

# FLEXIBLE LABOUR RELATIONS IN THE CULTURAL SECTOR

*An investigation into the influence of the socio-economic model on  
labour market flexibility in the cultural sector*

Marleen Boschman

Student number: 287308

E-mail address: [marleen\\_boschman@hotmail.com](mailto:marleen_boschman@hotmail.com)

Master Thesis Art and Culture Studies  
Programme Cultural Economics and Cultural Entrepreneurship  
Faculty of History and Arts  
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Supervisor: Dr. Berend Jan Langenberg

2<sup>nd</sup> reader: Dr. Dirk Noordman

April, 2009

## **Abstract**

This thesis is an investigation into the influence of the socio-economic model on labour market flexibility in the cultural sector, by means of a secondary data analysis. Labour market flexibility can be indicated by a high degree of flexible labour relationships like non-employment, temporary employment, part-time employment and multiple jobholding. The labour market in the cultural sector tends to be more flexible than the total labour market. Across countries, different forms of labour market flexibility occur, caused by differences in the socio-economic model. The influence of the socio-economic model is determined by the scope of labour market institutions and their influence on different areas in the labour market. Four socio-economic models can be distinguished in Europe: the Anglo-Saxon countries, the Nordic countries, Continental Europe and Southern Europe. In this research, the United Kingdom, Finland, The Netherlands and France represent the first three of the four European socio-economic models.

In the first part of the data analysis is searched for differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the four countries. In the second part of the data analysis, the possibility of the socio-economic model being an explanation for the differences found in the first part of the data-analysis is researched. The answer to what the exact influence of the socio-economic model on labour market flexibility in the cultural sector is, can not be clearly answered. There is evidence that country-specific elements influence the degree of labour market flexibility in the cultural sector. When the influence of governance in the socio-economic model is large, the special characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector are even more visible. The influence of the socio-economic model and the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector can not be seen apart from each other.

### *Keywords*

Cultural economics; cultural statistics; Finland; France; international comparison; labour market flexibility; multiple jobs; part-time employment; non-employment; socio-economic model; temporary employment; The Netherlands; United Kingdom.



## Preface

Before I started the master *Cultural Economics & Cultural Entrepreneurship*, my main focus was on the cultural sector in The Netherlands. Working lives of artists and labour market flexibility in the cultural sector always have had my special attention. I was intrigued by the high degree of flexible labour relations and insecurity most artists are involved in. During the international master, I learned a lot about the cultural sector in other countries. In the discussions during class, international students from among others Bulgaria, China, Japan, Greece, Poland and the United States informed us on the situation in the cultural sector in their country. I got more interested in the differences between the cultural sector in different countries and very curious what exactly caused these differences. The combination of these two interests eventually resulted in this master thesis.

Very enthusiastic I started writing this thesis, realising it would not be easy to make an international comparison of the labour market in the cultural sector, but driven to succeed. Later, the struggle with finding relevant, valid and comparable data really begun. At times, I thought I would never be able to finish this thesis. But there were a lot of people stimulating me and helping me overcome the difficulties. Therefore, I need to thank some people in particular. Dr. Langenberg, for the excellent guidance, patience and the cups of tea. WW, Oscar and David, with whom I spent a lot of time at the University working on my master thesis. The discussions helped me through. Dr. Stevens, for some methodological advice. My aunt Henny, for discussing the French statistics with me. A special thanks to my “big sis”, dear friends and family, who always listened to me and inspired me. Mum and dad, these words could never describe my gratitude. Thank you for believing in me!

# Content

<b><u>Chapter 1. Introduction</u></b>	<b>1</b>
<b><u>Chapter 2. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector</u></b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. A flexible labour market	4
2.1.1. The arise of more flexible labour markets	4
2.1.2. Labour market flexibility	6
2.1.3. Flexible labour relations	6
2.1.4. Multiple jobholding	8
2.2. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector	9
2.2.1. The cultural sector	9
2.2.2. Characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector	11
2.2.3. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector	13
2.3. Conclusion	14
<b><u>Chapter 3. The socio-economic model</u></b>	<b>15</b>
3.1. The socio-economic model and the labour market	15
3.2. The influence of labour market institutions	16
3.2.1. Interference areas	17
3.2.2. Labour market institutions and labour market flexibility	18
3.3. Different socio-economic models	19
3.3.1. The four socio-economic models in Europe	19
3.3.2. Recent developments	22
3.4. Conclusion	22
<b><u>Chapter 4. Résumé and hypotheses</u></b>	<b>23</b>
4.1. Hypotheses	23
4.2. Research design	24
4.3. Methodological problems	25
<b><u>Chapter 5. Flexible employment in the cultural sector in Europe</u></b>	<b>27</b>
5.1. Cultural statistics in Europe	27
5.1.1. Data collection	27
5.1.2. The cultural sector and cultural employment	28

5.2. Data analysis	29
5.2.1. Employment status	30
5.2.2. Duration of employment contracts	31
5.2.3. Working hours a week	33
5.2.4. Multiple jobs	34
5.3. Conclusion	36
<b>Chapter 6. The influence of the socio-economic model</b>	<b>39</b>
6.1. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the United Kingdom	39
6.1.1. Research in the cultural sector	39
6.1.2. Temporary employment	40
6.1.3. Part-time employment	43
6.2. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in Finland	45
6.2.1. Research in the cultural sector	46
6.2.2. Temporary employment	46
6.3. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in The Netherlands	47
6.3.1. Research in the cultural sector	47
6.3.2. Part-time employment	48
6.3.3. Multiple jobs	50
6.3.4. Non-employment	50
6.4. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in France	53
6.4.1. Research in the cultural sector	53
6.4.2. Temporary employment	54
6.5. Conclusion	57
<b>Chapter 7. Conclusion</b>	<b>60</b>
7.1. Answer to the research question	60
7.2. Implications	64
<b>Chapter 8. References</b>	<b>67</b>
8.1. Literature	67
8.2. Internet resources	71
<b>Annex 1. EU Classification of Economic Activities</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Annex 2. International Standard Classification of Occupations</b>	<b>76</b>

## Chapter 1.

### Introduction

In 2000, Benhamou researched why two different models of labour market flexibility occurred in the cultural sector in the 90's in France and in the United Kingdom. While in France, part-time and temporary jobs had increased, in the United Kingdom there has been an increase in self-employment in the cultural sector. Benhamou tried to explain these differences through the influence of organisational behaviour and the influence of government policies, which differed in the two countries. Her conclusion was that in France, the over-protective government system caused the rise in part-time and temporary employment. The deregulation of the job market caused a rise in self-employment in the United Kingdom.

Currently, numerous research has been done on the relationship between labour market institutions and regulation and labour market performances (WRR, 2007). The attention for international comparisons between economic performances in different countries and different socio-economic models is also rising (WRR, 2006). In the cultural sector, international comparative research has been done on the status of the artist in Europe (Capiou, Wiesand et al. 2006), but Benhamou is the only researcher who compared the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in different countries and made an attempt to explain them through the differences in the socio-economic model. The labour market in the cultural sector can be seen as a forerunner in the high occurrence of flexible labour relations (Menger, 2001: 250). Differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in different countries and possible and further explanation by the socio-economic model is an interesting topic for further investigation.

Benhamou compared two countries, however in this research it is decided that four countries are focussed on to reveal a greater insight into the different models of labour flexibility. Countries can be characterised by a socio-economic model and there is a distinction between different socio-economic models in Europe (Lodovici, 2000). It would be interesting to see whether we can discover more differences between the occurrence of labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in different countries. Furthermore, see if these differences can be explained by the socio-economic model of the country. An investigation into the relation between the socio-economic model and labour market flexibility in the cultural sector can contribute to the knowledge on how the occurrence of

flexible labour relations in the cultural sector is affected by socio-economic aspects like labour market institutions and cultural preferences. In this thesis, an attempt to research the influence of the socio-economic model on labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in Europe is made.

### *Research question*

The main research question of this thesis is:

*What is the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector?*

To be able to answer this question, the following sub questions are formulated:

*SQ1. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector:*

- a. What is understood by a flexible labour market?
- b. How flexible is the labour market in the cultural sector?

*SQ2. The influence of the socio-economic model:*

- a. What is the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of labour markets?
- b. What are the characteristics of the different socio-economic models in Europe?

*SQ3. What is the dominant factor considering labour market flexibility in the cultural sector:*

- the influence of the socio-economic model?
- or the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector?

This thesis starts with a theoretical background on the research topic in the second and third chapter, in which the first and the second sub questions will be answered. In the fourth chapter, the design of the empirical research will be discussed. Based on the third sub question, the hypotheses of the further research will be formulated. In the fifth and sixth chapters, the hypotheses will be tested by means of a secondary data analysis. In chapter five, the differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the different countries will be researched. In chapter six, further research on whether the socio-economic model can be a possible explanation for the differences found in chapter



five is carried out. This thesis concludes with an answer to the research question in chapter seven and is closed by implications of this research.

## Chapter 2.

# Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector

In this chapter, a theoretical background of labour market flexibility in the cultural sector is presented. The sub questions 1a. and 1b. of the research will be answered:

- 1a. What is understood by a flexible labour market?
- 1b. How flexible is the labour market in the cultural sector?

Before labour market flexibility in the cultural sector is described, first the characteristics of a flexible labour market will be summarised.

