Abstract
Artistic practices are subjected to numerous situational factors that simultaneously hinder and/or enable future artistic activity: public funding is positioned in this research as one such situational factor. This article explores the immediate impacts public funding has on the artistically creative processes of the funded art project using three case studies of Australian-based visual artists Kelly Doley, Agatha Gothe-Snape and Nigel Helyer. Each of these artists has recently received new work grants from the Australia Council for the Arts. Notions relating to definitions of creativity are explored. We conclude that while public funding can impact on the creative process of the funded projects, the (in)ability to access funding does not necessarily impact on the motivations to continuing practicing art.
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Introduction

Much debate surrounds the impacts cultural policy, and consequently public funding, have on the arts sector in Australia. Likewise, there is a large body of research exploring the notion of (artistically) creative processes. The aim of this article is to explore how public funding impacts on artistic processes in Australia. Interviews were conducted with three visual artists who have received funding from arms-length federal funding body, the Australia Council for the Arts, to reveal the nature of the relationship between funding and artistic processes.

As a result of the link between discourses concerning creativity, the arts, and the case studies, this article will focus on three key issues regarding artistic creativity for publically funded artworks. Firstly, debates surrounding the notion of creativity are discussed in relation to the nature of artistic practices. Included here are the interviewees’ own understandings of artistic creativity so as to establish a working definition of the key concepts in which this research is grounded. Secondly, theories regarding what constitutes creative processes and artistic processes are explored. Lastly, artist management, including public funding as a management activity, is discussed in relation to the impacts it has on artistic processes.

Research Methodology

This research project used a case study approach to gain an understanding of how public funding impacts on the respective artistic practices of three Australian-based visual artists: Kelly Doley, Agatha Gothe-Snape, and Nigel Helyer. Given that artistic processes are experiential, a semi-structured interview was chosen to reveal artists’ phenomenological understandings of their processes. Questions addressed each artist’s processes for applying for and creating a funded artwork in conjunction with questions regarding his or her artistic practice(s) and processes more broadly. Given the semi-structured nature of the interviews, there were slight deviations from the base questions asked (in response to issues raised by the artists). The validity of interview data has been debated when it comes to understanding creative processes: it has been argued that it fails to address the gap between perceived process and actual process (see Negus & Pickering, 2000; Weisberg, 2006). While it cannot be assumed that artists are fully conscious of their experiences, what is critical here is that the information provided by each interviewed artist was perceived to be of importance to his or her artistic practice (Nelson & Rawlings, 2007). The significance placed on these articulated experiences raises the question of why those experiences are consciously processed and given meaning by the artists. In the context of understanding the impacts of public funding, such perceptions are carried forward and thus impact the future creative process.

The criteria upon which artists were invited to participate in this study were that they had received in either 2010 or 2011 an Australia Council grant in either the Visual Arts New Work Emerging (less than five years professional practice) category or the Visual Arts New Work Established (over five years professional practice) category. The attainment of a grant defines the chosen participants as artists because they are creating art professionally with the aid of their respective grants. The years 2010 and...
2011 were selected as they provided insurance that the funded projects were completed without being too distant for the artists to easily reflect on the processes involved. Potential participants were identified through the Australia Council’s grant registry.

Artistic creativity is often described as arising from an ongoing commitment to artistic practice, allowing creativity to be ascertained in relation to the past artworks made by the artist(s) in question (Mace & Ward, 2002; Yokochi & Okada, 2005). This is based on the rationale that commitment to artistic practice develops an artist’s perspective as well as the technical skills required to realise artistic ideas and thus be deemed creative (Nelson & Rawlings, 2007, p. 242). The Australia Council selection criteria for new work grants similarly imply this with the applicant needing to display “a high degree of artistic merit in [their] work to date” and “the potential for innovation in the content and development of the new work” (Australia Council, 2010). The selection process for awarding the grants was peer reviewed and therefore it is evident that peers determined that the artists being studied here met this criteria, thus confirming their inclusion in this study.

