MSP Study One, Minneapolis/St. Paul
ST2AL  Study Two, Aggregate Response
ST2SF  Study Two, San Francisco
ST2LA  Study Two, Los Angeles
ST2NY  Study Two, New York
ST2MSP Study Two, Minneapolis/St. Paul
Race and Total Gross Income³

In Study One, 25% of our respondents earned between $20,001 and $30,000 total gross income in 1996. 6% of our respondents earned between $50,001 and $60,000 and another 8% earned over $60,000.

- Of the 257 respondents who said they earned between $20,001 and $30,000, 78% are white, 2% are hispanic, 5% are black, and 5% are Asian.
- Of the 61 who said they earned between $50,001 and $60,000, 72% are white, 2% are hispanic, 6% are black, 2% are American Indian or Alaskan natives and 12% are Asian.
- Of the 81 who said they earned over $60,000, 79% are white, 1% are hispanic, 9% are black, 1% are American Indian or Alaskan natives, and 5% are Asian.

In Study Two, 23% of our respondents earned between $20,001 and $30,000 total gross income in 1996. Just as in Study One, 6% of our respondents earned between $50,001 and $60,000 and another 8% earned over $60,000.

³ Throughout this analysis, percentages under 1% and ‘other’ are not reported. If a race is not represented at all, it is not mentioned.
- Of the 196 who said they earned between $20,001 and $30,000, 63% are white, 10% are hispanic, 5% are black, and 15% are Asian.

- Of the 48 who said they earned between $50,001 and $60,000, 69% are white, 6% are hispanic, 2% are black, and 17% are Asian.

- Of the 69 who said they earned over $60,000 73% are white, 3% are hispanic, 9% are black and 9% are Asian.
EDUCATION

43% in Study One and 40% in Study Two have a college degree. Another 38% in both studies have a graduate degree. More Asians have college degrees (48%) and more Asians and Whites have graduate degrees (38% and 42%).

Education and Total Gross Income

5% of our respondents in Study One earned between $20,001 and $30,000 total gross income in 1996, 6% earned between $50,001 and $60,000, and 8% earned over $60,000.

- Of the 260 who said they earned between $20,001 and $30,000 48% have a college degree, and another 39% have a graduate degree.
- Of the 62 who earned between $50,001 and $60,000, 37% have a college degree and another 44% have a graduate degree.

COMMUNITY SERVICE AND PARTICIPATION

Voting

Over 78% of the respondents voted in federal, state and local elections in the previous two years. Over 87% voted in federal elections. Over 75% are registered Democrats.

Figure 15 – Voting in Federal Elections

Figure 16 – Voting in State Elections

Figure 17 – Voting in Local Elections
Education and Voting

We tabulated the level of formal education with those respondents who said they had voted in federal elections.

In Study One, of the 944 respondents who told us they voted in federal elections in the last two years, 43% have a college degree and 41% have a graduate degree.

Of the 118 who told us they did not vote in those elections in the last two years, 48% have a college degree and another 22% have a graduate degree.

In Study Two, of the 748 who told us they voted in federal elections in the last two years, 39% have a college degree and another 40% have a graduate degree.

Of the 115 who said they did not vote in those elections in the last two years, 44% have a college degree and 26% have a graduate degree.

Income and Community Service

We tabulated levels of income with the number of hours of community service respondents performed per week during the last 2 years.

**In Study One, of the 383 who said they had performed community service 1-4 hours per week during the last 2 years, 45% earned between $10,001 and $30,000, and another 16% earned between $30,001 and $40,000.**

For the 101 who performed 5-10 hours of community service, 53% earned between $10,001 and $30,000 and another 12% earned between $30,001 and $40,000.

For the 41 who performed over 20 hours of community service 49% earned between $10,001 and $20,000 and another 17% earned between $30,001 and $40,000.

**In Study Two, of the 311 who said they had performed community service 1-4 hours per week during the last 2 years, 46% earned between $10,001 and $30,000 and another 16% earned between $30,001 and $40,000.**

For the 90 who performed 5-10 hours of community service, 49% earned between $10,001 and $30,000 and another 12% earned between $30,001 and $40,000.

For the 36 who performed over 20 hours of community service, half earned between $10,001 and $30,000 and another 14% earned between $30,001 and $40,000.

NEW ISSUES: TECHNOLOGY, PROFESSIONAL STATUS AND COMMUNITY

As stated earlier, we included new questions dealing with technology, professional status and community. These were based on issues that emerged in the site visits in our four cities: Los Angeles, Minneapolis/St. Paul, New York and San Francisco.

While three-quarters of the artists own computers and almost three-quarters of the artists say that technology has affected the production of their art, about half use electronic media in its creation and about a quarter use it to disseminate and market their art.
While 65% in Study One and 62% in Study Two would not like to be certified the way lawyers, doctors and CPAs are certified, a very large 74% in Study One and 79% in Study Two would find a handbook of “fair practices and standards for artists” useful.