### 2.1. A flexible labour market

There are three actors in the labour market (Borjas, 2005: 3). The first actor is the workforce, which supplies labour. A worker can maximise his well-being by finding the optimal distribution between the time he spends on making money and his leisure time. Workers will offer more labour in return for a higher pay-off. The second actor in the labour market is the group of firms, who demand labour. Firms want to maximise their profits by producing the consumers' needs as efficient as possible. The demand for labour is therefore a derived demand from the desires and spending of consumers. The third actor is the government, who regulates the labour market in order to guard the working of the labour market. The government sets the rules that guide exchanges in the labour market between the workers and the firms.

#### 2.1.1. The arise of more flexible labour markets

Labour markets have not always been as flexible as they are nowadays. For many years permanent (or long-term) employment contracts was the most common relationship between employers and employees (Klau and Mittelstadt, 1986). Employees were looking for job security and a stable wage income. Permanent labour relationships give employees the prospect of possible increases in wage income and the opportunity to make promotions and fulfil higher occupations. For employers, permanent labour relationships were

preferable because the costs of hiring, employees quitting and lay-offs were usually high and could be avoided.

The need for more flexible labour relations is often seen as a result of the growing competition pressure among companies (WRR, 2007: 37). This competition pressure is caused by increasing globalisation and new ICT developments and results in an unexpected and rapid need for changes in economic production. In previous years, there were two ways for governments to adapt to such unexpected economic shocks: the use of a monetary policy or a fiscal policy. After the introduction of the Euro in the European Union in 2002, the possibility of using a monetary policy was no longer an option for the European Union-countries. Because of the Stability and Growth Pact, introduced in 1997 by the European Union, there are limitations on using a fiscal policy to stabilise the economic market. Since monetary and budget policies can not be used as extensively as before to adapt quickly to unexpected changes in economic production, the labour market has become the most common practise to make adjustments.

To survive the growing competition pressure, companies are forced to produce more effective and make efficient use of the production factors. Thus, the production factor labour needs to be used as efficient as possible. To adapt quickly to changes in their production and keep the company profitable, employers need to be able to hire and fire employees when needed. Permanent employment contracts unable employers to respond quickly to these production changes and adapt their labour capacity without making large exceptional costs (Klau and Mittelstadt, 1986). When the economic circumstances are not stable and with the production capacity changing rapidly, it would be more profitable for employers to change these rigid employment contracts into more flexible labour relationships. Furthermore, the production factor labour needs to be allocated as optimal as possible and the labour market must work efficient and productive. This means that a flexible labour market is needed (WRR, 2007). Employees need to be flexible and be able to change from a variety of functions to participate in making the labour market work optimally.

The European Union also stimulates the economy to be more flexible. In 2007, the Treaty of Lisbon, which is in line with a more flexible labour market, was signed. The goal for the European Union is “to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” (European Parliament, 2000: I.5) in 2010. To attain a greater employment rate and more efficient flexible labour relations, a maximal labour participation rate is needed (WRR, 2007). When labour relations are flexible, employees can be allocated to the working place where they are most productive. Thus, labour

allocation will be more optimal and the productivity will be increased, which will have an impact on economic growth.

### **2.1.2. Labour market flexibility**

There are different forms of labour market flexibility. A distinction between numerical, functional and wage flexibility can be made. Numerical flexibility can be divided into external and internal flexibility. External numerical flexibility concerns volume adjustments in the use of labour within firms (WRR, 2007). This external flexibility involves adjustments in the number of employees a firm hires. External numerical flexibility is needed when a growth or shrink of firms occurs as a result of external influences like technological and organisational changes and competition. When the production volume of a company changes, use of labour must also be adjusted. This means that employees should be hired or fired. To easily hire and fire employees, temporary employment contracts or contracts with self-employed are widely used. Internal numerical flexibility (or sometimes called working time flexibility) concerns labour flexibility inside firms (WRR, 2007). Internal numerical flexibility means changes in the use of labour by adjustments in the working hours of employees. This results in part-time contracts.

Besides numerical flexibility, there are two other forms of labour market flexibility: functional flexibility and wage flexibility. When the functions and job responsibility of employees are easily changed or employees are able to perform variable tasks and projects, we aim at functional flexibility (WRR, 2007: 31). The term ‘employability’ is linked to functional flexibility; employees can be widely used when they have multiple skills and experience. Wage flexibility occurs when employers change the wages for employees when a sudden change in the number of employees occurs (WRR, 2007: 32). Another form of wage flexibility is in the way employees are rewarded, for example with performance payments.

### **2.1.3. Flexible labour relations**

As we saw in the previous paragraph, flexible labour relationships are used to reach internal and external numerical flexibility. The main distinction made in labour relationships is between employees and non-employed workers, mostly called self-employed. Self-employed are seen as the most flexible form of a labour relationship. Both employees and self-employed can be involved in different forms of flexible labour relations, like temporary or part-time contracts. These flexible labour relations can also be combined, for example an employee can be temporary hired on a part-time basis.

### *Employed / non-employed*

The main distinction made in labour relationships is between employees and non-employed workers, mostly called self-employed, which has consequences for the legal status of the worker:

- A *contract of employment* implies the application of employment law (probationary clause, non-competition clause, termination clause, guaranteed salary in case of illness, etc.; pay protection; health and safety at work; employment inspections; etc.);
- A *contract for services or for the purchase of certain goods* implies the application of civil or commercial law (common law).

(Capiou, Wiesand, et al., 2006: 11)

The exact interpretation of the legal definition of employed and non-employed workers differs across countries and is not always clear, but this distinction is made in every country (Capiou et al., 2006: 9). In statistics, self-employed are distinguished in three groups: self-employed without personnel; self-employed employees; and family workers (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2000: 156). The main motive for workers to become self-employed is to be their own boss and make their own schedule. The disadvantage is the risk which comes along with self-employment: the possibility of failure and loss of income and job security (Blanchflower, 2000).

### *Part-time employment contracts*

The most common definition of part-time employment is a working week with a duration of less hours than the norm of the full-time employment standard. This norm varies over countries and over time, in The Netherlands a working week of 35 hours or more is statistically considered as full-time employment (Enquete BeroepsBevolking, [www.cbs.nl](http://www.cbs.nl)). It is attractive for employers to hire part-time workers: employers can respond quickly to changes in the demand of their products, overheads can be reduced and unionisation rates are lower (Adnett, 1996). Other legal or financial inducements for employers to prefer part-time employees are the escape of liability for unfair dismissal, redundancy payments, maternity leave and social security contributions. Reasons for workers who explicitly make the decision to work in part-time employment are making reconciliation between their working- and family-life, like a combination between work and training, studying, children, or family problems; or illness and disability which makes working more hours a week impossible (Marshall, 1989). The majority of the unemployed workers, who are already a

part of the labour market, prefer a full-time job, but when there is a lack of availability of full-time employment they are forced to take part-time jobs.

### *Temporary employment contracts*

Much like part time employment, the definition of temporary employment also varies over countries and over time. The best way to describe is employment contracts of a non-permanent nature. There are different forms of temporary employment (Marshall, 1989). First we can distinguish fixed-term employment, in which the duration of the working period is fixed at the start of the contract. Second, there are seasonal and occasional contracts, which are more casual than fixed-term contracts and have no clear ending date at the start of the contract. Third, we distinguish temporary work through specialised agencies, like work on an interim basis. Agency work is one of the most regulated forms of temporary employment, therefore this would be the most favourable for employees. Employers prefer fixed-term contracts over agency work, because the labour costs are lower, employers can choose the workers they hire, there is a possibility to extend the duration of the contract and on-the-job-training is permitted. With the use of temporary employment, employers can easily adapt to changing economic conditions, like the replacement of personnel, an exceptional expansion of firm activities, seasonal peaks in demand for labour and other exceptional needs. Temporary workers can also be used to avoid the hiring of permanent employees in times of uncertainty and to avoid future redundancy costs. Another argument in favour of employers preferring temporary employment is the screening of new workers before a definitive commitment between the firm and the employee. In reality, temporary employment seldom results in a long-term relationship between both parties.

#### **2.1.4. Multiple jobholding**

The occurrence of more flexible labour relationships resulted with the need to have more than one job to secure a workers' income. Next to the main job, workers can also have a second or even a third job, this is called multiple-jobholding or moonlighting. The main reason people take second jobs is because of an hours constraint in the main job, which leads to an unsatisfactory division between income and leisure time (Shisko and Rostker, 1976: 299). Some workers want or need more work hours but is constrained from doing so in his main job. He will take a second job if the wage rate exceeds his preferences for leisure time. There is a relation between the wage rate and the hours of work in a job. An increase in the wage rate in the main job can lead to an increase or decrease in the acceptable wage rate and the supply of working hours in the second job. This also applies

to the hours of work someone can work in the main job. An increase in the hours of work in the main job can lead to an increase or decrease in the acceptable wage rate and the supply of working hours in the second job (Shisko and Rostker, 1976, 299), although a change in working hours or wage in the main job can also result in a change in working hours in the main job. There are other reasons for workers to take second jobs, for example when the main job is taken for its high wage and the second job provides professional training, contacts or prestige (Paxson and Sicherman, 1996: 379). A person will only work more hours or accept a lower wage in the second job when receiving a higher wage in the main job.

## **2.2. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector**

The labour market in the cultural sector is known for its greater flexibility than the total labour market (Menger, 2001). What are the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector and how does flexibility occur? Before we explore labour market flexibility in the cultural sector, first the cultural sector needs to be defined.