Creativity, Valuation and Novelty

The concept of creativity eludes concrete definition in the literature. The most common definition iterated is that creativity involves making useful, novel products (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Kilgour, 2006; Mumford, 2003; Weisberg, 2006; Weisberg 2010). Elaboration of this common definition has revealed issues surrounding the notion of valuing outcomes as creative and the ambiguity of the term ‘novel’ (see Madden, 2004; Madden & Bloom, 2001; Madden & Bloom, 2004; Oakley, 2009; Weisberg, 2006; Weisberg, 2010).

In systemic views, creativity involves interactions between an individual, or groups of individuals, a domain of knowledge, and a field(s) (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; McIntyre, 2008). Valuation occurs by a field(s), that ascertains a creative outcome’s appropriateness to a domain(s) (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; McIntyre, 2008). Creativity thus becomes a communicative concept in that novel value must be communicated to a field in order to be deemed creative (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Csikszentmihalyi, 1999; John-Steiner, 1992; Negus & Pickering, 2000). Consequently, Negus & Pickering (2000) shift the notion of creativity to a socially designated concept due to the view that valuation cannot be separated from the determination of creative value (p. 264). When considering the nature of public funding decision-making processes, valuation of (potential) creativity is paramount but the criterion of novelty in relation to artistic practices complicates the ability to make such valuations.

The emphasis placed on novelty in definitions of creativity potentially restricts whether artworks are considered creative (Madden, 2004; Madden & Bloom, 2004; Oakley, 2009). It has been contended that art is not necessarily synonymous with creativity (Madden & Bloom, 2001; Weisberg, 2010), however, the role the arts historically played in defining notions of creativity, particularly during the Renaissance period, has resulted in the link between the two (Negus & Pickering, 2000). It is due to this positioning of the arts that the criterion of novelty in creativity definitions restricts what can be viewed as art. As systemic views of creative processes hold that creativity develops from domain knowledge, the strict notion of novelty can initially be supplanted (Weisberg, 2006; Weisberg, 2010).

In the arts, it is noted that art-making involves drawing on the traditions of artistic mediums (Madden, 2004; Madden & Bloom, 2004). Consequently, much of what is considered art would not be considered creative as the common view of novelty is too narrow to accommodate the broad scope of artistic practices (Madden, 2004; Madden & Bloom, 2004; Oakley, 2009). By way of addressing this issue, Madden and Bloom (2001) suggest three categories of creativity. Firstly, hard creativity denotes an
invention that is new in the respect that it is unprecedented (Madden & Bloom, 2001: p. 412). Secondly, weak creativity refers to all production, or the act of bringing something into being (Madden & Bloom, 2001: p. 412). Lastly, soft creativity encompasses ‘reproduction’, making artistic creativity fall between hard and soft notions of creativity due to the varying roles tradition plays in art making (Madden & Bloom, 2001, p. 413; Madden, 2004).

The qualitative data collected from artists in our study similarly revealed this emphasis on ‘newness’, with Agatha Gothe-Snape noting how such an emphasis is problematic to how she views her own creativity. She states: “[Innovation and creativity] go back to the idea of the new and I do not think that is very useful … [Artistic] creativity is about making something that does not look like art, or it looks like something that we have not imagined art to be yet”. Here, an element of newness is critical in the suggestion that artistic creativity should go beyond past notions of art but a hard view of creativity that favours newness is positioned as problematic by Gothe-Snape. This echoes Madden and Bloom’s (2001) notions of hard (invention) and soft (reproduction) creativity with artistic creativity existing on the scale between the two.

Klamer and Petrova (2007) similarly highlight these issues regarding the concept of novelty and the imperative for artists to realise ‘novel’ artworks, but offer Eysenck’s notion of public and private novelty as an alternative (p. 247). Public novelty is separated from private novelty, with the former relating to an artistic field’s or audience’s assessment of novelty, and the latter referring to an artist’s assessment of novelty in his or her artwork(s) (Klamer & Petrova, 2007, pp. 247–248). Eysenck’s view of novelty brings the previous debate surrounding the valuation of creative outcomes back to the fore.

