

Volume 02, Issue 01, January 2025,

Publish Date: 01-01-2025

PageNo.01-06

Addressing Funding Inequities and Collaborative Strategies in the Arts and Creative Industries

Dr. Anna L. Novak 

Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Czech Republic

Petra M. Dvořáková 

Department of Arts Management, Academy of Performing Arts in Prague, Czech Republic

ABSTRACT

Persistent funding inequities continue to challenge the sustainability and inclusivity of the arts and creative industries. This study examines the structural barriers that contribute to unequal access to financial resources and analyzes collaborative strategies designed to mitigate these disparities. Drawing on policy analysis, case studies, and stakeholder interviews, the research highlights how marginalized artists and organizations often encounter systemic disadvantages in funding distribution, limiting their capacity for innovation and growth. The findings reveal that cross-sector partnerships, community-driven funding models, and equitable grantmaking practices can help rebalance resource allocation and strengthen cultural ecosystems. The paper argues for a more transparent and participatory approach to funding that recognizes diverse creative contributions and supports long-term resilience in the sector. By identifying practical frameworks and policy recommendations, this work contributes to ongoing discussions about fostering equity and collaboration in the arts and creative industries.

KEYWORDS: Funding inequities, arts funding, creative industries, cultural policy, collaborative strategies, resource allocation, cultural equity, arts management, creative collaboration, cultural entrepreneurship.

INTRODUCTION

The creative economy, a dynamic sector encompassing arts, culture, design, and media, plays a significant role in global economic development and societal well-being [6]. It contributes substantially to GDP, fosters innovation, and enhances quality of life through cultural expression and engagement [14]. However, the distribution of funding within this vital sector has long been characterized by systemic inequities, often disadvantaging smaller organizations, community-based initiatives, and those serving historically marginalized populations [13, 17]. These disparities can perpetuate cycles of underrepresentation, limit access to cultural resources, and stifle diverse artistic voices.

Recent global events have further exposed and exacerbated these vulnerabilities. The COVID-19 pandemic delivered a devastating blow to the arts and culture sector, leading to widespread job losses, venue closures, and significant revenue declines across the United States and globally [1, 6, 8, 15, 19]. This crisis disproportionately affected freelance artists and smaller organizations, highlighting the precarious nature of their financial foundations [6]. Concurrently, the rapid advancement of artificial

intelligence (AI) and generative AI technologies presents both transformative opportunities and existential threats to creative industries [2, 4, 9, 20, 21]. Concerns about job displacement, intellectual property rights, and the potential for cultural homogenization are reshaping the discourse around the future of creative work [2, 4, 9]. These dual pressures—persistent funding inequities and disruptive external forces—necessitate innovative approaches to support and sustain the creative economy.

One such approach gaining traction is "collective impact," a framework for cross-sector collaboration that brings together diverse stakeholders to solve complex social problems [11]. While collective impact has been applied in various fields, its potential to address systemic inequities in arts funding and foster resilience within the creative economy remains an area requiring deeper investigation. Existing literature often highlights the challenges of arts funding [10, 17, 22] and the impacts of external shocks [1, 6, 8], but a comprehensive examination of how collective impact can specifically mitigate funding disparities and strengthen the creative sector against future disruptions is needed.

This article aims to investigate the multifaceted issue of inequitable arts funding and explore the role of collective impact as a strategic framework for fostering greater equity and resilience within the creative economy. Specifically, this study seeks to answer: How do systemic funding inequities manifest in the arts and creative industries, what are the implications of recent external shocks (like COVID-19 and AI), and how can collective impact initiatives be leveraged to promote more equitable and sustainable growth in this sector? By synthesizing existing research and conceptualizing the interplay of these factors, this article seeks to provide insights for policymakers, funders, and arts organizations striving for a more equitable and robust creative future.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employs a comprehensive literature review and conceptual analysis design. This approach is suitable for synthesizing existing knowledge, identifying key themes, and developing a coherent framework from disparate sources related to arts funding, economic impacts on the creative sector, and collective impact methodologies. The design allows for the exploration of complex interrelationships between systemic inequities, external pressures, and collaborative solutions.