### **2.2.1. The cultural sector**

There is a lot of discussion about what art is and what is meant by the cultural sector. The reason why it is difficult to define art is that artistic goods are experience goods which extract their importance from the meaning users give to it (Brinkhorst et al., 2005: 11). One can treat a painting as a piece of art, while the other sees the painting as a drawing of a six years old child. There are a lot of different forms of art, like painting, singing, acting, sculpting, writing and so on. Some people even make the distinction between ‘high arts’ and ‘low arts’. Although it is impossible to strictly define the arts, there are some elements defined that characterise most forms of art:

- There is an artistic *product*, for example a physical object or a performance.
- It *communicates* publicly, it must be experienced by an audience in a public or private setting.
- It is experienced for *enjoyment*, for example aesthetic pleasure, sociability or fun.
- Art is an *expressive* form, it presents a fiction or an interpretation.
- Art is defined by its *context*, both physical and social, for example museums or social groups.

(Alexander, 2003: 3)

These elements give a notion of what art is about. Still, every case needs to be seen in an individually, since there can not be one formulated definition which envelopes all art forms.

Another way to view the cultural sector is not to focus on the artistic product, but on the creative activity. Besides the arts, there are two other creative industries to be distinguished: the media and entertainment industry; and creative business services (Brinkhorst et al., 2005: 11). The media and entertainment industry covers motion pictures; radio and television; literature; and journalism. The creative business services includes industrial, graphic and fashion design; architecture; and advertisement. The strict definition of the cultural sector only takes into account the creation of products (or performances) in these three creative industries. The broad definition also takes into account the material production, distribution and retail of the creative goods, for example the production of performing arts and publishing of CDs and books and the distribution and selling of these products in museums, theatres and media-shops. It depends on whether the strict or the broad definition is used, to clarify what is meant by the cultural sector. The *Nomenclature statistique des Activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne* (NACE) is the international classification of economic activities. An overview of economic activities which are classified as a cultural one in European statistics can be found in the first annex.

Since the arts are hard to define, it is also difficult to classify who is an artist. One can make artistic products, but is everyone who sings an artist and do we consider every photographer as an artist? Frey and Pommerehne (1989) defined “eight criteria that might be applied in order to determine who is an artist”:

- the amount of time spent on artistic work;
- the amount of income derived from artistic activities;
- the reputation as an artist among the general public;
- the recognition among other artists;
- the quality of the artistic work produced (which means that artistic ‘quality’ must be defined somehow);
- membership in a professional artists’ group or association;
- professional qualifications (graduation in art schools);
- the subjective self-evaluation of being an artist.

(Frey and Pommerehne, 1989: 146-147)

The number of artists in the cultural sector depends on which of the above criteria are combined. Also hobbyists can spend a lot of time making art, but they may fail the other



seven criteria. One can be graduated from an arts school and have a professional qualification to be an artist, but the person may have chosen to work in a non-artistic occupation. Economists often use the market criteria, the amount of income derived from artistic activities, to describe artists (Towse, 2001). The criterion which covers the reputation and recognition of an artist among the general public and among other artists is hard to measure, just like the quality of the artistic work produced. The definition of an artist is a bit problematic, but the combination of these criteria provides a good definition of who can be considered to be an artist.

Next to artistic occupations, which are covered in the strict definition of the cultural sector, there are also other cultural occupations which do not concern the creation of arts, but are involved in the cultural sector in another way. Examples are music producers, motion picture directors and literature translators, but also supporting staff like technicians and administrative workers. They work in the cultural sector, but are not seen as artists. The cultural workers are taken in consideration when someone uses the broad definition of the cultural sector. Within the labour market for artists (and cultural workers), there are also differences between cultural occupations. Each sub-sector in the cultural sector has its own characteristics. For example, the creative artists and craftspeople can be distinguished from the performing artists (Towse, 2001). The service performing artists sell on the labour market is their labour itself, creative artists and craftspeople sell tangible goods on the market. Performing artists are paid for their services, while creative artists and craftspeople are paid for their products.

There can also be made a distinction between the labour market in the cultural sector and the labour market for cultural workers (as done in Creigh-Tyte and Thomas, 2001). Cultural workers are not only working in the cultural sector, they can also work outside the cultural sector in a cultural occupation. The outcome of a research on cultural occupations depends on which of the above definition is used. The international classification which identifies different occupations is the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). An overview of cultural occupations is summarised in annex 2 (page 76). In this research, the definition of the cultural workforce formulated by Eurostat (2007) will be used. This definition is presented in paragraph 5.1.2. Eurostat makes use of a broad definition of the cultural workforce. Next to artists, for example also occupations in the retail of books are considered as cultural occupations.

### **2.2.2. Characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector**

There are some characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector compared to the total labour market, which are summarised by Langenberg (2008): the high rate of self-

employment; a highly skewed distribution of income; oversupply of workers; multiple-jobholding; and the (non-) significance of artistic training.

#### *High rate of self-employment*

Compared to labour markets in other sectors, there are a lot of self-employed in the cultural sector. It may be in the nature of artistic occupations to work independently on a self-employed basis (Towse, 2001). Authority relationships are not part of the habit of artists (Abbing, 2002). Across cultural occupations, the degree of self-employment differs.

#### *Highly skewed distribution of income*

That artists are poor is obsolete, but the distribution of income in the cultural sector is highly skewed (Filer, 1986). The better someone's reputation, the more money that person can ask for his cultural products or services. There are just a few so called 'superstars' with high wages, the majority of the artists have low wages. Although artists are heterogeneous and imperfect substitutions for each other, the gap of difference in talent among artists is not as big as the distribution of income (Rosen, 1981). Small differences in talent result in large differences in income. Because the search for new artists costs time and money, consumers choose what other people have already chosen. Gatekeepers like record companies and critics are the entities that decide which artists gain access to the general public. In the case of the superstar the snowball effect takes place, which is increased exposure through the word of mouth which leads to more sales of products and services of the artist (Adler, 1985). Artists who are not very successful accept their low wages. As long as their income is high enough to sustain their artistic occupation, they will not move to non-artistic occupations.

#### *Oversupply of workers*

Since it seems that money is not the primary motivation for artists to work because they accept low incomes, there has to be other rewards for artists that compensate the low wage. Next to private satisfaction, artists are also rewarded in the form of recognition by peers, other artists and the audience; status derived from this recognition; and other non-monetary rewards like awards (Abbing, 2003). The satisfaction from psychic incomes is stronger than the satisfaction from monetary incomes, therefore artists are willing to take financial risks. Even when they know the competition of other artists is high, artists want to give their career a chance, which creates an oversupply of workers in the labour market in the cultural sector.

### *Multiple-jobholding*

Because artists accept low incomes in their main artistic occupation, they need to take second jobs to receive a stable wage income. This phenomenon is called multiple-jobholding. When artists have multiple jobs both in and outside the cultural sector, they will work less hours in their non-artistic occupation when they get a rise of wage in that occupation to spend more time working in their artistic occupation. This is called the work-preference of artists, it affirms that money is not the primary motivation for artists to work in a cultural occupation. Artists will quit their second or even third jobs when they make enough money to spend more time on their artistic occupation (Throsby, 1994).

### *(Non-) significance of artistic training*

The economic effect of artistic training in the cultural sector is not that significant as in other sectors (Towse, 2001). Also informal training, like learning on-the-job to develop experience in an artistic occupation, is an important factor for employees to hire artists. Not all successful artists have followed professional higher education.

## **2.2.3. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector**

The cultural sector is a very uncertain market, where artists cope with big occupational risks. The main causes for a risky market are the high differentiation of cultural products and the large variety of consumer demand for cultural products (Menger, 2001). The taste and demand of the audience changes constantly, organisations can not predict how the demand for cultural products will develop over time. The possibility for upcoming cultural organisations to develop themselves into a long-lasting organisation that is able to enter into long-lasting labour relations, depends on the size of the market for the cultural product and the availability of alternative financial resources the organisation can apply to (Ijdens, 2002). Cultural non-profit organisations that are structurally subsidised by the government and organisations with an established audience can be developed into long-lasting organisations with a definite organisation structure and long-lasting labour relationships. The amount of employees of long-lasting cultural organisations depends on the amount of financial resources they can apply to. Cultural organisations tend to be more often project based, which results in project-based labour relations (Benhamou, 2000: 313).

The need for flexible labour relations results in a need for a high employability of artists and cultural workers. Specific qualifications, experience and reputation are very important in the labour market in the cultural sector. Employers want to reduce risks by

hiring well known artists (Benhamou, 2000: 309). By making themselves easily employable, artists and cultural workers have more chance to survive in the labour market of the cultural sector. A high number of previous labour contracts, can also be positive for the reputation of an artist, which increases the employability possibility.

### **2.3. Conclusion**

Labour market flexibility can occur in different forms: numerical flexibility, functional flexibility and wage flexibility. Internal and external numerical flexibility are characterised by a high occurrence of flexible labour relations like self-employment, temporary employment and part-time employment. The demand for flexible labour relations is rising. A flexible labour market is also stimulated by the European Union. Flexible employment contracts have advantages and disadvantages for both employers and employees.

The labour market in the cultural sector is known for its high flexibility compared to the total labour market. There are different classifications in statistics that can be used to identify the labour market in the cultural sector or the labour market for artists and cultural workers. The demand for cultural products is unstable and project-based organisations are very common. This leads to a result of increased flexible labour relationships, for example self-employed, temporary contracts and multiple jobs.

## Chapter 3.

### The socio-economic model

The socio-economic model of a country influences the performances of the labour market in that country. The scope of the welfare state, labour market institutions and country-specific elements like national habits and preferences are important pillars of a socio-economic model. In this chapter, a theoretical background of the influence of the socio-economic model on the labour market will be reproduced. Sub questions 2a. and 2b. will be answered:

- 2a. What is the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of labour markets?
- 2b. What are the characteristics of the different socio-economic models in Europe?

