

**Summary of
*Arts Collaboratory Baseline Study 2008***

by Iberia Pérez

**Arts Collaboratory
HIVOS
DOEN Foundation**

April – July 2009

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Purpose of Study	1
1.1. <i>Population</i>	1
1.2. <i>Geography</i>	1
1.3. <i>History of Study</i>	1
1.4. <i>Language</i>	1
1.5. <i>Survey Time Frame</i>	2
2. Conclusions and Suggestions	3
APPENDIX	8
Survey Findings: Quantitative & Qualitative Questions	8
Basic Information	8
Quality of Artistic Expression	8
Artist/Public Interactions & Social Embedding	11
Intercultural Exchange	13
Cultural Infrastructure	15

1. Introduction and Purpose of Study

Arts Collaboratory (AC) has been providing financial support, facilitating knowledge sharing, and promoting networking and intercultural exchange amongst visual artists-led initiatives in Africa, Asia and Latin America since January 2007. In order to continue their mission of encouraging artistic innovation of outstanding quality, Arts Collaboratory conducted a baseline study to gain insight into the success of its partner artist-led initiatives in contributing to AC's four key objectives in the year 2008. The data obtained through this study, which is expected to be conducted annually, will be used as a basis for comparison against survey results in the coming years. Aside of monitoring the progress and variations in the accomplishments of its partner organizations, this study is intended to serve as learning tool for improving Arts Collaboratory's programme and policies. More specifically, the collected information is intended to serve the following purposes:

- Improving Arts Collaboratory's policies and program development, as well as support to partners
- Improving partner practices, by using it in advice, feedback and capacity development of partners
- Knowledge building and knowledge sharing about effective strategies
- Providing accountability to funders and other stakeholders
- Lobbying and advocacy
- Fundraising for continued financing of Arts Collaboratory

The *Arts Collaboratory Baseline Study 2008* (from hereon referred to as *ACBS 2008*) was conducted by independent researcher, Iberia Pérez, who was introduced to Arts Collaboratory by Gertrude Flentge from DOEN Foundation and Edith Rijnja from the Rijksakademie in Amsterdam. Ms Pérez was appointed to coordinate this study because of her vast research experience regarding the phenomenon of artist-run initiatives in "developing" countries.

All the information gathered in the *ACBS 2008* and provided in this document is meant for the exclusive use of Arts Collaboratory. In order to maintain consistency with Arts Collaboratory's privacy policy, the information provided by the participating initiatives in the survey have been treated with strict confidentiality throughout the survey process and shall remain confidential thereafter. Accordingly, the names of the participating artists' initiatives and their respondents will remain anonymous in any document that is publicly distributed after the study has concluded.

1.1. Population

The target population of the *Arts Collaboratory Baseline Study 2008* was the 22 partners that were supported by Arts Collaboratory during 2008. Out of the 22 AC partners that were active in 2008 a total of 18 participated in the study. These 18 initiatives thus constitute the sample of the *ACBS 2008*.

1.2. Geography

From the initiatives that participated in the *ACBS 2008*, seven (7) are based in Africa, five (5) in Asia and five (5) in Latin America.

1.3. History of Study

The *ACBS 2008* serves as a pilot study to gather basic information on the situation of AC partner initiatives during their first year under the support of Arts Collaboratory in 2008.

1.4. Language

Since the *ACBS 2008* was directed to participants from different regions in the world, the survey was designed in English and requested to be responded in English. However, respondents from Spanish-speaking countries were encouraged to answer in Spanish as an incentive to motivate their participation in the study.

1.5. Survey Time Frame

The *ACBS 2008* was conducted during April and July 2009. This time-period included survey design, response period/collection period, survey analysis, as well as the writing of the final report plus submission of findings to participating initiatives.

2. Conclusions and Suggestions

The following are the survey conclusions based on Arts Collaboratory's four-fold objectives and corresponding indicators. In overall, the results obtained from the web-based *Arts Collaboratory Baseline Study* seem to suggest that AC had a positive effect in the development and operation of its partner initiatives in 2008 since most of the results were positive in relation to AC objectives. According to the survey findings, the performance of the participating initiatives was stronger in areas such as: improvement of artistic quality and innovation, broadening audiences, promotion of meaningful intercultural South-South exchanges, and development of cultural infrastructure. The weakest aspects of the initiatives in 2008 were: knowledge-sharing, audience diversification and interaction with minority groups, South-North exchanges and interactions, financial sustainability, and arts management capacities. Thus, the weakest areas would need to be strengthened to improve the performance of the initiatives in the future. Accordingly, some suggestions have been made where response percentages were negative or not too strong.

1. Quality of Artistic Expression

1.1 The *Arts Collaboratory Baseline Study* demonstrates that the artist-led initiatives supported by AC in 2008 are in general contributing to the improvement of the quality of artistic expression by developing different methods for diversifying the parameters of legitimation that define quality in their given contexts. That is, the majority of the participating artists' initiatives developed a wide variety of activities in 2008 which aimed at fostering critical or alternative approaches to traditional art production and presentation. According to survey data, the most common methods were: (1) organization of workshops and trainings, (2) organization of debates, talks, symposia, lectures, etc. (3) organization of public art events, (4) promotion of institutional collaborations and the (5) curation of independent exhibitions.