Notions of soft, hard and weak creativity as well as public and private novelty expand the definition of creativity, making the concept more inclusive of variations in artistic practices and the varying novel values of artworks. These more inclusive views of creativity in the arts, combined with the recognition that creativity is a socio-culturally constructed and designated concept, further emphasise the role of valuation in determining creativity. In particular, these conceptions of creativity and novelty in the arts imply an inability to separate the notion of creativity from the action of judging what is creative. As suggested earlier, what remains unclear from the inclusive approach to artistic creativity is how valuation occurs for potential creativity in proposed publically funded artworks.

Helyer’s past position on the Inter-Arts peer-review board at the Australia Council sheds a different light on how creativity and innovation are conceived in the public funding context. He notes that taking a creative risk in artistic practice is a way of gauging the potential creative value of a proposed artwork. Bilton (2010) suggests that “without the element of risk and the possibility of failure, it is unlikely that creative thought can genuinely push boundaries” (p. 265). This shifts the emphasis on newness to an emphasis on risk-taking in artistic processes. However, in this reconceptualisation of creativity in art, the issue shifts from how to judge novelty to how to assess risk in proposed art projects. In-depth studies of artistic processes offer a different perspective on the notion of artistic creativity, while also implicitly suggesting a way in which creative risk can be evaluated.

**Commitment to Artistic Practice**

As mentioned previously, artistic creativity eventuates from commitment to artistic practice. The nature of Doley’s artwork, *The Learning Centre*, displays how creativity results from commitment to, and development of, an artistic perspective. The project, which was initially installed at Tin Sheds Gallery and First Draft Gallery in Sydney in 2010 (Doley, 2012), was funded for a second instalment of what appears to be the same idea. It involved Doley creating artworks in exchange for knowledge and new skills. From here, she created the work *49 Things Learnt About Humans* (2012), a book which explored the outcomes of these processes of interaction and learning with
participants. Discussing her funded art project exhibited at Fremantle Arts Centre, WA in 2011, Doley suggests that “[it] is a new work even though it uses the same model of The Learning Centre; it is dealing with new things”. Here, Doley draws on a method or artistic perspective to further explore her ideas.

Helyer similarly notes this of his own work in relation to a future project that utilises a similar audio system as his funded project, VoxAura, a public art installation of two boats with an integrated soundscape examining the environmental and socio-historical data of the region for Turku, Finland: “The work has already been developed as a method [but] the actual outcome of the work will be totally different”. It is suggested here that new artworks, which are assumed creative, arise from past artistic practice allowing the development of both technical skill and artistic perspective. Thus, persistence and determination are two factors that, when combined with intrinsic motivation, enable such ongoing artistic practice (Nelson & Rawlings, 2007; Throsby & Zednik, 2010), as evidenced in the three artists’ experiences.

In conjunction with commitment and creative risks, the literature also recognises affect as being involved in judgements of artistic creativity (Madden, 2004; Madden & Bloom, 2004). Affect can be further positioned as critical to artistic creativity when considering definitions of art, such as Carey’s (2006): art is anything anyone considers art and artworks become defined to be all those considerations over time (pp. 29, 31). While there is a spectrum of definitions of art, from those that involve subjective reception to (more) objective reception of ideas as being art, Carey’s definition is useful here because it encompasses both a subjective definition, “anything anyone considers art”, with a more objective one, “artworks become defined to be all those considerations over time”. This latter part of the definition fits with the literature that situates the concept of creativity within social systems, therefore requiring a more objective valuation of outcomes as being creative, or in this case, as being art, because the definition encompasses many people’s affective responses to artistic stimuli over time. This view of the role of affect is based on the assumption that if something is to be considered art, the audience may have had some form of affective response to the artwork. Indeed, Negus and Pickering (2000) similarly suggest that art should be defined according to its ability to communicate an experience as opposed to its perceived novel value (pp. 179–180).

For Helyer, affective responses to art become another way in which he defines artistic creativity:

If I engage with [an artwork] very strongly, it is usually because of [these] two things: the possibility to transcend and transform. If the work is very beautifully made, I can appreciate it but it is a bit of a shoulder shrug. So, for me, creativity would also be tied up in those processes of transformation and transcendence.