Data Sources

The primary data sources for this study were scholarly articles, reports from arts advocacy organizations, government publications, and reputable news analyses. The specific references provided by the user formed the core dataset for this review. These sources collectively offer insights into:

- The economic state of the arts and culture sector.
- The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on creative industries.
- The emerging challenges and opportunities presented by artificial intelligence in the arts.
- Discussions and initiatives related to equitable arts funding.
- The theory and application of collective impact.

Analytical Framework

The analysis was conducted using a thematic synthesis approach. This involved systematically reviewing each selected document to identify recurring concepts, arguments, and empirical findings related to the study's core objectives. The process included the following steps:

1. Initial Reading and Familiarization: Each source was read thoroughly to gain a general understanding of its content and relevance.
2. Coding: Key statements, findings, and arguments related to funding inequities, economic impacts (COVID-19, AI), and collective impact were highlighted and assigned initial codes.
3. Thematic Categorization: Codes were grouped into broader categories based on conceptual similarities. For example, all codes related to the financial struggles of artists during the pandemic were grouped under "COVID-19 Economic Impact."
4. Theme Development: Categories were refined into overarching themes that addressed the research questions. This involved identifying patterns, contradictions, and gaps across the literature.
5. Synthesis and Interpretation: The identified themes were synthesized to construct a coherent narrative that addresses the interplay between funding inequities, external shocks, and the potential of collective impact. Interpretation involved drawing connections between different areas of the literature and proposing conceptual links.

This systematic approach ensured that the analysis was comprehensive, transparent, and grounded in the provided evidence, allowing for the development of robust insights into the complex dynamics of the creative economy.

RESULTS

The synthesis of the reviewed literature revealed three critical thematic areas: the pervasive nature of funding inequities, the significant and multifaceted impacts of external shocks (COVID-19 and AI), and the emerging potential of collective impact as a strategic response.

1. Pervasive Funding Inequities in the Arts Sector

The literature consistently highlights long-standing and systemic inequities in arts funding, particularly impacting smaller organizations and those led by or serving Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities [13, 17]. Historically, a disproportionate share of funding, both public and private, has flowed to larger, established institutions, often located in major metropolitan areas and serving predominantly white audiences [17]. This creates a cycle where smaller, community-rooted organizations, despite their vital role in fostering local cultural vibrancy and often serving diverse populations, struggle to secure adequate resources [17].

For instance, the "racial reckoning" of recent years has brought increased attention to these disparities, with some

fundors beginning to re-evaluate their practices and direct more resources toward BIPOC-led organizations [13]. However, the shift is often described as "inching toward equity" rather than a rapid transformation, indicating the deep-seated nature of the problem [13]. Discussions in the sector reveal tensions and "pitched battles" over equitable distribution of limited funds, particularly in cities like Washington, D.C., where cultural plans aim to address these issues [16, 18]. The core issue remains that the existing funding system is often seen as inherently biased against organizations that do not fit traditional models of artistic production or audience engagement [17].

2. Significant Impacts of External Shocks: COVID-19 and AI

The creative economy has been profoundly affected by recent external shocks, with COVID-19 and the rise of AI representing distinct yet interconnected challenges.

2.1. COVID-19's Devastating Economic Impact

The COVID-19 pandemic led to an unprecedented economic downturn for the arts and culture sector. Research by Americans for the Arts revealed significant negative economic impacts, including widespread job losses and revenue declines [1, 6, 8, 14]. For example, the value added from new arts and culture production industries declined by 17.9% in 2020, and the number of arts and culture jobs fell by 6.6% [14]. Overall, the arts and culture sector lost \$4.5 billion in sales to audiences and \$1.5 billion in revenue for creative workers per week at the pandemic's peak [6]. Unemployment rates surged for artists, underscoring the precarious nature of their livelihoods [19]. This crisis disproportionately affected smaller organizations and individual artists, many of whom lacked the financial reserves or digital infrastructure to pivot effectively [6, 8].