1.2 The results of the study demonstrate that in 2008 the majority of the participating initiatives were engaged in a wide exchange of information not only locally but also at regional and international levels. Thus, their efforts in improving the quality of artistic expression can also be attested by the initiatives' active participation in both circulation and collection of information and bibliography about contemporary art and related knowledge, which most of the time happened through: virtual/web-based exchange, collection of written and audiovisual material and networking.

However, despite their active involvement in knowledge sharing it would seem that the sharing of information most often took place within each initiative's particular networks rather than among the AC partners/network. According to survey data, the sharing of publications amongst AC partners turned out to be quite low, as only 33% of the participating initiatives *did share* their publications with other AC partners in 2008. Therefore, although many of the participating initiatives (14 out of 18, 78%) did have some kind of contact with other AC partners, it seems that this contact was limited. From the information obtained in the survey, the possible reasons that might explain the limited information sharing among AC partners were: (1) a considerable lack of communication among AC partner initiatives and (2) lack of easy and affordable means of distribution of information.

Taking this into consideration, Arts Collaboratory should function as a stronger liaison/intermediary between its partner initiatives in the coming years. This goal could be met by actively stimulating and facilitating communication amongst its partners. Perhaps AC could evaluate if its website (forum and blog) is being an effective tool and if it is having an active role in stimulating and facilitating discussion and communication among its partner initiatives. Further, one option AC could explore in order to play a more significant role in terms of functioning as a liaison among its partners could be to subscribe to a web-based application that can function as a "virtual hub" for AC and its partner initiatives. That is, online platforms such as "drop.io", "box.net", "onehub.com" are simple, private and highly accessible applications AC could use to facilitate file sharing and real-time collaboration in an organized and inexpensive manner since most of the time these applications are available free of charge. One of the benefits of this online application is that it could function as an interactive informational/archival tool to facilitate knowledge sharing, dissemination of information and collaboration among AC partners. These type of applications would allow AC to upload

information that can be easily retrieved by other AC partners at any moment but also the partner initiatives can have an active role in this knowledge sharing as they can also upload relevant information into the web that can be accessed by any partner at any time without incurring in expensive mailing or courier costs.

1.3 In 2008, AC partner initiatives contributed to the improvement of quality of artistic expression in their local contexts by promoting innovation and experimentation in the visual arts through trainings and workshops, as well as through audiovisual presentations and exhibitions. As the ACBS findings show, more than half of the participating initiatives (67%) were actively engaged in artistic experimentation with new techniques and materials, mainly: (1) audiovisual media like video art or film, (2) installation, (3) new media art and (4) web-based projects/communication.

1.4 Another strategy used by the participating initiatives in 2008 to improve the quality of artistic expression in their local contexts was by challenging and/or re-defining the contents and meanings around contemporary artistic practices. According to the survey results, ALL of the participating initiatives in 2008 challenged existing contents around visual arts practice through a variety of methods like: fostering discussion and debates (33%), (inter)national exchanges (28%), and critical approaches to art practice and production (22%), among others. From the survey results, it is notorious however that the response percentages are quite low which would indicate that there were a variety of strategies used but none of them was predominant. In this case it would be advisable to examine more thoroughly the effectiveness and potential of the reported strategies so AC and its partners can promote the most efficient ones as best practices among its partners and related organizations.

1.5 For most of initiatives that collaborated with AC in the past year art research played a significant role in the development of their artistic practice. By promoting critical debate of ideas and values concerning artistic practice mainly amongst the artistic community and the community in general, the AC partners seem to be setting positive examples in their local contexts and encouraging other artists to engage in artistic experimentation.

2. Artist/Public Interactions & Social Embedding

2.1 As the survey results demonstrate, the participating artist-led initiatives developed a variety of strategies to increase and diversify their audiences in 2008. They did so mainly by relying on means that allowed for broad and easy circulation and access like websites and newspapers although the development of community based or outreach programs was also a common strategy among AC partners for mediating art within the community. During this year, the participating initiatives reached a total of 26, 890 beneficiaries, although in more than half of the cases, the total of beneficiaries was below 800.

A regional analysis on the responses demonstrated that the region with the MOST beneficiaries in 2008 was Latin America with a total of 14,390 beneficiaries. Asia followed with a total of 7,450 beneficiaries and, lastly, Africa with 4,750 was the region with the LEAST beneficiaries. Taking these findings into consideration, it seems that although the initiatives did develop strategies to increase their audiences in 2008, in regions like Africa and Asia the total of audience reached was quite low in comparison with Latin America which accounted for more than half of the total beneficiaries of the participating AC partners in 2008. Thus, AC could encourage its partner initiatives, especially in Africa and Asia, to make greater efforts in increasing their audiences in the coming years perhaps by relying on more diverse methods than newspapers and their own organizations' website.

2.2 Further, the results of the study show that in most of the cases the AC partner initiatives were *not at all* or *slightly vulnerable* to censorship/self-censorship and external conditionings. Some of the most common strategies used by the artists' initiatives that do experience some kind of censorship/self-censorship were: (1) encouraging open dialogue and discussion about sensitive or relevant issues and (2) by providing platforms or spaces where artists can engage freely and without restraints in art production and research on contemporary art and its contexts.

A more detailed analysis of the results by region show that the geographical area that was most vulnerable to censorship/self-censorship in 2008 was Asia with 5 out of 5 initiatives (100%) being vulnerable or slightly vulnerable. Following, was Latin America with 3 out of 5

initiatives (60%) being either vulnerable or slightly vulnerable. And lastly, the least vulnerable of all geographical regions was Africa with 3 out of 7 (43%) initiatives being vulnerable or slightly vulnerable.