It has become evident that artistic practice involves intuitive processes and ongoing commitment while artistic creativity involves risk and affect. The intersection between these provides the ability to evaluate potential creativity for funding purposes, however. The concept of the creative individual was also raised despite being theoretically contested. Doley states that in the context of the arts, she does not view everyone as creative because creativity results from a particular way of thinking as well as an artist’s education and upbringing. Helyer similarly states that creativity results from a particular way of thinking, processing and expressing ideas, which is inextricably linked to an individual’s state of mind. There has been much debate regarding whether creative processes involve (extra)ordinary thinking processes and whether the ‘creative individual’ exists.

Weisberg (2006; 2010) suggests that creativity is the outcome of intentional actions produced by ordinary thinking processes. On an alternative, but related, note to the dismissal of extraordinary thinking processes, Bilton (2010) recognises that in the light of process-/systems-based theories of creativity, trait-based theories that focus on the
creative individual have become unfashionable (p. 258). In contradistinction to these views, Klamer and Petrova (2007) note that trait-based creativity may be in operation for artistic creativity due to the individuated and unpredictable nature of artistic processes, making personality and cognitive variables a potential factor involved in those processes (p. 252). It is important to note that this argument made by Klamer and Petrova (2007) is based on artists’ perceptions of their individual artistic practices. Despite this position of the creative individual as expressed by the interviewees, it is evident in the Australia Council criteria that this is not a factor which is evaluated.

The Interviewees' Experiences of Artistically Creative Processes

With regards to artistically creative processes, it has been suggested that artistic ideas develop simultaneously with artworks, as an artist allows intuition to direct experimentation with artistic mediums (Mace & Ward, 2002; Nelson & Rawlings, 2007; Yokochi & Okada, 2005). As a consequence, this process can simultaneously clarify initial ideas and discover new ones. Nelson and Rawlings (2007) extend this notion of artistic processes to include the concept of creativity by suggesting that they are "triggered by the sense of a new synthesis of elements within the context of ongoing artistic activity" (p. 242). Although not implying all artistic practices are creative, they suggest artistic practices have the ability to produce novel and therefore creative outcomes (Nelson & Rawlings, 2007, p. 242).

The experience of artistic processes of each artist in this study aligns with past academic research. In particular, Gothe-Snape, Helyer and Doley each describe their respective processes as organic and fluid, with creative ideas being simultaneously clarified and changed through engagement with an artistic medium. Initial ideas for artistic projects are often described as vague, resulting in a negotiation between ideas and medium(s) to realise artworks (Bilton, 2010; Mace & Ward, 2002; McIntyre, 2008; Nelson & Rawlings, 2007). As a result, in artistic processes, an artist remains receptive to new ideas that emerge from the initial idea as opposed to reproducing that initial idea through art-making activities (Bilton, 2010; Mace & Ward, 2002; McIntyre, 2008; Nelson & Rawlings, 2007).

Regarding artistic ideas and their development, Doley states that her best ideas manifest from periods of travel. Her idea for The Learning Centre resulted from a period of travel through Tibet and China with artist group, Brown Council. The idea and how it became the model for further work involves this aforementioned negotiation between medium and initial idea. She states: "I was just kind of problem-solving as to how to do it for quite a while". She also notes discussions with peers and gaining an understanding of what can be achieved in relation to her practice as a business and an artist being factors involved in this problem-solving process.

Helyer describes his creative process as “quite murky”. He says that his ideas “will kind of be operating in the background, processing until, ‘Okay, yes. That is it. Bam!’” and adds, “[i]t often happens like that for me, where I let things ruminate and get almost an entire Gestalt of what it is I am going to do”. Although this experience appears to confirm the ‘Aha moment’ notion of creativity, in which a creative idea appears suddenly, as if from nowhere (Bilton, 2010; Madden, 2004; McIntyre, 2008; Weisberg, 2010), another part of Helyer’s process of idea generation involves drawing and documenting those partial ideas until the right synthesis between them occurs. Thus, his moment of insight does not arise from a void, reflecting Nelson and Rawlings’ (2007) understanding of artistic processes: Artistic processes occur from a synthesis of elements within ongoing artistic practice (Nelson & Rawlings, 2007, p. 242).

Agatha Gothe-Snape outlines the very organic, unknown nature of her artistically creative processes in the following way:

The way I work in my studio is akin to a performance improvisation. I am always working with what is at hand and following my nose. I do not really ever
know what medium the artwork will be [in] or what form it will take, and ultimately, that process will go right up until the moment of exhibiting.