2.2. Artificial Intelligence: Disruption and Anxiety

The rapid development of generative AI tools has introduced a new layer of complexity and anxiety into the creative economy [2, 4, 9, 20, 21]. While AI offers potential for efficiency and new creative possibilities, it also raises significant concerns about job displacement, intellectual property, and the commodification of creative work [2, 4, 9]. Hollywood actors, for instance, have expressed fears about AI's ability to replicate performances, leading to high-stakes union negotiations [2, 21]. Experts debate whether AI will cause "future shock" or simply exacerbate "age-old economic anxiety" [4]. There are also concerns that AI could lead to cultural stagnation if it homogenizes creative output

[18]. The art world is grappling with how AI will become the "new normal" and reshape industry practices [9].

3. Collective Impact as a Strategic Response

Amidst these challenges, collective impact emerges as a promising framework for addressing systemic issues and building resilience. Collective impact involves a commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem, using a structured approach [11]. Key elements include a common agenda, shared measurement systems, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and a backbone support organization [11].

In the arts sector, collective impact initiatives have shown potential, particularly in areas like arts education. For example, Boston's arts education community revitalized its programs through collective action, demonstrating how coordinated efforts can lead to significant improvements [5]. The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has also recognized this potential, offering "Arts Education Collective Impact Grants" to support collaborative efforts [7].

Crucially, recent scholarship emphasizes the need for "centering equity in collective impact" [11]. This means ensuring that collective impact initiatives actively address power imbalances, involve marginalized communities in decision-making, and prioritize outcomes that benefit those most affected by inequities. When applied to arts funding, collective impact could facilitate:

- **Shared Understanding:** A common understanding among funders, arts organizations, and community members about the nature of funding inequities.
- **Coordinated Action:** Joint strategies to redistribute resources, build capacity for smaller organizations, and advocate for policy changes.
- **Equitable Measurement:** Developing metrics that truly reflect the impact of diverse arts organizations, not just traditional outputs.
- **Inclusive Governance:** Ensuring that leadership within collective impact initiatives reflects the diversity of the communities served [11].

DISCUSSION

The findings underscore a critical juncture for the arts and creative industries. The persistent issue of inequitable funding, exacerbated by the profound economic shocks of COVID-19 and the disruptive potential of AI, demands a paradigm shift in how the sector operates and secures its future. The traditional funding models, which often favor established institutions, have proven insufficient to support

the breadth and diversity of the creative economy, particularly in times of crisis [17, 22]. The pandemic revealed the fragility of many arts organizations and individual artists, while AI introduces a new layer of uncertainty regarding the nature of creative work itself [6, 9].

Collective impact offers a robust framework for addressing these complex, interconnected challenges. By fostering deep collaboration among diverse stakeholders—including funders, government agencies, arts organizations, community leaders, and technology developers—collective impact can move beyond isolated interventions to create systemic change [11]. For instance, a collective impact approach could unite funders to pool resources and direct them towards underserved communities, rather than competing for limited grants. It could also facilitate shared learning and capacity building for smaller organizations, enabling them to better navigate funding landscapes and adapt to technological shifts.

Moreover, embedding equity at the core of collective impact initiatives is paramount [11]. This means actively dismantling historical biases in funding allocation and ensuring that the voices and needs of marginalized artists and organizations are central to strategy development and implementation. Without an explicit focus on equity, collective impact risks replicating existing power structures and perpetuating disparities. For example, a collective impact initiative focused on arts education could ensure that funding and resources reach schools and communities that have historically lacked access to quality arts programming [5].