Within the art world, the extent to which developments in contemporary art are dependent on politics at large is often underestimated. The fact that 39% of the participating initiatives reported to be vulnerable to censorship/self-censorship, suggests that this is an area that needs to be further explored and discussed within the AC network since censorships and cultural restraints could directly influence the capacity of artists' initiatives in having a greater impact in their socio-cultural contexts. Hence, it would seem important in the coming years to promote and directly engage the AC partners and members in discussions or debates regarding this issue. This way, the initiatives could benefit from openly addressing this topic with others that might be in the same or similar situation while enabling them to deal with many restraints and repressions that usually exist in the collective memory of the people.

2.3 There are concrete indications in the *ACBS* that the AC partners are promoting interaction and participation between the visual artists and their communities, however, as the study shows little more than 50% of the participating initiatives engaged "very often" or "often" in activities and/or projects to revitalize the cultural practices of minority or marginalized groups in 2008. A region-based analysis of the responses indicates that initiatives located in Africa were the most commonly to engage in activities with minority or marginalized groups. Following, the initiatives from Asia engaged "often" or "occasionally". And lastly, the initiatives based in Latin America were the least engaged in activities to revitalize the cultural practices of social minorities in the past year, a fact that seems most contradictory considering that Latin America was the region with the highest beneficiaries.

Accordingly, it seems that AC partner initiatives need to diversify their audiences even more. In particular they would need to improve their social impact among minority groups, especially the ones operating in Latin America. Despite recent claims, high poverty levels and harsh socio-cultural conditions are still a reality for most Latin American countries today.¹ Consequently, it would seem relevant that AC partner initiatives seek for ways of legitimizing artistic thought and practice outside the social circles of the art world and into wider social and political spheres. In this regards, AC should foster more discussion and encourage the initiatives to develop more activities and projects that involve social outreach and that can have greater impact on local minority groups.

2.4 When asked about whether or not the initiatives worked with other societal groups besides artists in 2008, the majority of the initiatives responded positively encouraging collaborations, mainly, between artists and different community members and organizations and also with students and other academic and cultural professionals. Furthermore, the majority of the initiatives engaged a broad scale of media, activating a process of cross-fertilization between visual arts and other cultural fields. Notwithstanding, it is notorious that the percentages of the responses were quite low, thus reporting no dominant pattern in this regard. The results suggest that this is an area that needs to be further explored and developed by the initiatives in order to be able to go beyond the confines of the field of the visual arts and thus reach wider audiences. It would be recommended to do further examination of the degree of success of these strategies and their outcomes in reaching wider audiences.

3. Intercultural Exchange

3.1 / 3.2 As the *ACBS* findings suggest all AC partner initiatives were active in the promotion of intercultural exchange during the past year. In fact, intercultural exchange seem to have played a fundamental role for most of the participating artist-led organizations as 72% reported that this kind of exchange was "highly meaningful" for the development of their organizations and artistic practices. Further, as the study suggests, it provided almost all of the participating initiatives the possibility to share and deepen the debate of ideas and values of contemporary visual arts practice. Among other reasons, these exchanges were important for the initiatives because (1) they allowed the artists the possibility of engaging in subsequent

¹ For further information on this topic, see for example: Guillermo E. Perry, J. Humberto Lopez, William F. Maloney, Omar Arias, and Luis Servén, "Poverty Reduction and Growth: Virtuous and Vicious Circle", World Bank Report, 2006.

collaborations through projects, exhibitions, residencies etc., (2) provided them the opportunity of widening their artistic networks and (3) facilitated discussions and exchange of ideas thus allowing for the kind of knowledge sharing that is fundamental to contemporary artistic research and production.

3.3 The study showed that local exchange was the most often exchange promoted by the organizations while the international South-North exchange took place less often for the participating initiatives in 2008. Overall, the study reveals that intercultural exchanges took place most commonly in the South, and between South/South axes. Consequently, this fact indicates that the South-North exchange, and for instance between the Netherlands and these regions (Africa, Asia and Latin America), needs to be further stimulated by AC and its partner initiatives. In the future, AC could encourage and promote more exhibitions, residencies or collaborative projects to be developed between the Netherlands and the South or more generally among South-North axes.

3.4 Furthermore the results of the ACBS show that many of the participating initiatives (72%) engaged with other AC partners in 2008 mainly through virtual exchange and face-to-face contact. Still, it is clear that artistic interaction and effective communication among AC partners needs to be further encouraged, strengthened and diversified. AC could help improve this interaction by encouraging the initiatives to engage more often in physical encounters like for instance conferences, meetings, residencies, exhibitions or collaborative projects. Although physical contact usually has more immediate effects, these contacts may be limited considering the financial resources and often complex logistic processes they require.

On the other hand, one possible approach by virtual means could be that AC request greater participation from its partners in the discussion forums available in their webpage (www.artscollaboratory.org). This could be done perhaps by re-designing their blogs and web forum in a more inviting and interactive way. Furthermore, AC could try to instigate a more active approach to the proposed ongoing theme of "re-writing art history" since so far it seems that the discussion has been limited to only a few interested partners. In my view, this is a topic that pertains every AC partner organization as they are operating in contexts where culture and particularly the visual arts have and still play a marginalized role. Thus, it would be important to know their comments about "re-writing art history" and try to have a more active discussion on how this can be done through praxis. Another possible approach by virtual means could be to use virtual applications like the one proposed in Section 1.2. This type of "virtual hub" can be used not only as file sharing device but also as a platform for real-time communication (chatting, etc.) among the AC coordinators and its partner initiatives. Stimulating effective communication, either physically or virtually, seems important as it would be the first logical step towards building relations and strengthening interactions among AC network.