In conjunction with being able to view Gothe-Snape’s artistic process as a negotiation between ideas and artistic mediums, she also speaks of another quality that is at play: her artworks have a self-generating momentum. This self-generating quality is also noted in other research studies of artistic practices and is described as a feeling that an artwork is ‘demanding’ the path an artist needs to explore (Mace & Ward, 2002; Nelson & Rawlings, 2007).

**Artist Management and Artistic Motivations**

From the level of practicing artists, government assistance can be positioned as a business/management opportunity that enables career development. Varying sources of financial assistance are one way to manage and sustain artistic careers but, as the literature notes, such an approach has impacts on artistic processes (Banks & Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Hausmann, 2010; Throsby & Zednik, 2011). Artist management, which includes the artist as self-manager, is seen as critical to artistic careers because it increases employability and reduces the gap between artwork and audience (Bendixen, 2000; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Segers, Schramme & Devriendt, 2010). With regards to creativity, it is suggested that artist management is a part of artistic processes (Evrard & Colbert, 2000; McIntyre, 2008). Employing the aforementioned definition of art by Carey (2006), marketing an artwork and/or artist brings audiences to particular artworks, allowing them to become communicative and be deemed as art (Evrard & Colbert, 2000).

The nature of artist management ensuring future artistic practice by increasing the economic viability of an artist has led to the suggestion that management activities can ‘crowd out’ artistic motivations (Bendixen, 2000; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Hausmann, 2010; Klamer & Petrova, 2007). It is generally agreed that artistic processes are primarily intrinsically motivated, although extrinsic motivation cannot be completely discounted (see Bendixen 2000; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Klamer & Petrova, 2007; Mace & Ward, 2002; McIntyre, 2008; Mumford, 2003; Nelson & Rawlings, 2007; Weisberg, 2006).

Drawing on Frey’s crowding theory, Klamer and Petrova (2007) describe crowding out as the process through which the extrinsic, economic motivations related to business activities interfere with the intrinsic motivations that spur on artistic processes (p. 249). Eikhof and Haunschild (2007) similarly note this and argue that economising artistic practices damages the resources that initially enable artists’ careers: intrinsic motivations; persistence; and the artistic logics that separate one artist from another within market segments. Alternative to these positions, Mumford (2003) suggests that not all extrinsic motivations will negatively impact on artistic practice, noting choice of field, task-type and method as being potentially positive external factors impacting on art projects (p. 112). Such suggestions of financial assistance enabling sustained practice while potentially disabling artistic motivations signals the need to examine the impacts of public funding on artistic creativity.

**Financial Assistance and Creativity**

With regards to financial assistance, Klamer and Petrova (2007) note that the relationship between financer and artist impacts on artistic processes. The nature of giving/receiving relationships and the societal values and norms on which they founded are argued as psychologically impacting on an artist’s behaviour (Klamer & Petrova, 2007). When speaking of government financial assistance, they suggest values such as “equity, solidarity, accessibility and national [or community] identity” may crowd out intrinsic motivations (Klamer & Petrova, 2007, pp. 250–251).

Caust (2005) similarly suggests this of public funding in Australia, stating that artists need to be wary of the motivations behind offers of financial assistance. Taking a systemic view of the creative process into account, these arguments imply that artists
may be pressured by situational factors to realise certain kinds of art based on their relationships with the structures that financially support their practices. Thus, such relationships can be positioned as a distraction from the habitual, intuitive nature of artistic processes.

The nature of Australia Council funding applications will be outlined before discussing the impacts proposing an art project has on the realisation of the funded artwork. The section of the application which is of particular importance to artistic processes is that which provides the space to outline a proposed project. There were two opportunities to outline a project within the Visual Arts New Work Grant application for 2010 and 2011:

- Describe your project in a brief summary – 100 characters (not words) or less.
- Outline your project: detailed description.

(Australia Council, 2010)

It is also asked that proposed projects be described in consideration of the aforementioned selection criteria (Australia Council, 2010).