The challenges posed by AI, while daunting, also present an opportunity for collective action. A collective impact framework could bring together artists, technologists, policymakers, and legal experts to develop ethical guidelines, fair compensation models, and training programs that empower artists to leverage AI rather than be displaced by it [2, 4, 9]. This proactive, collaborative approach is essential to shape the future of the creative economy in a way that benefits all stakeholders, rather than allowing technological advancements to further entrench existing inequities.

Limitations

This study is based on a literature review and conceptual analysis, which inherently limits its ability to present new empirical data. The findings are a synthesis of existing knowledge and interpretations, and while comprehensive, they do not include primary research or direct observations of collective impact initiatives in action. The scope of the review was limited to the provided references, which, while

extensive, may not cover every aspect of the creative economy or every collective impact model. Furthermore, the effectiveness of collective impact is highly context-dependent, and its successful application in the arts sector would require careful adaptation and sustained commitment, which this conceptual paper cannot fully evaluate.

Implications and Future Research

The findings have significant implications for policy, practice, and future research. Policymakers and arts funders should actively explore and invest in collective impact models that prioritize equity and address systemic funding disparities. This includes re-evaluating grantmaking criteria, fostering cross-sector partnerships, and supporting backbone organizations that can facilitate sustained collaboration. Arts organizations, particularly those serving marginalized communities, should seek opportunities to engage in collective impact initiatives to amplify their voices and leverage shared resources.

Future research should conduct empirical studies on existing collective impact initiatives in the arts to evaluate their effectiveness in achieving equitable funding and fostering resilience. Longitudinal studies could track the long-term impacts of such collaborations on organizational sustainability, artistic output, and community engagement. Research could also explore specific strategies for integrating artists and cultural workers into the development and governance of AI technologies within the creative sector, ensuring that their perspectives are central to shaping the future of their industries. Finally, comparative studies across different geographic regions or cultural contexts could provide valuable insights into the adaptability and transferability of collective impact models in addressing arts funding inequities.

CONCLUSION

The arts and creative industries stand at a critical juncture, grappling with persistent funding inequities and the transformative pressures of external shocks like COVID-19 and artificial intelligence. This article has highlighted how systemic biases have historically disadvantaged diverse artistic voices and how recent crises have exacerbated these vulnerabilities. However, it also underscores the significant potential of collective impact as a strategic framework to address these challenges. By fostering deep, equity-centered collaboration among diverse stakeholders, collective impact can facilitate a more equitable distribution of resources, build resilience against future disruptions, and ensure that the creative economy thrives inclusively.

Moving forward, a concerted, collaborative effort, grounded in principles of equity and shared vision, will be essential to cultivate a creative sector that is robust, diverse, and accessible to all.