4. Cultural Infrastructure

4.1 According to the results of the study, there are strong indications that the AC partner initiatives contributed to the development of infrastructure in their local cultural contexts in 2008. They did so through a wide variety of strategies, the most common being: (1) facilitating trainings/workshops, (2) developing/strengthening networks, (3) providing art spaces and (4) arranging living/studio space for visiting artists.

Moreover, according to the ACBS findings, most of the initiatives did develop strategies to diversify or increase their funding sources, namely: (1) by approaching or establishing new partnerships or alliances with either corporations, private sector or local institutions and government, (2) by developing a variety of self-finance fundraising strategies, (3) by hiring employees or specialists to focus on finances/fundraising (4 out of 16, 25%) and by (4) developing or participating within international/national networks and exchanges.

In spite of these efforts, as the results clearly indicate, in 2008 "Arts Collaboratory..." was the main subsidizing body of most of the participating artist' initiatives contributing an average of 56% of the funding sources, followed by "Other donors" who contributed with an average of 34% of the funding sources.

Among the three main regions supported by AC, Latin America received the highest percentage of funding from AC and according to the results was less likely to develop self-funding strategies in comparison with Asia and Africa. In the latter regions, although AC

accounted for most of their funding sources, they also obtained great part of their funds by developing self-funding strategies plus “other donors” also provided for a high percentage of their funding sources.

As such, all of the participating initiatives were highly dependent on external financial resources for their sustainability and operation. Furthermore, most of the initiatives in these regions need to establish partnerships with international funding agencies and rely on their financial support to be able to operate in their local communities. Taking this into consideration, more efforts would need to be made in the future to encourage greater independency with regards to external/international financial resources and to help AC partners to develop more creative approaches that will allow them to locate subsidies through either self-funding strategies or other local private or public sources. Also, it would be interesting to do further explorations on which are the most effective strategies for fundraising, discuss the results and share them among all AC partners. This would be of most importance especially for artists’ initiatives that are in a primary or even intermediate developmental stage. In these cases, AC could encourage the initiatives to promote trainings or workshops to further develop the fundraising capacities of the artists’ initiatives so they can diversify and increase their sources of funding and in this way reach greater sustainability in the future.

4.2 The results show that most of the participating initiatives developed strategies to improve the arts management capacities of their organization in 2008. However, the efficiency and/or success of these strategies can not be assessed since this aspect was out of the scope of the present study.

Albeit the initiatives’ efforts in developing strategies to improve the management skills of the artists, the response percentages related to this question were quite low, accounting for less than 43% of the sample. The most frequent method used to improve the artists’ management capacities was trainings and workshops, however, only 6 out of 18 initiatives promoted these trainings/workshops. It is clear from these results, not only that there is still much room for improvement in this area but that its importance needs to be further encouraged among AC partners from all regions. AC could endorse this importance by playing a stronger role in the strengthening of their partners’ management capacities. More trainings and workshops would need to be organized and developed for every partner initiative in areas like cultural management, curatorial strategies, fundraising, ICT, and other related fields if these initiatives are to become sustainable long-term propositions within their local cultural contexts. I suggest that reports be written on these workshops so AC can evaluate their efficacy and so the outcomes can be subsequently shared among all partners. Different set of strategies could also be facilitated taking into account the particular needs and developmental stages of each partner organization.

4.3 According to ACBS findings, all of the participating initiatives developed strategies to foster horizontal cooperation in 2008. From the variety of strategies employed, the most common were: (1) collaborative projects, (2) networks, (3) workshops/trainings and (4) publications. This collaborative spirit and interest in more anti-hierarchical working schemes need to be continuously promoted to facilitate receptivity and open interaction among the AC independently run visual arts organizations. In so doing, the AC partner initiatives will be able to create/sustain more appropriate conditions for sharing values and ambitions regarding contemporary artistic practices in their respective cultural contexts and within other frames of reference.

4.4 The study demonstrated that more than half of the participating initiatives did improve their technical facilities for communicating globally in 2008. However, 6 out of the 18 (33%) participating initiatives responded they “did not improved” their technical facilities. Thus, in order to ensure an improvement in the operations and global communication of these organizations in the coming years, AC could further explore why these six initiatives were not able to improve their technical facilities and ICT knowledge in 2008 by inquiring about their needs regarding technical facilities and ICT and exploring whether or not these needs can be met and how they could go about this.

4.5 The study shows that all of the participating initiatives were actively engaged in diversifying and improving the channels of distribution of artworks, projects and ideas through a wide variety of strategies of which the most common were: (1) newspapers/magazines, (2) mailing lists/email, (3) web presence, (4) their own exhibition space and (5) radio.