Finally, in an era when issues of freedom of speech, censorship and artistic integrity have received a great deal of public discussion and scrutiny, it was perhaps surprising to learn that 89% in Study One and 87% in Study Two have voted during the last two years in Federal elections, 87% in Study One and 84% in Study Two in state elections and 81% in Study One and 84% in Study Two in local elections, and that 79% are registered Democrats. Taking a cue from those artists in our site visits who complained that “people are always touting the negative things about artists; it’s time to document some of the positive ones,” these percentages reveal a strong involvement.

In addition to this involvement, 67% in Study One and 62% in Study Two of the artists spent between one and four hours per week volunteering or performing community service, and another 18% spent between five and ten hours per week. Forty-one percent in Study One and 38% in Study Two wrote to legislators or elected officials; 26% in Study One and 27% in Study Two demonstrated for or against an issue, and 27% in Study One and 30% in Study Two were active in advocacy organizations.

**SUMMARY**

While some people still cling to the 19th century myth of the starving artist, marginalized from society and living in isolation (which many confuse with freedom), today’s artists, at least according to this study, are involved in their communities, vote in elections, use computers, and are planning for retirement.

> Nevertheless, close to 62% of the artists here earn less than $30,000 in gross individual income, and 45% earn less than $3,000 from their art; 59-60% have only 1-2 dependents and 45% are single. Only 26-30% earned their major income from art in the previous year. And yet, over 80% list the career of artist as most important to them and 89% consider themselves professional artists.

Data, of course, must be viewed within the context of the communities and the artists from which they come. In addition, comparisons of artists to other professions, across disciplines, and with artists in other countries is helpful to our understanding of the artist’s situation in the United States. The Research Center’s comparisons of painters in the early 1990s in the United States and Australia showed them to be very similar in areas of income, occupational, marketplace and peer recognition; American painters, however, were more highly educated than their Australian counterparts. Continuing research with a university social science institute in Portugal will yield comparisons between American and Portuguese artists during the coming year.

In this study, some of the major findings include:

- Artists (like arts audiences) are highly educated, with between 38% and 43% having both undergraduate and graduate degrees.
- 64-65% of the artists received some art-related training in their particular city or region; for blacks this was as high as 79%.
- Artists, like many in the population, have veered away from private physicians and insurance plans, toward HMOs and PPOs. Nevertheless, 14% in Study One and 16% in Study Two do not obtain routine health care.
• With a mean age of 41, 59% in Study One and 55% in Study Two have retirement plans. At least 9% more whites have retirement plans than Asians, blacks or hispanics.
• There are indications that artists of white non-hispanic backgrounds and Asian backgrounds do better economically than black and hispanic artists.
• More Asians have college degrees (48%) and more Asians and whites have graduate degrees (38% and 42%) than black or hispanic artists.
• 3% of the artists in Study One and 4% in Study Two earned over $60,000 from their art in 1996; 5% of the Asian and 6% of the white respondents in Study Two earned over $60,000 from their art in 1996.
• 45% of the artists earned under $3,000 from their art in 1996. Black artists in Study Two did somewhat better, with only 35% earning under $3,000 from their art.
• 62% of the artists in Study One and 64% of the artists in Study Two earned under $30,000 total gross individual income including income from art in 1996. In Study Two this was true of over 70% of the Asians, blacks and hispanics.
• In applying for bank loans, lines of credit, mortgages and credit cards, more blacks and hispanics were turned down than Asians and whites.
• Artists have a strong community involvement, evidenced by voting over the last 2 years: 89% in Study One and 87% in Study Two in federal, 87% in Study One and 84% in Study Two in state, and 81% in Study One and 78% in Study Two in local elections in the last two years, and by community involvement: 61% in Study One and 65% in Study Two volunteered, 43% in Study One and 50% in Study Two performed community service.
• 79% in Study One and 76% in Study Two are registered Democrats.
• Artists advocate for causes: 41% in Study One and 38% in Study Two wrote to legislators or public officials and 27% in Study One and 30% in Study Two have been active in advocacy organizations during the last 2 years.
• 76% in Study One and 75% in Study Two own computers; over 40% use them in relation to their art.
• Artists are concerned about their professional status: 35% in Study One and 38% in Study Two would like to be certified as artists in the way lawyers, doctors, CPAs are certified; 74% in Study One and 79% in Study Two would find a handbook of “fair practices and standards for artists” useful.

Economically, artists seem to be doing about the same as in 1988, although in California, artists in both studies seem to have done better in grants and royalties.