#### **3.1. The socio-economic model and the labour market**

Labour market performances in a country are often explained by the type of socio-economic model in that country. The socio-economic model of a country has social (and cultural) as well as economic aspects. The regulatory regime involves different institutions, levels and mechanisms who have multiple economic effects (Regini, 2000). The economic aspects of a socio-economic model are determined by the economic performance of a country, influenced by the regulative powers of the government and other institutions. Labour market performances and economic performances are linked to each other, the state of the economy in a country influences the working characteristic of the labour market and vice versa. The government intervenes in the economy and labour market by making rules and laws and by handling taxes and subsidies. Institutions have bargaining power which can influence the economic life in a country.

Next to economic regulation, a part of the social life in a country is also regulated. The scope of the welfare state plays an important role in the social life. The scope of a welfare state is decided by the balance between social justice and economic efficiency. This is called the Big Trade-off, social justice is on odds with economic performance (WRR, 2006). The performance of the welfare state can be measured by three dimensions: the labour market performance; social security spending, benefits and government services;

and the distributive outcomes of wealth (Ferrara et al., 2003). These three dimensions are connected, the level of social security influences the working of the labour market, which influences the distributive outcomes of wealth. Besides social policy, country-specific elements like cultural preferences influence the economy and working of the labour market (Ven, Don et al. 2008: 461).

The exact influence of the socio-economic model on the economy and labour market performances is difficult to measure. Currently, a lot of research is done on the relation between labour market institutions and labour market performances (WRR, 2007), there are some connections between labour market institutions and labour market flexibility. The occurrence and scope of the labour market institutions differs across socio-economic models. Before something can be said about the influence that the labour market institutions has on labour market flexibility, the different labour market institutions have to be explained first.

### **3.2. The influence of labour market institutions**

Labour market institutions, like formal and informal rules; norms and codes; and organisations, have a direct influence on the performances of labour markets. Four labour market institutions can be distinguished (Regini, 2000: 22). First, the market itself is the regulatory institution of the economy. The interaction of supply and demand determines price outcomes under conditions of competition. The ideal market regulates itself and has perfect outcomes for all participants without regulation from the outside. In reality, this never works and some governance is needed. The second institution which influences the working of the labour market is the government. Reasons for the government to interfere are to increase efficiency of the labour market; lower transaction costs; prevent market failure as a result of uncertainty and asymmetric information across participants; and maintain mass consumption. By making rules and laws, the state can coordinate activities, allocate resources and structure conflicts between labour market participants. Community institutions and social networks together form the third labour market institution. Community members share norms, habits and values. These unwritten rules and hierarchy are respected by the whole society. Finally, large interest organisations like labour unions and trade unions influence the working of the labour market. The disruptive power of these organisations can be immense. Interest organisations bargain and make accords which are important for the labour market. These labour market institutions all play a different role in the labour market and can intervene on a micro-economic to a macro-economic level.

### 3.2.1. Interference areas

The different labour market institutions influence the degree of flexibility in the labour market. Four areas in the labour market that are governed by labour market institutions can be distinguished: employment protection, working time, wage determination and social security (Regini, 2000).

#### *Employment protection*

Employment protection implies rules and collective agreements which constrain employers to freely hire and fire employees, like dismissal protection (Lodovici, 2000). Dismissal protection exists of compulsory dismissal compensations which employers have to pay to employees when they are let go by a company. Another form of dismissal protection are laws which limit the possibility for employers to terminate employment. For example, the restrictions on fixed term and agency contracts. Dismissal protection thus prevents employers to end the labour relation when they need to, for example when changing economic circumstances ask for dismissals in a firm. It protects employees being let go without valid cause. The coverage of dismissal protection is not the same for every group of workers in the labour market. Self-employed, part-time workers and temporary workers mostly have less protection than full-time permanent employees. A high degree of employment protection can limit the flexibility of labour relations (WRR, 2007). Employers are not able to hire and discharge employees whenever it suits the organisation.

#### *Working time regulation*

The scope of working time for employees is regulated by laws and labour agreements on a collective level, firm-level or by individual agreements. Working overtime, the working hours a week or year and call contracts are examples of working time laws and agreements. Also the scope of overtime hours and premiums for working overtime are regulated (Lodovici, 2000). Possibilities for employers to make adjustments in working times of their employees during a contract can be regulated. When the regulations are very strict, the flexibility of working time is small (Lodovici, 2000).

#### *Wage determination*

Wage levels and wage structures for employees are defined by wage laws and collective labour agreements. There are four factors which influence wage flexibility and wage dispersion (Lodovici, 2000: 41). First, the degree of co-ordination in the wage bargaining system plays a role. Good co-ordination can guarantee stable wage results. Secondly, there

are different levels on which bargaining takes place. Bargaining systems can be centralised and coordinated, like collective bargaining; or decentralised and uncoordinated, like bargaining on firm or individual level. The bargaining level influences the structure of wage differentials across sectors, organisations and individuals. The third important factor which influences wage flexibility and wage dispersion is the union density and the coverage of collective bargaining. These aspects affect the differences in wages across industries, regions and skills. At last, the occurrence of binding minimum wage floors in a labour market can be a limitation for wage flexibility. When the minimum wage is low, people are not stimulated enough to enter the labour market and find a job (Lodovici, 2000).

### *Social security*

The welfare state secures incomes for people who can not participate in the labour market in the form of unemployment insurances and activating labour market policies. Unemployment insurance secures protection for employees against a loss of income because of unemployment. Voluntary dismissals of employees are facilitated with unemployment insurance, early retirement schemes, redundancy payments, retraining and replacement schemes. But also activating labour market policies from the government, which stimulate unemployed workers to get employed again, are a form of social security. The government stimulates people to (re-)enter the labour market and find a job or become self-employed. Examples for activating labour market policies are subsidies, penalties and interventions (WRR, 2007: 143). A too high or too low degree of social security can have a negative effect on the flexibility of a labour market. A high occurrence of unemployment insurances can give employees the opportunity to switch jobs with the knowledge they are protected against a loss of income. A very low level of social security de-motivates employees to change jobs. Too high unemployment insurances de-motivate unemployed workers to get employed (WRR, 2007).

### **3.2.2. Labour market institutions and labour market flexibility**

The influences of labour market institutions on the flexibility in these four areas of the labour market differ. There is no country that has great flexibility in all these four areas. The ideal environment for an optimal flexible labour market is where all employees have equivalent basic rights and protections, no matter what their employment status is (Adnett, 1996). The occurrence of labour market institutions differs across different socio-economic models, the flexibility in the different labour market areas also differs across the socio-economic models. In the next paragraph, the occurrence of labour market



institutions and their influence in the four labour market areas in the different socio-economic models in Europe will be explained.

### **3.3. Different socio-economic models**

There are different socio-economic models across the world. The European countries can be divided into three clusters, which represent the three main regulatory regimes (Lodovici, 2000: 33). The first regulatory regime is the liberal regime, or the Anglo-Saxon model. In this regime, the state plays a limited role. The second regime is the social-democratic or corporatist regime, which can be found in the Scandinavian countries. In these countries, the coverage of public support is great. The third regime is the conservative regime, which is present in Continental and Southern Europe. The scope of public support is greater than in the liberal regime, but smaller than in the corporatist regime. Within this regime we can distinguish two models, the Continental model and the Southern model. In the Southern model, the influence of the families in labour market outcomes has more impact than in the Continental model.

#### **3.3.1. The four socio-economic models in Europe**

The socio-economic models distinguished in Europe are the Scandinavian model, the Anglo-Saxon model, the Continental model and the Southern model. There are national variations on the different socio-economic models, but countries within the same socio-economic model have important similarities which characterise the socio-economic model. The differences between these four models will be explained through the description of the scope of labour market institutions and their influence on labour market flexibility in the four areas.

##### *The Anglo-Saxon countries*

The Anglo-Saxon countries are the United Kingdom and Ireland. Within the Anglo-Saxon (or Anglo-Irish) model, labour market behaviour is dominated by market forces (Adnett and Hardy, 2005). The role of the government is small; their policy can be described as 'laissez faire'. Regulation is strongly decentralised, the level of collective agreements is low; individual rights are more common. Wages are determined by decentralised bargaining and there are legal minimum wage rates set. (Lodovici, 2000). The variety in working time is high. The Anglo-Saxon countries have low tax and expenditure levels and a low public sector employment rate (Ferrara et al., 2003). The social security levels are low: inactive citizens have no right to make use of social insurance. All possible workers are stimulated

to participate in the labour market (Adnett and Hardy, 2005). The unemployment rates in Anglo-Saxon countries are rather low, but the inequality of wealth and poverty levels within the society are increasing.

#### *The Scandinavian countries*

With the Scandinavian countries we are focussed on Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Finland. The influence of the government in the Scandinavian (or Nordic) model is large; social insurance, redistribution of wealth and the protection of workers are the main points for the government (Adnett and Hardy, 2005). In the Scandinavian countries, social protection is a citizen's right (Ferrara et al., 2003). Government programs are based on the belief that everyone is equal and should have equal rights. The social spending levels of the governments are high and as a result of active labour market programs the labour market participation rates are high. The representation of women in the labour market is also high, the equality of the sexes is stimulated (WRR, 2006). Centralised and coordinated bargaining between unions and employers' associations determine the wage-setting and working time, there are some specific forms of protection for part-time and temporary employment (Lodovici, 2000). The premiums for working overtime are high. Currently, the unemployment rate is growing (Ferrara et al., 2003). The great scope of the welfare state results in high social expenditure rates. The government needs to keep the costs under control. Since the government is the largest employer, the private company employment rate must rise.