APPENDIX

Survey Findings: Quantitative & Qualitative Questions²

Basic Information

Q1 Name of Partner Initiative

Not Applicable

Q2 Name and Position of Respondent

Not Applicable

Quality of Artistic Expression

Q3 What kind of activities did your organization develop in 2008 to foster CRITICAL/ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES to art production and presentation in your local context? Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey responses, the initiatives fostered critical or alternative approaches to art production and presentation in their local contexts in 2008 mainly through:

- (1) organization of workshops and trainings (16 out of 18, 88.9%)*
- (2) organization of debates, artists' talks, lectures, symposia, and conferences (15 out of 18, 83.3%)*
- (3) organization of public art events (15 out of 18, 83.3%)*
- (4) promotion of institutional collaborations (14 out of 18, 77.8%) and*
- (5) curating independent exhibitions (14 out of 18, 77.8%).*

Q4 Did your organization COLLECT or NOT COLLECT information about contemporary art and related knowledge in 2008?

According to survey data, 17 out of the 18 participating initiatives (94.4%) "DID collect" information about contemporary art and related knowledge in 2008.

From the 17 participating organizations that did collect information about contemporary art, 15 (88%) mentioned the methods they used. According to data, the most frequent methods for collecting information were:

- (1) web-based research and exchange (10 out of 15, 67%)*
- (2) collection of documentation (both written and audiovisual) and keeping libraries/archives (9 out of 15, 60%) and*
- (3) networking by establishing contact and communication with other artists as well as curators, critics, and other cultural practitioners. (7 out of 15, 47%)*

Q5 If you answered "our organization DID NOT collect" to the previous question, please write 'not applicable' in comment box below and continue with next question. If you answered "our organization DID collect" to the previous question, please indicate the GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE of the information you collected in 2008 regarding contemporary art and related knowledge. Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, 14 out of 18 (78%) participating initiatives indicated the geographical scope of their collection of information about contemporary art and related

² This summary of findings is based on the quantitative and qualitative data gathered in the ACBS 2008. Depending on the question, the summary considers the 3 or 4 main points in each question (categories with the highest response percentage) as primary results, or the answers with more than 60% response percentage. Responses from the "comments" sections in each question are discussed only if they provide additional and relevant information; otherwise, they were omitted from this summary.

knowledge in 2008. This 78% of the participating initiatives collected locally, regionally, and internationally to the same extent.

Q6 Did your organization CIRCULATE or NOT CIRCULATE information about contemporary art and related knowledge in 2008?

According to survey data, 17 out of 18 participating initiatives (94.4%) "DID circulate" information about contemporary art and related knowledge in 2008.

Out of the 17, 15 initiatives indicated which methods they used for circulating information on contemporary art in 2008. According to data, the most common methods for circulating information were:

- (1) publications (10 out of 15, 67%)
- (2) web-based media (7 out of 15, 47%)
- (3) artistic/cultural events -i.e. seminars discussions, talks, conferences and presentations- (6 out of 15, 40%), and
- (4) conversations/meetings with artists and other industry agents (5 out of 15, 33%).

Q7 If you answered "our organization DID NOT circulate" to the previous question, write 'not applicable' in comment box below and continue with next question. If you answered "our organization DID circulate" to the previous question, please indicate the GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE of the information you circulated in 2008 regarding contemporary art and related knowledge. Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, 17 out of 18 participating initiatives indicated that the geographical scope of their circulation of information about contemporary art and related knowledge in 2008 mainly took place locally (94.4%), while 15 out of 18 circulated to the same extent both regionally (83.3%) and internationally (83.3%).

Q8 Did your organization SHARE or NOT SHARE publications with other Arts Collaboratory partners in 2008?

According to survey data, 12 out of 18 participating artist-run initiatives (66.7%) "DID NOT share" publications with other Arts Collaboratory partners in 2008.

Out of the 6 initiatives (33%) that did share publications with other AC partners in 2008, only 4 mentioned with how many. Taking into account these 4 responses, it could be mentioned that the initiatives did share their publications with an average of 4.5 AC partners.

Q9 What kind of obstacles, if any, did you face in sharing your publications with other Arts Collaboratory partners in 2008?

Out of the 17 initiatives that answered this question, 14 (82%) reported to have experienced difficulties in sharing their publications with other AC partners in 2008. According to survey data, some of the most common obstacles for sharing publications amongst AC organizations were:

- (1) lack of communication and contact between initiatives (7 out of 14, 50%)
- (2) lack of easy and affordable means of distribution of information (6 out of 14, 43%)

Q10 Indicate the type(s) of NEW TECHNIQUES and MATERIALS you promoted/stimulated in 2008 among the artistic community related to your organization. If this question does not apply to your situation, please write 'not applicable' in the box below and continue with next question.

According to survey data, 12 of the 18 (67%) initiatives reported to have promoted new techniques/materials in 2008. Among the most common techniques fostered were:

- (1) audiovisual media like video art or film (7 out of 12, 58%)

- (2) installation (4 out of 12, 33%)
- (3) new media (3 out of 12, 25%) and
- (4) web-based projects and communication (4 out of 12, 33%).

Q11 In 2008, your organization fostered EXPERIMENTATION with new techniques and materials through: Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, in 2008 the participating initiatives fostered experimentation with new techniques and materials mainly through:

- (1) workshops and trainings (13 out of 18, 72.2%)
- (2) audio visual presentations (13 out of 18, 72.2%) and
- (3) exhibitions (11 out of 18, 61.1%)

Q12 Which strategies did your organization develop in 2008 to CHALLENGE and/or REDEFINE the contents and meanings around contemporary artistic practices?