Funding Proposals and the Realisation of a Funded Art Project

Situational factors are recognised as impacting on artistic processes, with government financial assistance being posited as one such factor (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Klamer & Petrova, 2007; Mace & Ward, 2002; Mumford, 2003; Weisberg, 2010). With regard to potential impacts, it should not be assumed that they are solely negative or positive in nature (Segers et al. 2010). Such factors are complex and interrelated, having unknown impacts on artists, with each artist's situation being different from the next. Concerning the interviewed artists in this research, they had varied responses to how the process of proposing an art project to a funding body such as the Australia Council impacts on the process of realising the funded artwork.

The process of writing a proposal, both for the Australia Council and other arts-related bodies, was described by the interviewees as an exercise that can give clarity to artistic ideas. Doley states that even though very simple, savvy language must be employed when pitching a project, the time spent writing out an idea can be beneficial to her artistic practice: “I always appreciate going for grants and competitions because it is great. Even if you do not get it, what you have done is spent time articulating your ideas”. It is evident here that proposing an art project can help clarify and further develop an understanding of the ideas an artist plans to explore. This aspect of Doley's practice is akin to Mace and Ward's (2002) notion of “enriching, expanding and discovering” (p. 184) an idea, which involves increasing an artist's understanding of an idea through means such as writing, drawing and gathering related information.

In relation to his experience of grant writing, Helyer notes that a certain level of clarity is required if a grant application is going to be successful. Speaking from his experience of lecturing arts students in professional practice, his advice to his students is that if another person cannot understand the articulation of a student’s idea, then that student may not be successful with that proposal. Of his own practice, he says that his ideas are “usually planned and conceptually developed” before he applies for a grant. Although no link was made in this instance between the process of grant writing and the process of idea development, what can be inferred from Helyer is that the ability to articulate an idea with clarity is critical to a successful grant application. Here, proposals do not necessarily give clarity to an idea, rather they foster a clear, verbal articulation of that idea.

Gothe-Snape also recognises that grant writing can be a good exercise for artists to engage with. Concerning her grant, however, she presents a unique case as to the potential impacts it had on her artistically creative processes. Being the only grant
Gothe-Snape has received from the Australia Council to date, her works for Primavera 2010 had been predominantly completed prior to receiving the grant. These works included *Cruising at Primavera*, a performance work whereby participants navigate the Museum of Contemporary Art (Sydney) with a heightened sense of consciousness; the animated work, *True Love False Consciousness*, created to evoke emotional responses from audience members; and a set of gouache-style paintings. She recalls the clarity with which she described these artworks being due to her proposal not being predictive. In contrast with this, she notes that she has not been successful with Australia Council grants since and she views this as a consequence of not being able to propose her ideas in such a predictive fashion. She says:

I find it very difficult talking about something in the future that you do not really know has happened yet. My practice does not lend to it because [it] is very fluid and flowing …. It is like you are making parameters around your work very immediately before your work has had a chance to find its own shape.

It has been established that artistic processes do not reproduce ideas but rather allow those ideas to transform through a negotiation with an artistic medium, resulting in the sense of an artwork being self-generated (Bilton, 2010; Mace & Ward, 2002; McIntyre, 2008; Nelson & Rawlings, 2007). Here, Gothe-Snape’s description of her artistically creative processes further exemplifies this organic, fluid nature of artistically creative processes as well as noting a negotiation with a medium and the self-generation of an artwork. Gothe-Snape’s experience with Australia Council funding processes suggests that the predictive nature of proposing an artwork(s) that is not yet created is not conducive to the vague, self-generating process of realising an artwork. Klamer and Petrova (2007) note this issue with regards to any form of financial support for the arts. They recognise that creativity requires time and space to develop, thus creating an issue with attempting to predict, or relying on predictions of, artists’ potential creative contributions.

With regards to the predictive nature of proposing projects, Doley and Helyer both recognise the impact this has on their respective artistic processes for projects funded by the Australia Council and other funding agencies. Doley states that, given the nature of her artistic processes, she occasionally feels limited by what she has proposed. Similarly, Helyer notes the obligation he feels to produce the artwork he proposed but contends that “usually by the time [I am] writing a grant [I] already like to know what [I am] going to do”. He adds that even though an artwork can be realised in numerous ways, in his experience, it “is still in the form of the description more or less”.