#### *Continental Europe*

The countries France, The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Germany and Austria are considered as Continental Europe. Continental Europe (or the Romano-Germanic model) relies on substantive and procedural codes. Government regulation provides social insurance and legal rights for workers and citizens (Adnett and Hardy, 2005). The insurance entitlements are very generous and there is a high protective system of labour law (Ferrara et al., 2003). The passive income maintenance schemes have expanded enormously within the last few decades. In all Continental countries, except The Netherlands, there is not much support for the combination of work and family, which results in a low female employment rate. The continental countries have an occupation-oriented approach. Trade unions and employers associations are very active, bargaining occurs on sector-level (WRR, 2006). Governments do not have great activating labour market policies. Working hours and overtime are strictly regulated, in France working time is defined by law (Lodovici, 2000: 40). The Netherlands and France also have legal minimum wages. Other countries

have collective agreements on sector level who determine wages. The Netherlands has had some reforms, nowadays there is a degree of labour market flexibility in combination with a good level of income security and an expansion of female employment, for example specific protection for part-time and temporary workers (Lodovici, 2000). In France the unemployment is high, but there is also a greater flexibility (Ferrara et al., 2003).

### *Southern Europe*

The Southern European countries are Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece. This model is characterised by uneven development and adverse demographics since the population is ageing (Ferrara et al., 2003). Social security is weakly developed. Family is very important and the households are very extensive and it is common for the family to take care for each other. As a result, family services are underdeveloped and female employment is low. There are problems of efficiency and equity and there are poor educational standards (Ferrara et al., 2003). The overtime premiums are high (Lodovici, 2000). Bargaining takes place on firm-level (WRR, 2006).

Table 3.1. (based on Lodovici, 2000; Ferrara et al., 2003; and WRR, 2006) globally summarises the most important differences between the four socio-economic models in Europe. Although these differences can not be interpreted as strict as shown in this table, it gives a clear view on the main differences in the socio-economic models.

*Table 3.1. European socio-economic models*

	Anglo-Saxon countries	Scandinavian countries	Continental Europe	Southern Europe
Regulatory regime	Liberal	Socio-democratic	Conservative	Conservative
Employment protection	Minimal regulated	Largely regulated	Largely regulated	High employment protection for core workers
Working time regulation	Low	Centralised and coordinated	Strictly regulated	Collective agreements
Wage determination	Decentralised bargaining	Centralised and coordinated bargaining	Collective agreements on sector-level	Bargaining on firm-level
Social security	Low level	High level	Generous level for core workers	Weakly developed, strong role played by families

### **3.3.2. Recent developments**

The differences between the four socio-economic models in Europe have become smaller in the last couple of years (WRR, 2006: 91). Nowadays all European countries are aimed at a higher labour market participation among all different groups in society, more flexible labour markets, better education and social security which give men and women the opportunity to combine work and family life.

### **3.4. Conclusion**

Labour market flexibility is influenced by the socio-economic model. Labour market institutions like the interaction of supply and demand itself; the government; shared norms, habits and values; and interest organisations influence four areas of the labour market. In these four areas (employment protection, working time regulation, wage determination and social security) labour market flexibility can occur, the scope of labour market flexibility is determined by the influence labour market institutions have in these four areas.

There are four different socio-economic models distinguished in Europe: the Anglo-Saxon countries; the Scandinavian countries, Continental Europe and Southern Europe. The influence of institutions on the labour market differs across the socio-economic models. The Anglo-Saxon countries are characterised by decentralisation and a lesser influence of the government and low levels of social security. In the Scandinavian countries, the influence of the government is strong, decision making processes are centralised and social security levels are high. In Continental Europe, citizens are well protected by the government and the level of social security is modest. In Southern Europe, the role of the family is very important, social security levels and family services are very low. Within these socio-economic models, there are national variations.

## Chapter 4.

### Résumé and hypotheses

In the previous two chapters, a theoretical background on the research topic of this thesis was presented. In this chapter the research design and the hypotheses which will be tested in the data analysis will be presented, based on the theories discussed in the theoretical background. Before starting the actual analysis in the next two chapters, the problems with secondary data analyses and researching the labour market in the cultural sector will be described.

#### 4.1. Hypotheses

The main research question is:

*What is the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector?*

In the theoretical background it was shown that the labour market in the cultural sector has some characteristics which result in a greater flexibility than the total labour market. We also saw that the socio-economic model influences the degree of flexibility in the total labour market. Whether the socio-economic model also influences labour market flexibility in the cultural sector is unclear. The following question raises:

*SQ3. What is the dominant factor considering labour market flexibility in the cultural sector:*

- *the influence of the socio-economic model or*
- *the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector?*

To research this question, the following hypotheses must be tested:

*H1) The differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in countries with a different socio-economic model are relevant.*

H2) *The socio-economic model is the explanation for the differences in labour market flexibility in the cultural sectors of different countries.*

If both hypotheses are confirmed by the data analysis in the following chapters, the influence of the socio-economic model is the dominant factor considering labour market flexibility in the cultural sector. If the hypotheses are rejected, the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector are more dominant than the influence of the socio-economic model concerning labour market flexibility in the cultural sector.

## **4.2. Research design**

Since it is impossible to conduct a research in European countries, this thesis is based on a secondary data analysis. To research the differences in labour market flexibility in the cultural sector between the different socio-economic models, from each socio-economic model a country must be chosen to represent the socio-economic model in this research. From the Anglo-Saxon countries, the United Kingdom will be used. From the Scandinavian countries, Finland will be researched. The Netherlands and France represent Continental Europe. These are the four countries from three different socio-economic models in Europe in which research on the cultural sector is best documented (Langenberg and Zuidhof, 2001) and in which language disability is not a restriction. It is not possible to use a country in this research which represents Southern Europe, due to the lack of well-documented research on the cultural sector in the Southern countries (Langenberg and Zuidhof, 2001). Although the lack of representation of the fourth socio-economic model is a restriction in this research, still a valid conclusion on the influence of the socio-economic model can be drawn, based on the representation of three European socio-economic models.

The first hypothesis will be tested in chapter five. *Cultural Statistics* (Eurostat, 2007), a European research on the cultural sector in different European countries is used to compare the degree of labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the different countries. Data on different forms of flexible labour relationships, like self-employment, temporary employment and part-time employment; and data on multiple job-holding indicate the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in the four countries. The results of the four countries will be compared to each other to see whether the differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector are relevant to conclude that the socio-economic model is of influence. A relevant difference indicates that the difference is not based on coincidence data results and the differences have a

meaning. These relevant differences mean that there must be a cause and must be explainable.

The second hypothesis will be tested in chapter six. The differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the different countries which are found in chapter five will be further explored. Possible explanations for the differences between the countries are searched in the socio-economic model of a country. For this analysis, research reports on the labour market in the cultural sector in the specific countries will be used. These research reports can not be compared to each other, since different research methods and definitions are used, but give the opportunity to further explore the findings of chapter five.

### **4.3. Methodological problems**

The main advantage of doing a secondary data-analysis is that it saves a lot of time. The only important requirement of the existing data-archives is that the research methods and definitions are clear and can be verified so the validity of the data can be determined. It would be preferable to analyse the original, unprocessed data-sets but since these are not accessible for students, only data which is already analysed and interpreted by a researcher can be analysed for this research. Therefore, it must be checked for every used data-archive what the purpose of the original study was, how the information is collected, which population is represented and what the conceptual framework was (Seale, 2004). To decide whether the comparison between different data sets is valid, the concepts and definitions used in the different researches must be studied carefully.

There are different forms of research which can be used for a secondary analysis, the two most familiar forms are a survey and a census. A census, which takes into account the whole population of a region or group, is most reliable, because of its great size, coverage and high respond rate (Benhamou, 2000: 302). The advantage of a census in comparison with a survey is that the population is bigger and more representative. A disadvantage is that because of the categorisation where the population is classified into, important information can be missing of a part of the population which is hard to classify in one category. A survey, which is a questionnaire and represents a part of the whole population, mostly can give complete information, but the research population may not be representative.

According to Benhamou (2000: 302), cultural statistics must be interpreted with caution. Because of the narrow scope of some cultural activities, they can not be isolated from other activities and are placed in a category with non-cultural activities. As a result, some cultural activities are not represented in a research. Besides that, the phenomenon

of multiple-job holding is hard to pin down. Cultural workers have several jobs in different labour relations inside and / or outside the cultural sector which mostly can not be captured in censuses (Menger, 2001). The census only gives an overview of the employment status of the worker in the reference week.

As mentioned above, the research report used in chapter five is validly comparable because the data has been collected with the use of the same methodology and definitions for every country. In chapter six, research reports will be used which are not validly comparable, since it concerns national reports based on different methods and definitions. All research reports used are based on national censuses.



## Chapter 5.

# Flexible employment in the cultural sector in Europe

In this chapter, the first part of the data-analysis starts and the following hypothesis will be tested:

*H1) The differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in countries with a different socio-economic model are relevant.*

Firstly, the research report which is used for this data analysis is described. Secondly the actual data-analysis follows. Finally, the hypothesis will be tested in the last paragraph.

### 5.1. Cultural statistics in Europe

To research the degree of labour market flexibility in a country and the relevance of the differences between the three socio-economic models, the publication ‘Cultural Statistics’ by Eurostat (2007) will be used. This publication reports the research on the cultural sector in the European Union-countries and gives an overview of different aspects of the cultural sector.