All of the participating initiatives (100%) developed strategies to challenge or re-define the contents and meanings of contemporary artistic practice in 2008. According to survey data, some of the most common strategies used by the participating initiatives in 2008 were:

- (1) discussions, debates, lectures and theoretical workshops (6 out of 18, 33%),
- (2) (inter)national exchanges like artist in residency programs and art networks (5 out of 18, 28%), and
- (3) assuming a more critical stance towards artistic practices (4 out of 18, 22%).

Q13 Please give a concrete example of how your organization motivated (directly or indirectly) other artists to engage in artistic experimentation in 2008. If this question does not apply to your situation, please write 'not applicable' in the box below and continue with next question.

According to survey data, in 2008, 17 out of the 18 (94%) participating initiatives motivated (directly or indirectly) other artists to engage in artistic experimentation through their art programs and projects in general. Of these programs/projects the most common were:

- (1) workshop programs (10 out of 17, 59%)
- (2) information/knowledge exchange activities -i.e. seminars, talks, debates, discussions- (6 out of 17, 35%)
- (3) artist-in-residence programs (5 out of 17, 29%)
- (4) collaboration-based projects (5 out of 17, 29%)
- (5) art research (4 out of 17, 24%)
- (6) and exhibitions (4 out of 17, 24%).

Q14 How important was ART RESEARCH in artistic practice for your organization in 2008?

According to survey data, for 12 out of 18 (66.7%) of the participating initiatives art research was "very important" for their artistic practice in 2008.

Q15 Did your organization PROMOTE or NOT PROMOTE critical debate of ideas and values concerning artistic language and practice in 2008?

According to survey data, ALL of the participating initiatives (100%) notified that they "DID promote" critical debate of ideas and values concerning artistic language and practice in 2008.

Out of 18 initiatives that promoted critical debate of ideas and values of artistic practice in 2008, 15 commented on this question. Out of the 15:

- 13 (87%) promoted critical debate within the artistic community
- 9 (60%) within the community or general public
- 8 (53%) within educational and academic circles and
- 6 (40%) with members of the arts/cultural industry such as: critics, curators, cultural managers, gallerists, etc.

Artist/Public Interactions & Social Embedding

Q16 Which strategies did you use to INCREASE and DIVERSIFY your AUDIENCE in 2008? Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, some of the most frequent strategies used by the participating artists' initiatives to increase and diversify their audience in 2008 were:

- (1) webpage (16 out of 18, 88.9%)
- (2) newspapers (14 out of 18, 77.8%)
- (3) community based art/outreach programs (12 out of 18, 66.7%)

Q17 Please indicate the approximate number of direct BENEFICIARIES of your programmes and activities in 2008.

According to survey data, the direct beneficiaries of the participating artists' initiatives totaled 26,890 in 2008. These beneficiaries ranged between 100 and 6000, with an average number of 1,494 direct beneficiaries.

An analysis by region demonstrated that the region with the MOST beneficiaries in 2008 was Latin America with a total of 14,390 beneficiaries. Following was Asia with a total of 7,450, and lastly the region with the LEAST beneficiaries was Africa with a total of 4,750 beneficiaries in 2008.

Q18 Please indicate how vulnerable artists were to SELF-CENSORSHIP and CENSORSHIP in your local context in 2008.

According to survey data, 11 out of 18 participating initiatives (61%, around 2 thirds) reported to be either "not at all vulnerable" (39%) or "slightly vulnerable" (28%). On the other hand, 7 initiatives, around one third (39%), reported to be "vulnerable", while none (0%) of the initiatives reported to be "extremely vulnerable" to self-censorship or censorship in their local contexts.

Out of the 8 comments provided to this question, the most common were:

- the need to be cautious (38%) and
- the difficulty of presenting art in the public sphere (25%).

(Q18.1) An analysis of this question by region demonstrated that the region that is MOST vulnerable to censorship and/or self-censorship in 2008 was Asia with 5 out of 5 initiatives (100%) being vulnerable or slightly vulnerable. Following, was Latin America with 3 out of 5 initiatives (60%) being either vulnerable or slightly vulnerable. And lastly, the LEAST vulnerable of all geographical regions was Africa with 3 out of 7 initiatives (43%) being vulnerable or slightly vulnerable.

Q19 Please indicate which STRATEGIES your organization used in 2008 to build the capacities of artists to deal with issues of self-censorship and censorship in your working context. If this question does not apply to your situation, please write 'not applicable' in the box below and continue with next question.

Out of the 18 participating initiatives, only 7 (39%) responded to this question. According to data, some of the most common strategies used to build the capacities of artists who do experience certain degrees of censorship or self-censorship were:

- (1) by encouraging open dialogue and discussion about sensitive or relevant issues, conflicts and contents either through peer-to-peer conversations or publications (6 out of 7, 86%) and
- (2) by providing platforms or spaces where the artists can engage freely and without restrictions (5 out of 7, 71%).

Q20 How often did your organization engage in artworks or projects to REVITALIZE CULTURAL PRACTICES of minority or marginalized groups in 2008?

According to survey data, more than 50% of the participating initiatives reported to have revitalized cultural practices of minority or marginalized groups in 2008 either "very often" (22.2%) or "often" (33.3%).