What is evident from the interviewees is that proposing an art project has the potential to set precedents on the outcomes of artistic processes despite the process of writing being an aspect of artistic processes that may clarify initial ideas. This complex relationship between the nature of grant proposals and the nature of producing a funded artwork reiterates the argument of Segers et al. (2010) that situational factors such as financial assistance should not be solely viewed as negative or positive in their impacts (p. 62). For each artist, as has been shown, the impact a funding body like the Australia Council has on an artwork is dependent on how an artist typically experiences artistic processes within his or her ongoing artistic practice. One cause of these potential impacts is the structure of the relationship between a government funding body and an artist (Klamer & Petrova, 2007).

**Interactions Between Artists’ Motivations and Public Funding**

As stated earlier, financial assistance has been posited as potentially crowding out artistic motivations. Thus, it is critical to explore whether the intrinsic motivations that lead to an engagement with artistic processes are impacted by the nature of supporting an art project with public funding. Such intrinsic motivation is evident in the ways the interviewees described their processes for their respective funded artworks.
Although Gothe-Snape received the new work grant after the majority of her project was completed, she says that any artwork will be made regardless of whether she receives financial assistance to realise it. Doley similarly states that “[grants are] simply a way of funding [a project]” and adds that she does not produce art to receive funding but rather produces it just for the sake of doing so. Helyer also discusses how funding is not the incentive behind engaging in artistic practice: “I do not do things I do not want to do. Even if there is money in a project, [if] I do not want to do it, I will not do it. I will not take the money”.

These descriptions of artistic motivations by the three interviewees imply that intrinsic motivations not only generate artistic processes but, in some cases, ensure an artwork is made even though it may not be financially supported through funding bodies like the Australia Council. Despite the predominance of intrinsic motivations in artistically creative processes, it is suggested elsewhere that extrinsic motivations may also have an impact on artistic practices (Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Klamer & Petrova, 2007; Mumford, 2003; Weisberg, 2010).

Helyer states that “[grants] are obviously very helpful but they are not usually the deal breaker … Sometimes, they might be, especially if it is a group project or a slightly more complex project”. Here, Helyer recognises that extrinsic motivations such as funding can impact on the decision to continue an artistic process and consequently realise an artwork. It is also critical to note with regards to Helyer, that he does not suggest that those initial intrinsic motivations have disappeared: Rather, he suggests that a project may not be feasible, leaving it incomplete and the intrinsic motivations behind it not satisfied.

It is interesting to note that the obligations to produce what is proposed and the perceived parameters drawn around artworks by proposals, as discussed previously, are not recognised as impacting on artistic motivations. The notion of crowding out, which sees other logics or intentions superseding the artistic logics that manifest during an artistic process (Bendixen, 2000; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007; Hausmann, 2010; Klamer & Petrova, 2007), could be positioned as occurring in artistic processes for publically funded artworks. What is meant by this is that if the organic flow of producing an artwork is interrupted by the notion of having to remain true to the initially proposed project, then the proposal shifts to become an external motivator that ‘crowds out’ the new artistic logics that an artwork presents to an artist during its realisation. This disjuncture between theories of crowding out artistic logics and the interviewees’ experiences needs further research to gain greater understanding of how artistic and other logics interact within artistic processes.

Conclusion
The language employed in debates concerning artistic creativity and public funding for the arts complicates what is considered art and would thus be considered a fundable art project. Given the expectations of commitment, artistic merit and innovation in Australia Council grants, it can be assumed that public funding impacts on the artistic processes for the funded project. This is particularly important to consider when the predominantly auto-telic nature of artistic practice as a career is brought into consideration.