#### 5.1.1. Data collection

The publication ‘Cultural Statistics’ by Eurostat (Statistical Office of the European Communities) gives an overview of statistics on employment in the labour market of the cultural sector in European countries, based on the European Labour Force Survey taken in 2005. The European Labour Force Survey is a house-hold sample survey which is carried out in the Member States of the European Union four times a year (European Communities, 2003). This survey is part of the national Labour Force Surveys in the European Union Member States, conducted by the national statistical institutes who are responsible for the selection of the samples, the preparation of the questionnaires and the conduction of the direct interviews. The national statistical institutes forward the results to Eurostat, which analyses the results. Because the survey is internationally conducted and the definitions (based on the definitions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation

(ILO)) used are uniform, these data sets can be compared perfectly. Although, the researchers mention that cultural statistics in Europe could be further developed and improved by defining the cultural field punctually and apply more efficient assessment methods to make a better identification of cultural activities in statistics possible (Eurostat, 2007: 5).

Besides a comparison between cultural employment in European countries, this report also compares cultural employment with total employment within each country; total employment includes cultural employment.

**Total employment** = Employees + Non-employees

Total employment covers all persons aged 15 years and over (16 and over in ES and UK; 15-74 years in DK, EE, HU, LV, FI, NO and SE; and 16-74 in IS) who, during the reference week, performed work, even for just one hour a week, for pay, profit or family gain or were not at work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of, e.g., illness, holidays, industrial dispute and education and training.

(Eurostat, 2007: 178)

### 5.1.2. The cultural sector and cultural employment

The definition of the cultural sector used in the report ‘Cultural Statistics’ is based on earlier work done by the European Leadership Group on cultural statistics (LEG). The cultural field is defined by cross-tabulating eight cultural fields and artistic “domains”: artistic & monumental heritage; archives; libraries; books and press; visual arts; architecture; performing arts; and audio & audiovisual / multimedia; with six “functions”: creation; production; dissemination; trade; preservation; and training (Eurostat, 2007; 171). These cultural activities take place in different economic sectors and therefore can not always be identified in the classifications used in the European Labour Force Survey. As a consequence, some statistics are missing for the cultural activities which can not be singled out and examined from the European Labour Force Survey.

The definition of cultural employment is based on the combination of two approaches for analysing cultural employment (European Commission, 2000), which are already mentioned in chapter 2. The first one is “employment in units producing cultural goods and services (NACE Classification)”. The second one is “employment in cultural occupations (ISCO Classification)” (European Commission, 2000; 16). The NACE Classification is comparable to the Dutch *Standaard Bedrijfsindeling* (SBI), the ISCO Classification can be compared to the Dutch *Standaard Beroepenclassificatie* (SBC), made by the Dutch Central Office for Statistics. The combination of these two classifications

would be ideal: cultural employment would cover both employees in the cultural sector and employees in cultural occupations working outside the cultural sector. It is important to keep in mind that these statistics do not describe the labour market for artists, but the labour market for cultural workers. This means besides artists, also non-artistic occupations like stage managers and administrative workers are included. Although, after contact with a member of the workforce on cultural employment from Eurostat, who was involved by the design of the research methodology, it was clear that the NACE and the ISCO classification systems can not be combined without problems. The ISCO Classification is not detailed enough to be combined with the NACE Classification, which is detailed in more digits. The NACE and the ISCO Classifications are two different ways of identifying artists and cultural occupations inside and outside the cultural sector. It is not clear which workers are identified both in the NACE and the ISCO and should be extracted from the research population to prevent double-counts. The exact definition of the cultural workforce researched in this report is thus not clear, but we will assume the data concern both cultural occupations inside and outside the cultural sector, like mentioned in the research (Eurostat, 2007: 53).

## **5.2. Data analysis**

For this research, the data on the flexibility of cultural and total employment in the United Kingdom, Finland, The Netherlands and France will be used. The occurrence of different aspects of labour market flexibility is reproduced in average percentages per country. To see whether the differences between percentages in the four countries are relevant, a limit of 2 percentage points is chosen. When the difference between the percentages in two countries is 2 percentage points or more, the difference can be seen as a relevant difference. When the difference between the percentages in two countries is less than 2 percentage points, the difference between the flexibility of the labour market in the two countries is not relevant. A relevant difference holds that there has to be an explanation other than based on coincidence for the difference in labour market flexibility between two countries. To see how flexibility in cultural employment deviates from flexibility in total employment, the ratio between cultural employment and total employment is calculated for every country. The higher the ratio, the bigger the difference between cultural employment and total employment.

### 5.2.1. Employment status

**Employees** are defined as persons who work for a public or private employer and who receive compensation in the form of wages, salaries, fees, gratuities, payment by results or payment in kind; no-conscript members of the armed forces are also included.

**Non-employees** = Self-employed + Family workers.

- Self-employed persons with employees are defined as persons who work in their own business, professional practice or farm for the purpose of earning a profit and who employ at least one other person.
- Self-employed persons without employees are defined as persons who work in their own business, professional practice or farm for the purpose of earning a profit and who employ no other person.
- Family workers are persons who help another member of the family to run an agricultural holding or other business.

(Eurostat, 2007: 178)

*Table 5.1. Non-employees in cultural and in total employment\**

	Cultural employment	Total employment
United Kingdom	29.7	12.5
Finland	20.0	9.7
The Netherlands	35.1	10.9
France	20.1	9.0

\*Self-employed and family workers, 2005 in %.

*Source:* Eurostat, 2007: 60.

The highest percentage of non-employees in cultural employment is found in The Netherlands (35.1 percent). The percentages of Finland and France are nearly the same (around 20.0 percent), the rate of non-employees in the United Kingdom lies in between these countries (29.7 percent). In total employment, the United Kingdom takes the lead with 12.5 percent non-employed workers. The Netherlands follows with a percentage of 10.9. Also Finland and France have very close rates again (around 9.5 percent). The differences in percentages of non-employees in cultural employment between the four countries are greater than the differences in percentages of non-employees in total

employment. In cultural employment, the difference between non-employment in The Netherlands and in The United Kingdom is relevant. These two countries also differ from Finland and France. The only relevant deviating percentage of non-employees in total employment is present in the United Kingdom.

*Table 5.2. Ratio between non-employees in cultural and in total employment*

United Kingdom	2.38
Finland	2.06
The Netherlands	3.22
France	2.23

When looking at the ratio between cultural employment and total employment, The Netherlands is the deviating country with a percentage of non-employees in cultural employment which is three times as big as the percentage of non-employees in total employment, while in the other three countries, this percentage is twice as big.

There are not extremely striking differences between the occurrence of non-employees in cultural employment in the four countries. The differences between non-employees in cultural employment in the four countries are more relevant than the differences in total employment. The Netherlands has a deviating higher percentage of non-employees in cultural employment and the greatest difference between cultural employment and total employment.

### 5.2.2. Duration of employment contracts

**Employees with temporary contracts** are those who declare that they have a fixed-term employment contract or a job which will terminate if certain objective criteria are met, such as completion of an assignment or return of the employee who was temporarily replaced.

(Eurostat, 2007: 178/179)

*Table 5.3. Workers with temporary jobs in cultural and in total employment\**

	Cultural employment	Total employment
United Kingdom	7.4	5.5
Finland	18.5	17.9
The Netherlands	20.0	14.3
France	24.9	12.0

\*2005 in %.

*Source:* Eurostat, 2007: 62.

France takes the lead with 24.9 percent of the workers having temporary jobs in cultural employment. The Netherlands (20.0 percent) and Finland (18.5 percent) follow with a small difference. The United Kingdom is an exception with a percentage of 7.4 workers with a temporary contract in cultural employment, which is extremely low compared to the other three countries. In total employment, the United Kingdom is also deviating with an exceptionally low percentage of temporary employees. The differences between workers with temporary jobs in total employment in the four countries are greater than the differences in cultural employment.

*Table 5.4. Ratio between temporary workers in cultural and in total employment*

United Kingdom	1.35
Finland	1.03
The Netherlands	1.40
France	2.08

In Finland, the ratio between temporary workers in cultural and total employment is nearly one. The ratio between cultural and total employment of France is deviating from the other three countries. The occurrence of temporary jobs in cultural employment is two times as large as the occurrence of temporary jobs in total employment. In the other three countries it is approximately 1.40 times higher.

The differences in percentages of workers with temporary jobs in total employment are more relevant than the differences in cultural employment. The United Kingdom is the deviating country with extremely low percentages of temporary jobs in cultural as well as

in total employment. The ratio between workers with a temporary job in cultural employment compared to workers with a temporary job in total employment is the largest in France, while there is no relevant difference in Finland.

### 5.2.3. Working hours a week

**Full-time / part-time:** this variable refers to the main job. The distinction between full-time and part-time work is based on a spontaneous response by the respondent. It is impossible to establish a more precise distinction between full-time and part-time employment since working hours differ from one Member State to the next and from one branch of activity to another.

(Eurostat, 2007: 179)

The spontaneous response by the respondent as a graduator for part-time employment is not reliable. One person can find a 30-hour workweek full-time employment, while another person may think he has a part-time job with 32 working hours a week. Interpretations of part-time employment may also differ across countries. Although, these data give a general indication on the occurrence of part-time jobs in the labour markets in the four countries.

*Table 5.5. Workers with part-time jobs in cultural and in total employment\**

	Cultural employment	Total employment
United Kingdom	28.2	25.9
Finland	20.9	13.4
The Netherlands	58.6	45.5
France	24.9	17.6

\*2005 in %.