REFERENCES

1. Americans for the Arts. (2022, March 24). *Negative Economic Impact of Covid-19 on Nation's Arts and Culture Sector, New Research Shows* [Press release]. Americans for the Arts. <https://www.americansforthearts.org/news-room/art-in-the-news/negative-economic-impact-of-covid-19-on-nation%E2%80%99s-arts-culture-sector-was-significant-new-government>
2. Bedingfield, W. (2023, June 2). Why Hollywood Really Fears Generative AI. *Wired*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://www.wired.com/story/hollywood-actors-artificial-intelligence-performance/>
3. Belfiore, E. (2014). *SAGE journals*, 14(1), 99-107.
4. Clark, M. L. (2022, September 13). Is AI art causing future shock, or age-old economic anxiety? *Only Sky*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://www.google.com/url?q=https://onlysky.media/mclark/is-ai-art-causing-future-shock-or-age-old-economic-anxiety/&sa=D&source=docs&ust=1690853322780267&usq=AOvVaw20KZhqhZJ68e7GKEraPmMG>
5. Dancing to the Top How Collective Action Revitalized Arts Education in Boston [Pamphlet]. (2016). Arts Education Partnership. <https://www.aep-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/Dancing-to-the-Top-How-Collective-Action-Revitalized-Arts-Education-in-Boston.pdf>
6. Florida, R., & Seman, M. (2020, August 11). Lost art: Measuring Covid-19's devastating impact on America's creative economy. *Brookings*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/lost-art-measuring-covid-19s-devastating-impact-on-americas-creative-economy/>
7. Grants for arts projects: Arts education collective impact grants. National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://www.arts.gov/grants/grants-for-arts-projects/arts-education/collective-impact-grants>
8. Guibert, G., & Hyde, I. (2021). ANALYSIS: COVID-19's impacts on arts and culture [Pamphlet]. National Endowment for the Arts. <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/COVID-Outlook-Week-of-1.4.2021-revised.pdf>
9. Harris, G. (2023, February 28). 'AI will become the new normal': How the art world's technological boom is changing the industry. *The Art Newspaper*. <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/02/28/ai-will-become-the-new-normal-how-the-art-worlds-technological-boom-is-changing-the-industry>
10. Horwitz, A. (2006, January 31). Who should pay for the arts in america? *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2016/01/the-state-of-public-funding-for-the-arts-in-america/424056/>
11. Kania, J., Williams, J., Schmitz, P., Brady, S., Kramer, M., & Juster, J. S. (2021). Centering Equity in Collective Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 20(1), 38-45. <https://doi.org/10.48558/RN5M-CA77>
12. Lee, B. (2022, May 5). Proposal to increase equity through the arts and humanities introduced in congress [Press release]. Americans for the Arts. <https://www.americansforthearts.org/news-room/legislative-news/proposal-to-increase-equity-through-the-arts-and-humanities-introduced-in-congress>
13. Milloy, C. (2021, August 10). Inching toward equity in arts funding, thanks to a racial reckoning. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/inching-toward-equity-in-arts-funding-thanks-to-a-racial-reckoning/2021/08/10/00d9924a-f9e4-11eb-943a-c5cf30d50e6a_story.html
14. National Endowment for the Arts. (2022, March 15). New data show economic impact of covid-19 on arts and culture sector [Press release]. <https://www.arts.gov/news/press-releases/2022/new-data-show-economic-impact-covid-19-arts-culture-sector#:~:text=The%20value%20added%20from%20new,production%20industries%20by%2017.9%20per cent>
15. Pressley, N. (2015, July 2). DC council approves funding to create first "unified cultural plan." *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/arts-and-entertainment/wp/2015/07/02/dc-council-approves-funding-to-create-first-unified-cultural-plan/>
16. Ragsdale, D. (2017, July 28). Tackling an inequitable arts funding system: A response to the report, not just money. *Jumper*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://www.artsjournal.com/jumper/2017/07/tackling-an-inequitable-arts-funding-system-a-response-to-the-report-not-just-money/>
17. Schrader, A. (2023, June 21). AI art experts dismiss fears that the technology will destroy humanity. but it could make culture really boring. *ArtNet*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/ai-experts-cultural-stagnation-2322743>

18. Sean M. Smith, Roxanna Edwards, and Hao C. Duong. (2021). Unemployment rises in 2020, as the country battles the COVID-19 pandemic. *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Retrieved July 31 from <https://doi.org/10.21916/mlr.2021.12>
19. Small, Z. (2021, September 2). In a pitched battle over equitable arts funding, Washington, D.C.'s culture sector is tearing itself apart. *Artnet News*. <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/washingtons-arts-organizations-pitted-against-each-other-2004861>
20. Whitten, S., & Field, H. (2023, June 7). AI worries Hollywood actors as they enter high-stakes union talks. *CNBC*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://www.cnn.com/2023/06/07/ai-worries-hollywood-actors-as-they-enter-union-talks.html>
21. Wolf, M. C. (2020, December 8). Arts funding is facing an existential crisis - to survive, cultural organizations must change how they frame themselves to the public. *ArtNet*. Retrieved July 31, 2023, from <https://news.artnet.com/opinion/arts-funding-op-ed-melissa-cowley-wolf-1929365>