Unlike other countries, the United States has no mandates for the Status of the Artist. The country’s size, competing media, and various campaigns for advocacy of one cause or another, combined with the ongoing Culture Wars, may make artists seem unconnected and inarticulate. Certainly, our site visits proved otherwise, as did many of the responses to the survey.
APPENDIX: LIST PROVIDERS WERE ASKED TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

STUDY ONE

IN WHICH DISCIPLINES DO THE ARTISTS ON YOUR MAILING LIST WORK?
Visual, literary and performing arts including: architecture, choreography, clay, crafts, computer arts, dance (new dance, performance), fiber, fiction, film, glass, literature, multi-disciplinary, multi-media, nonfiction, metal, music (composers, performers), performance art, playwriting, photography, painting, poetry, printmaking, sculpture, theatre, video, wearables mixed, wood and writers.

HOW DOES AN ARTIST GET INCLUDED ON YOUR MAILING LIST?
Many of these organizations are membership service organizations. Artists are added when they join as members. In addition, artists may be included on the lists by request, by applying for a fellowship or agreeing to serve as a panelist, by requesting information either by phone or by mail, or through controlled circulation lists.

“HOW DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION DEFINE ‘ARTIST’?”
Answers included the following:
“We generally allow our members to define themselves but the artist must have some connection to 1 or more of the disciplines listed above.” “Anyone who makes art works.” “We serve literary artists.” “Primary creator” “Any applicant is an artist; however, our applicants are originating rather than interpretive artists.” “One who creates new works (and, for this funding program, is a local resident) of art.” “Anyone who performs and continues to create work in the community.” “Anyone involved in the creative process.”
“An individual engaged in academic study of art, an individual engaged in the practice of art, either professionally or personally.”

STUDY TWO

IN WHICH DISCIPLINES DO THE ARTISTS ON YOUR MAILING LIST WORK?
Visual, literary and performing arts including: ceramics, dance, design, digital art, 2-dimensional art, 3-dimensional art, drawing, film, installation, interdisciplinary, literature, media arts, multi-arts, multimedia, muralists, music, painting, performance art, photography, sculpture, spiritual/culturalism, spoken & written word, theatre, traditional/folk arts, tribal arts, video, visual, writing. In addition, some of the artists were identified by categories including: Multi-Cultural Entry, Multi-Cultural Advancement, Organizational Support, Artists in Residence, and Artists Fellowships.

HOW DOES AN ARTIST GET INCLUDED ON YOUR MAILING LIST?
Many of these organizations are also membership service organizations. Artists are added when they join as members. In addition, artists may be included on the lists by request or referral; by paying membership fees; as applicants to the most recent grant programs in the county, through general inquiry; by submitting work; by attending events; by being identified as potential funders; by filling out slide registry applications; through written or phone inquiries; through complimentary mailing list/publication sign-up sheets at festivals and community events; as residency artists or presenters in school programs; by working (or exhibiting) with major art organizations; by signing-on via web pages; by signing guest lists; through fiscal sponsorship; by completing Artist Action Plans; by calling and sending in a resume/c.v.; by attending workshops; or by responding to yearly calls for artists.

“HOW DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION DEFINE ‘ARTIST’?”
Answers included the following:
“Our membership base is a mixture of artists, curators, educators and media administrators so it is difficult for us to define the term.” “Anyone involved in the creation of art.” “We ask individuals to designate themselves. We accept what they tell us.” “We as an institution do not define artists, it is up to the individual for definitions.” “Creates work in multiple media for public or private exhibition or performance.” “We ask individuals to define themselves by filling out coding form.” “Someone that has acquired & mastered the skills of a discipline, visual or performing.” “Any persons using the ‘arts’ to express culture, emotion, beauty.” “Native artists who create through the written word, performance, visual and traditional art forms.” “We do rely on the artists to help us make that determination, however, we factor in professional affiliations, schooling, body of work and references from colleagues.” “Performing arts—theatre mostly” “Self-defined.”
PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM
THE RESEARCH CENTER FOR ARTS AND CULTURE

The Research Center for Arts and Culture has the following reports available for purchase. Please contact the Research Center for prices.

Information on Artists II (1998) Report Series:
- Abstract
- Actors' Equity
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis/St. Paul
- New York
- San Francisco
- Racial Report

Information on Artists (1988) Report Series:
- Executive Summary
- Actors' Equity
- Boston
- Cape Cod
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Los Angeles
- Minneapolis/St. Paul
- New York City
- Philadelphia
- San Francisco
- Western Massachusetts

Information on Artists Database Services:
The Research Center for Arts and Culture can do customized searches and reports of the Information on Artists databases. Information is available in hard copy or on computer disk.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS


Available from Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc. 88 Post Road West, P.O. Box 5007, Westport, CT 06881. Tel. (203) 226-3571.

ISBN: 0-313-29097-0

ISBN: 0-313-27993-4

ISBN: 0-313-28915-8