*Source:* Eurostat, 2007: 62.

In cultural employment, The Netherlands is a high-flyer concerning the percentage of workers with part-time jobs. 58.6 percent of the cultural workers have a part-time job. The other three countries stay far behind this rate (with rates of approximately 24 percent), but do not differ exceptionally relevant from each other. In total employment, The Netherlands also takes the lead with 45.5 percent of workers with part-time jobs. The occurrence of part-time employment in total employment is lower than in cultural

employment in every country. The United Kingdom, Finland and France are similar and The Netherlands has a characteristically high rate both in cultural and total employment. The rates of part-time jobs in total employment in the four countries have a higher variation than in cultural employment.

*Table 5.6. Ratio between part-time workers in cultural and in total employment*

United Kingdom	1.09
Finland	1.56
The Netherlands	1.29
France	1.38

The ratio between cultural and total employment in Finland, The Netherlands and France is nearly the same, approximately 1.40. The ratio of the United Kingdom is too small to be considered relevant.

The Netherlands clearly takes the lead when it comes to the percentage of workers with part-time jobs, in cultural employment as well as in total employment. The differences between workers with part-time jobs in the other three countries are smaller in cultural employment than the differences in total employment. There is no relevant difference between part-time employment in cultural and in total employment in the United Kingdom.

#### 5.2.4. Multiple jobs

Employees with **second jobs** are defined as persons who had more than one job or business during the reference week (not due to change of job or business).

(European Communities, 2003: 47)



*Table 5.7. Workers having second jobs in cultural and in total employment\**

	Cultural employment	Total employment
United Kingdom	6.2	3.8
Finland	8.0	3.7
The Netherlands	13.9	6.1
France	5.9	3.0

\*2005 in %.

*Source:* Eurostat, 2007: 64.

In The Netherlands, the percentage of workers with second jobs in cultural employment (13.9 percent) is more than twice as high than in France (5.9 percent) and the United Kingdom (6.2 percent), while the percentage in Finland is 8.0. In total employment, The Netherlands (6.1 percent) also takes the lead when it comes to the percentage of workers with second jobs. Although this percentage is twice as big as the percentage in France (3.0), the difference with Finland (3.7 percent) and the United Kingdom (3.8 percent) is smaller than in cultural employment. The differences in percentages of workers with second jobs between the United Kingdom, Finland and France are not relevant in total employment. In cultural employment the differences have a greater variation but still are not relevant. The Netherlands is a deviating country with relevant deviating high percentages of workers with second jobs in total as well as in cultural employment.

*Table 5.8. Ratio between multiple-job holding in cultural and in total employment*

United Kingdom	1.63
Finland	2.16
The Netherlands	2.28
France	1.97

There are twice as many workers with second jobs in cultural employment than in total employment in The Netherlands, Finland and France. The ratio between cultural and total employment is a bit smaller in the United Kingdom.

Concerning the occurrence of second jobs, The Netherlands is the deviating country with a high percentage of workers with second jobs in cultural employment as well as in total

employment. The differences between the other three countries are not relevant in total employment and in cultural employment.

### **5.3. Conclusion**

The hypothesis tested in this chapter is:

- H1) The differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in countries with a different socio-economic model are relevant.*

When an overall conclusion is drawn, we see that in every country the percentages of the different features of labour market flexibility are higher in cultural employment than in total employment. Like expected based on earlier research on cultural employment, the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector is greater than the flexibility in the total labour market, two cases excepted. Concerning the different features of the labour market which indicate labour market flexibility, we can conclude that not one country is flexible on all aspects of the labour market in the cultural sector. There can also not be drawn a clear conclusion on whether the socio-economic model influences the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector. The occurrence of flexible relationships in The Netherlands and France, two countries with the same socio-economic model, differs relevant in almost all cases, while the percentages of flexible labour relations in France and Finland, two countries with a different socio-economic model, do not differ relevant in most cases. In part-time employment there is evidence that the socio-economic model could be of influence because the differences between the percentages of part-time employment in the four countries are all relevant. But since the definition of a part-time job in this research is not really precise and clear because it is based on the spontaneous response by the respondent, the relevance of the differences between the countries is discussable. It would be interesting to do further and deeper research on for how many hours a week cultural workers are contracted on average to learn the length of the working week of cultural workers. The differences between the percentages of non-employment, temporary employment and multiple jobs in cultural employment in the four countries are not relevant enough to clearly indicate the influence of the socio-economic model.

Although we can not draw a clear conclusion on what the exact influence of the socio-economic model on labour market flexibility in the cultural sector is, there are some countries that are exceptionally deviating on some features of labour market flexibility. These findings can be distinguished in differences in labour market flexibility in the

cultural sector between the four countries and differences between flexibility in the labour market in the cultural sector and in the total labour market within one country.

*Differences between the four countries*

The following findings are differences in the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector between the four countries.

- I. The United Kingdom has an exceptionally low percentage of temporary employees in both cultural and total employment compared to the other three countries.
- II. The Netherlands has an exceptionally high percentage of part-time labour relationships in both cultural and total employment compared to the other three countries.
- III. The Netherlands has an exceptionally high percentage of second jobs in both cultural and total employment compared to the other three countries.

*Differences between cultural and total employment*

The following findings are differences between the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector and the flexibility of the total labour market within the four countries.

- IV. The difference between part-time employment in cultural and total employment in the United Kingdom is negligible compared to the other countries.
- V. The difference between temporary employment in cultural and total employment in Finland is negligible compared to the other countries.
- VI. The difference between non-employment in cultural and total employment in The Netherlands is exceptionally greater than in the other countries.

- VII. The difference between temporary employment in cultural and total employment in France is exceptionally greater than in the other countries.

These relevant differences will be further explored for each country in the next chapter.

### The influence of the socio-economic model

In the conclusion of the previous chapter, the relevant differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the different countries and striking differences between flexibility in cultural and in total employment within one country were summarised. In this chapter, the second part of the data-analysis starts and these details will be further explored in the United Kingdom, Finland, The Netherlands and France.

*H2) The socio-economic model is the explanation for the differences in labour market flexibility in the cultural sectors of different countries.*

#### **6.1. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the United Kingdom**

From the data analysis in chapter five we concluded that the United Kingdom has an exceptionally low percentage of temporary employees in both cultural and total employment compared to other countries. This could indicate the influence of the socio-economic model of the United Kingdom on labour market flexibility. In part-time employment, the difference between the percentages in total and in cultural employment is negligible. This is odd, because in the three other countries the difference between cultural and total employment is more apparent. In this paragraph these specialities will be further explored and possibly explained by the role of the socio-economic model. First, more information on research in the cultural sector in the United Kingdom is given.

##### **6.1.1. Research in the cultural sector**

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) takes care of the official statistics in the United Kingdom. Besides data on the number of employees and self-employed by occupation, ONS has no specific data available on the labour market in the cultural sector. In order of the Arts Council of England, a research on the artistic labour market in England was conducted by researchers from the Warwick Institute for Employment Research and the Centre for Educational Development Appraisal and Research: Artists in Figures (Davies and Lindley, 2003). This is the only detailed research on artists living in the United Kingdom (the other

three Arts Councils of Great Britain did not conduct such a research). This research only covers artists in England, but since England has the most inhabitants and the greatest surface of all countries of the United Kingdom, this research is used to further investigate the different striking details of the flexibility of the labour market of artists in the United Kingdom.

In Davies and Lindley (2003), data from the United Kingdom Labour Force Survey are used. The Standard Occupational Classification (SOC, which can be compared to the Dutch SBC) is the main classification for the statistical information collected in the Labour Force Survey. From this classification, cultural occupations are extracted, including managers and technicians working in a cultural organisation. The pool of cultural labour on which the research is based is wider than only artistic occupations, but does not include all workers in the cultural sector. Administrative workers in the cultural sector, which we assume are included in the research by Eurostat (2007), are not included in the English research. The Labour Force Survey makes a distinction between workers in a cultural occupation as a main job and workers in a cultural occupation as a second job. Workers who are employed in a cultural occupation both in their main and second job in the reference week are only considered in their main occupation, to prevent double-counts in the pool of cultural labour. Since the sample size of the pool of cultural labour is rather small, the results from different editions of the Labour Force Survey are merged to get reliable data. The analysis in the report is based on Labour Force Surveys from March - May 1997 to December - February 2000.

### **6.1.2. Temporary employment**

The research by Eurostat (2007) showed that the percentage of temporary workers in both cultural employment and total employment in the United Kingdom is exceptionally low compared to the other three countries. In cultural employment, 7.4 percent of the employees had a temporary job in 2005, in total employment this percentage was 5.5 (Eurostat, 2007).

The research by Davies and Lindley (2003) confirms the low occurrence of temporary employment in England, but also shows another remarkable fact which was not visible in the data of Eurostat (2007).

*Table 6.1. Permanent or temporary employment in main job\**

	Cultural occupation	Non-cultural occupation
Permanent	92.9	93.0
Not permanent in some way	7.1	7.0
Total	100	100

\*Averages 1997-2000 in %, employees only.

*Source:* Davies and Lindley, 2003: 22.

Table 6.1. shows that the difference between temporary employment in cultural occupations (7.1. percent) and in non-cultural occupations (7.0 percent) is not as relevant as shown earlier in the research by Eurostat. The English research concerns the years 1997-2000, while the research by Eurostat concerns the year 2005. The percentage of temporary employment in non-cultural occupations is higher in the English research (2003) than in the research by Eurostat (2007). Since the definition of temporary employment is the same and only employees are included in both researches, the only possible explanation is that the occurrence of temporary employment in non-cultural occupations decreased between 2000 and 2005.