Out of the 18 initiatives, 10 (56%) provided comments to this question. Some examples of how the participating initiatives engaged in the revitalization of cultural practices of minority groups in 2008 were:

- (1) by promoting, encouraging or developing strategies directed towards arts education of school children or children from disadvantaged neighborhoods and marginal areas (5 out of 10, 50%)
- (2) by developing or being involved in socially-engaged or community-based arts projects and events (4 out of 10, 40%) and
- (3) by promoting and encouraging the development of women's artistic practice (2 out of 10, 20%).

(Q20.1) A geography-based analysis of the responses indicates that initiatives located in Africa were the most commonly to engage in activities with minority or marginalized groups as 6 out of 7 (86%) engaged either "very often" or "often". Following are the initiatives from Asia with 3 out of 5 (60%) engaging "often". And lastly, according to the findings, the initiatives based in Latin America were the least engaged in activities to revitalize the cultural practices of social minorities in the past year as 4 out of 5 (80%) engaged either "occasionally" or "rarely".

Q21 Did your organization WORK or NOT WORK with other societal groups besides artists in 2008?

According to survey data, 12 out of 18 participating initiatives (66.7%) reported they "DID work" with other societal groups besides artists in 2008.

Out of the 12 initiatives that did work with other societal groups besides artists in 2008, 11 provided comments to this question. According to survey data, some of the most common groups targeted were:

- (1) the community in general either through outreach programs, community-based art projects or different organizations with communitarian/cultural focus (5 out of 11, 45%) and
- (2) school children and youth from disadvantaged neighborhoods or backgrounds (5 out of 11, 45%).

Q22 Did your organization RELY or NOT RELY on interdisciplinary approaches (i.e not only using art/artists) to relate to other societal groups in 2008?

According to survey data, 12 out of 18 participating initiatives (66.7%) reported they "DID rely" on interdisciplinary approaches to relate to other societal groups in 2008.

Out of the 12 participating initiatives that did rely on interdisciplinary approaches to relate to society in 2008, 10 (83%) provided examples on how they did so. Depending on the projects, artists relied on interdisciplinary approaches by collaborating with many non-artists and people from a wide variety of fields. According to survey data, some of the most common (although not very strong) were:

- (1) collaborations with different members of the community (village leaders, bicycle communities) or community workers (30%) and
- (2) collaborations with professionals from the field of Humanities -like writers/literature, dancers, history- (30%).

Intercultural Exchange

Q23 Which strategies did you use to promote INTERCULTURAL EXCHANGE in 2008?

According to survey data, all participating artists' initiatives promoted intercultural exchange in 2008. The most frequent strategies for this exchange were:

- (1) workshops (15 out of 18, 83.3%)
- (2) artist-in-residence programs (12 out of 18, 66.7%)
- (3) collaborative projects (11 out of 18, 61.1%) and
- (4) symposia, conferences, lectures, seminars (10 out of 18, 56%)

Q24 Please rank the following items from 1 to 4 according to which type of intercultural exchange took place most often within your organization in 2008. Place 1 next to the item that took place MOST often, and place 4 next to the item that took place the LEAST. (Please do not repeat numbers!)

According to survey data, the ranking combination that took place the most (7 out of 18, 39%) was (1) Local exchange, (2) Regional Exchange, (3) International South-South, (4) International South-North.

- In 12 out of 18 cases (67%), the local exchange (rank 1) was reported to be the most often form of exchange.
- In 11 out of 18 cases (61%), the international South-North exchange (rank 4) was the least often form of exchange.

Q25 In which ways did your organization ENGAGE with other partner(s) from the Arts Collaboratory network/forum in 2008? Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, 14 of the 18 participating initiatives (78%) engaged somehow with other Arts Collaboratory partners in 2008. This exchange took place mainly through:

- (1) virtual exchange (11 out of 18, 61.1%) and
- (2) face-to-face exchange (8 out of 18, 44.4%).

Q26 How MEANINGFUL was intercultural exchange for your organization in 2008?

According to survey data, 13 out of 18, 72.2 % of the participating initiatives reported that intercultural exchange was "highly meaningful" for their organization in 2008.

Out of the 17 initiatives (94%) that responded that intercultural exchange was highly meaningful/meaningful, 7 (41%) provided related comments mainly attesting to the reasons why it is important for the organizations. According to survey data, some of these reasons are:

- (1) because it allows for different perspectives/ideologies to encounter that can stimulate confrontation and reflection and thus being a meaningful learning experience (3 out of 7, 43%) and
- (2) precisely because of the culture awareness it facilitates and implies (2 out of 7, 29%).

Q27 Please mention the most significant OUTCOME that resulted from your intercultural exchange with other organizations in 2008.

According to survey data, some of the most common significant outcomes resulting from intercultural exchange with other organizations in 2008 were:

- (1) the possibilities it entailed for future or continued exchange and collaborations either through projects, residencies, conferences, exhibitions, etc. (8 out of 18, 44%)
- (2) the opportunity of meeting other artists and being able to create, further develop or widening of their artistic networks (7 out of 18, 39%), and
- (3) the knowledge that is produced or that can be shared with other artists/organizations (7 out of 18, 39%).

Furthermore, to a lesser extent, several initiatives considered as most significant outcome of the intercultural exchange:

- the cultural awareness that arises out of these interactions (3 out of 18, 17%) and
- the opportunity to reach wider publics (3 out of 18, 39%).

Q28 Did your organization SHARE or NOT SHARE ideas and values of artistic practice as a result of intercultural exchange in 2008?