From the perspectives of Doley, Gothe-Snape and Helyer, a complex relationship exists between artistic processes and funding processes. One layer of this complexity is that it is important not to confuse the impact on process (being discussed here) with the impact of funding on an artist’s overall career. Funding impacts the process of the funded project but the (in)ability to access funding does not necessarily impact on the motivations to continuing practicing. A second layer of this complexity is that it cannot be assumed that funding processes only negatively or positively impact on artistic processes and consequently crowd out artistic logics and intrinsic motivations. This complex relationship can be positioned as a part of artistically creative processes in that it provides the opportunity to clarify, enrich and expand initial ideas behind an art
project. Past the point of idea generation, however, grant proposals may become a distraction when contrasted with the nature of artistic processes. The negotiation between artist, idea, and medium results in the sense of a fluid, organic process that sees the artwork presenting new ideas and the path it needs to take in order to be resolved. If these newly presented ideas differ to the initially proposed ideas, a disjuncture occurs. The interviewed artists noted how the initially proposed idea can set parameters around the development of an artwork, thus resulting in experiencing a sense of obligation to realise proposed ideas.

Despite public funding having varied impacts on artistic processes, it is a potential opportunity for artists to continue practicing and supports a career in the arts. Future research into the nature of artistic practices in Australia should employ observational methods to better situate artistic practices within the environmental and social structures that support/inhibit artistic processes. The scope of this research did not allow time and space to use such methods, particularly given that the nature of this research question is also constrained by funding cycles. Research could also be conducted regarding the notion that cultural policies and public funding agendas confer certain cultural and political values onto art and whether such notions are perceived by practicing artists who are publically funded and therefore presumed to be influenced by such agendas. Public funding facilitates artistic processes by enabling ongoing artistic practice but such facilitation has varied positive and detrimental impacts on the realisation of artworks through such processes.

Endnotes
i. The Australia Council for the Arts is hereafter referred to as the Australia Council.
ii. Doley is a Sydney-based visual and performance artist whose practice involves both individual work and collaborative work with artist group, Brown Council (see Doley 2012). She has received three grants from the Australia Council since 2008: Visual Arts New Work (Emerging Artist) grants in 2010 and 2012, and an ArtStart grant in 2011. Of particular importance to this research is her 2010 new work grant ($10,000) for a project entitled The Learning Centre (2011). This project is ongoing and involves interaction with people: she offers artworks in exchange for knowledge. The grant funded one installation of this project at Fremantle Arts Centre (WA), where she was also offered in-kind support. 49 Things Learnt About Humans (2012) is the outcome of this and other stages of The Learning Centre conducted thus far. She received the 2012 Redlands Westpac Art Prize (Emerging Artist) for this artwork (The COFA Blog, 2012).
iii. Gothe-Snape is a Sydney-based, multidisciplinary visual artist. Her artistic practice includes the use of visual arts, multimedia and performance mediums. She received a Visual Arts New Work: Emerging Artist ($10,000) grant for three artworks she exhibited at Primavera 2010 (see Gothe-Snape 2010). Held annually at the Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA), Sydney, Primavera is an exhibition for young Australian artists under thirty-five years of age. Cruising at Primavera (2010) is a collaborative work whereby people navigate the gallery using a heightened sense of physical and psychological awareness (DasPlatforms, 2011; Gothe-Snape, 2010; Museum of Contemporary Art, 2010). True Love False Consciousness (2010) is an animated artwork using sound, colour and text to evoke emotional responses in others. The third artwork was a set of gouache-style paintings. This is the only grant she has received from the Australia Council, although she has received grants from other public funding bodies in the past.
iv. Helyer’s artistic practice combines science and art in sculptures and installations that are often integrated with soundscapes, and frequently explore environmental issues (see Helyer, n.d.). He has received numerous grants and fellowships from various Australia Council boards over the years, including a New Work (Media Arts) grant from the Music Board in 2012. His 2011 Visual Arts New Work: Established ($20,000) grant is the main focus in this research. The funded work is VoxAura: The River Sings (2011), a public art project for, and also supported by, the European Capital of Culture, Turku, Finland. The project is an installation using two boats that are integrated with a soundscape that explores environmental data regarding water quality and social data
regarding Baltic maritime traditions (Helyer, 2011; Turku European Capital of Culture, 2011).

v. All comments attributed to Gothe-Snape, Helyer and Doley are taken from interviews and personal correspondence with the authors conducted between July and September, 2012.

vi. From 2010 Visual Arts New Work: Emerging Grant application but noted by Australia Council as not differing from 2011 Visual Arts New Work: Established Grant application.
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