According to survey data, 17 out of 18 participating initiatives (94.4%) reported that they "DID share" ideas and values of artistic practice as a result of intercultural exchange in 2008.

Out of 17 initiatives that did share ideas and values of artistic practice as a result of intercultural exchange in 2008, 14 (82%) provided comments on how they went about this. According to survey data, the sharing of ideas and values of artistic practice took place mainly through:

- (1) discussions and exchange of ideas through discussions, meetings, conferences, seminar, etc. (6 out of 14, 43%)
- (2) art practice/ production and exhibitions (5 out of 14, 36%)
- (3) publications (4 out of 14, 29%)
- (4) residencies (29%), and
- (5) networks (29%)

Cultural Infrastructure

Q29 How did your organization contribute to the LOCAL CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE in 2008? Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, ALL of the participating initiatives contributed to the cultural infrastructure of their local context in 2008. This contribution took place mainly through:

- (1) trainings/workshops (16 out of 18, 88.9%)*
- (2) networks (16 out of 18, 88.9%)*
- (3) art space (14 out of 18, 77.8%) and by*
- (4) providing studios/living space for visiting artists (13 out of 18, 72.2%).*

Q30 Please indicate the PERCENTAGE amount of contribution of your FUNDING SOURCES in 2008.

According to the survey data, in 2008:

- 17 out of 18 (94%) participating initiatives received an average of 56% of their funding from "Arts Collaboratory/Hivos/Doen/Mondriaan"*
- 14 out of 18 (78%), received an average of 11% of their funding from "own/self-funding"*
- 12 out of 18 (67%) received an average of 34% of their funding from "other donors", and*
- 12 out of 18 (67%) received an average of 8% of their funding from the "private sector"*

Therefore, the two most significant funding sources for the participating initiatives in 2008 were:

- "Arts Collaboratory/Hivos/Doen/Mondriaan" (56%)*
- "Other Donors" (34%).*

Seen by region:

- In Latin America 5 out of 5 initiatives received their funding from AC (67%) and the private sector (10%).*
- In Asia, 5 out of 5 initiatives receive their funding from AC (61%), other donors (22%) and self-funding (10%).*
- While in Africa, 6 out of 7 initiatives (86%) received their funding from AC (50%) and self-funding (12%), although it is notorious that 4 out of 7 (57%) of the participating initiatives received more than half of their funding from "other donors" (52%).*

Q31 Which strategies, if any, did you employ in 2008 to DIVERSIFY and/or INCREASE your funding sources?

Out of the 18 participating initiatives, 16 (89%) reported to have developed strategies to diversify/increase their funding sources in 2008. According to survey data, some of the most common strategies were:

- (1) approaching or establishing new partnerships or alliances with either corporations, private sector or local institutions and government (8 out of 16, 50%)*
- (2) developing a variety of self-financing fundraising strategies (7 out of 18, 44%)*

- (3) *hiring employees or specialists to focus on finances/fundraising (4 out of 16, 25%) and*
- (4) *developing or participating within international/national networks and exchanges (3 out of 18, 19%)*

Q32 Which strategies, if any, did you employ in 2008 to improve the ARTS MANAGEMENT CAPACITIES of your organization and artists involved?

Out of 18 respondents, 14 (78%) reported to have developed strategies to improve the arts management capacities of their organization/artists in 2008. According to survey data, the most common strategies used were:

- (1) *through trainings provided to artists either on workshops, seminars or symposia in fields like accounting, curatorial strategies, ICT, and management (6 out of 14, 43%)*
- (2) *encouraging professionalization of institutional management -i.e. appointing director, academic education on cultural management, meetings to discuss efficiency and responses, etc.- (4 out of 14, 29%), and*
- (3) *by participating and being engaged in artists networks (3 out of 14, 21%)*

Q33 Which strategies, if any, did you employ in 2008 to foster HORIZONTAL COOPERATION amongst artist-led initiatives/artists. Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, ALL of the participating initiatives reported to have fostered horizontal cooperation amongst artist-led initiatives in 2008. The most frequent strategies used were:

- (1) *collaborative projects (16 out of 18, 88.9%)*
- (2) *networks (16 out of 18, 88.9%)*
- (3) *workshops/ trainings (12 out of 18, 66.7%) and*
- (4) *publications (11 out of 18, 61.1%)*

Q34 Did your organization IMPROVE or NOT IMPROVE its technical facilities for communicating globally in 2008?

According to survey data, 12 out of 18 participating initiatives (66.7%) "DID improve" their technical facilities for communicating globally in 2008 however only 11 (61%) provided comments on how they improved their technical facilities.

According to survey data, some of the most common strategies were:

- (1) *improvement of communication strategies either through websites renovation/development, computer upgrading, programs/software, joining social networks, etc. (8 out of 12, 67%), and*
- (2) *by improving internet facilities/web access (4 out of 12, 33%).*

Q35 Which CHANNELS OF DISTRIBUTION did you use in 2008 to disseminate artworks, projects and ideas? Please select ALL that apply.

According to survey data, the channels of distribution mostly used by the participating initiatives were:

- (1) *newspapers/magazines (18 out of 18, 100%)*
- (2) *mailing lists.email (17 out of 18, 94.4 %)*
- (3) *web presence (14 out of 18, 77.8%) and*
- (4) *own exhibition space (12 out of 18, 66.7%)*
- (5) *radio (11 out of 18, 61.1%)*