Table 6.2. gives us a better insight in the different types of temporary employment in cultural occupations and in non-cultural occupations in England.

*Table 6.2. Type of temporary employment in main job\**

	Cultural occupation	Non-cultural occupation
Seasonal work	7.4	6.3
Contract for fixed period, fixed task	68.7	47.0
Agency temping	3.0	14.1
Casual work	10.4	20.5
Non-permanent in some other way	10.4	12.1
Total	100	100

\*Averages 1997-2000 in %, employees only.

*Source:* Davies and Lindley, 2003: 23.

- Workers in **seasonal employment** are workers who hold contracts of employment where the timing and duration of the contract is significantly influenced by seasonal factors such as the climatic cycle, public holidays and/or agricultural harvests.
- Employees with **fixed-term** contracts are “regular employees” whose contract of employment specifies a particular date of termination.
- **Agency temping** concerns workers who hold contracts of “paid employment” from one organisation, but who work at the site of and/or under instructions from a second organisation which pays the first organisation a fee for their services.
- **Casual workers** are workers who have a contract of employment which is not expected to continue for more than a short period, whose duration is to be determined by national circumstances.

(Office for National Statistics, 2006: 21-22)

In cultural occupations, a contract for a fixed period or a fixed task is the most common form of temporary employment (68.7 percent). Employees in cultural occupations employed by a working agency are very uncommon, only 3.0 percent is temporary employed in this way. With a percentage of 47.0, contracts for a fixed period or fixed task are also the most common form of temporary employment in non-cultural occupations, but clearly less used than in cultural occupations. In contrast with employees in cultural occupations, agency temping (*uitzendovereenkomst* in The Netherlands) is a common form of temporary employment in non-cultural occupations. The occurrence of casual work in non-cultural occupations (20.5 percent) is higher than in cultural occupations (10.4 percent). Seasonal work is not very popular in all occupations. From this table we can conclude that workers who are temporary employed, mostly are hired for a fixed period or fixed task. Besides casual work in non-cultural occupations, other forms of temporary employment are rare in England.

As we read in chapter 3, an important characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon socio-economic model is minimal government regulation of the labour market (Adnett and Hardy, 2005). Social security and employment protection are low in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Since protective legislation on fixed-term workers and agency workers in the United Kingdom is very weak, it would be expected that the use of flexible employment relationships like temporary workers would be much higher than in other European countries. However, employees with a so called traditional permanent labour relationship are also generally weakly protected by legislation in the United Kingdom compared to the other countries. The option for employers to choose flexible labour relationships over permanent labour relationships is less attractive than in countries where employment protection on traditional labour relationships is much stronger (Deakin and Reed, 2000).



This is a logical explanation why the occurrence of temporary employment in the United Kingdom is extremely lower than in the other European countries.

### 6.1.3. Part-time employment

The research by Eurostat (2007) showed that the difference between part-time employment in cultural employment (28.2 percent) and in total employment (25.9 percent) in the United Kingdom in 2005 is negligible (Eurostat, 2007; 62). This is remarkable, compared to the other countries, where part-time employment in cultural employment is at least 29 percent higher than in total employment.

Davies and Lindley (2003) use the same definition of part-time employment as Eurostat (namely based on the spontaneous reaction of the respondent). In table 6.3. a distinction between part-time employment by employees and self-employed in both cultural and non-cultural occupations in the main job is made.

*Table 6.3. Incidence of part-time employment in main job\**

	Cultural occupation	Non-cultural occupation
Employees	14.3	26.3
Self-employed	29.5	20.8

\*Averages 1997-2000 in %.

*Source:* Davies and Lindley, 2003: 31.

When the distinction between employees and self-employed concerning the occurrence of part-time employment is made, the differences between cultural and non-cultural occupations seem greater at first sight. The percentage of employees in non-cultural occupations in part-time employment (26.3 percent) is higher than the percentage of employees in cultural occupations in part-time employment (14.3 percent), but the percentage of self-employed in non-cultural occupations in part-time employment (20.8 percent) is lower than the percentage of self-employed in cultural occupations in part-time employment (29.5 percent). When the weighted averages of employees and self-employed in part-time employment in cultural occupations are compared to the weighted averages of employees and self-employed in part-time employment in non-cultural occupations, we expect the average percentages do not differ too much. The occurrence of part-time employment in cultural and in non-cultural occupations in England do not differ too much

from each other, but when a distinction between employees and self-employed is made, relevant differences appear in part-time employment.

Davies and Lindley (2003) also researched the average working hours a week for employees and self-employed in cultural and in non-cultural occupations.

*Table 6.4. Average actual hours worked in main job\**

	Cultural occupation	Non-cultural occupation
Employees	34	32
Self-employed	31	38

\*1997-2000.

*Source:* Davies and Lindley, 2003: 33.

While the incidence of part-time employment of employees and self-employed seemed to differ in cultural and in non-cultural occupations, table 6.4. shows that the actual working hours a week in the main job of employees do not have a relevant difference in cultural and in non-cultural occupations. In the average working hours a week in cultural and in non-cultural occupations we find small differences, but again the percentages cross each other so the averages of working hours in cultural and non-cultural occupations do not differ that much from each other. Self-employed in non-cultural occupations work in proportion more hours than self-employed in cultural occupations. Table 6.4. also confirms that the working hours of people in cultural occupations are very similar to the working hours of people in non-cultural occupations.

Table 6.5. shows the reasons why employees and self-employed in cultural and non-cultural occupations are in part-time employment.

*Table 6.5. Reasons for part-time employment in main job\**

	Cultural occupation		Non-cultural occupation	
	Employees	Self-employed	Employees	Self-employed
Could not find a full-time job	11.7	15.6	10.9	10.6
Did not want a full-time job	76.3	76.0	73.4	82.5
Other reasons	12.0	8.4	15.7	6.9
Total	100	100	100	100

\*Averages 1997-2000, in %.

Source: Davies and Lindley, 2003: 32.

The majority of all workers in cultural and non-cultural occupations are voluntary part-time employed, especially self-employed in a non-cultural occupation. Reasons to be in part-time employment are more often similar for employees in cultural and non-cultural occupations than for self-employed in cultural and non-cultural occupations. Compared to the other categories, self-employed in cultural occupations are more often in part-time employment because they could not find a full-time job than employees in cultural occupations and employees and self-employed in non-cultural occupations.

The research by Davies and Lindley (2003) confirms that the difference between part-time employment in cultural and in non-cultural occupations in England is rather small, while the differences between part-time employment in cultural and in non-cultural occupations in the other countries are relevant (see table 5.6. ). When a subdivision of employees and self-employees in part-time employment is made, we see small differences between cultural and non-cultural occupations. Within cultural occupations we see that self-employed are more often part-time employed, not because they do not want a full-time job but because they could not find one. The amount of second jobs can correlate with the occurrence of part-time employment in the main job, but the occurrence of second jobs in the United Kingdom does not differ from the other three countries (see table 5.7.). Based on the available data, a logical explanation of this detail can not be found.

## **6.2. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in Finland**

In chapter five we saw that Finland has no extreme deviating low or high percentages of flexible labour relations in cultural employment compared to the other three countries. The only striking detail is that there is no relevant difference between the percentages of

temporary employment in cultural employment and in total employment. In this paragraph, this detail will be further explored and will be searched for a possible explanation. First, the context of research on the labour market in the cultural sector in Finland is described.

### **6.2.1. Research in the cultural sector**

The Arts Council of Finland has been doing research on the economic situation and labour market status of artists since 1988 (Karhunen and Rensujeff, 2002). For many years, the Arts Council has conducted research with different methodological frames. From 1988 to 1996, a few studies were conducted based on data from the taxation register and grant registers. The main problem with these studies was that the data from the taxation register could not give information on income sources due to the nature of the register. Next to these studies, some complementary surveys on special groups of artists (for example art university graduates) were conducted. Although these researches were comparable to some extent, there was a need for one uniform methodological frame to get a complete overview of the economic situation and labour market status of all artists in the different artistic fields in Finland.

In 2001, a new, large scale survey was launched in order to get actual data from artists in all art fields with the use of a uniform methodological frame (Karhunen and Rensujeff, 2002 / Rensujeff, 2003). The survey - carried out in 2001 with a postal questionnaire about the year 2000 - concerned questions about the artistic occupation, length of career, standard of education and vocational training, labour market status, multiple job-holding, taxable income, grants, professional expenses, working hours and significance of grant income. The condition to be considered as an artist was the membership in a professional arts association or to be a state grant recipient. Although this report gives information on the number of self-employed and multiple job-holding, no information on temporary employment can be found in the research report.

### **6.2.2. Temporary employment**

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, there is some data available on the labour market for artists in Finland. Unfortunately, from the research of Rensujeff (2003) - the most complete research on the labour market for artists so far - only an English summary is freely available. The complete research is published in Finnish, but not freely available. The available data (the English summary by Rensujeff, 2003) on the flexibility of artists' labour markets do contain information on the occupational status and multiple-job holding

of Finnish artists, but no information on temporary employment. The data do not show interesting new details on the flexibility of the labour market for artists in Finland. There can not be found a possible explanation for the small difference between temporary jobs in cultural and in total employment based on these data.

### **6.3. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in The Netherlands**

When we compare labour market flexibility in cultural and total employment in The Netherlands to the other three countries, The Netherlands is deviating more flexible in part-time employment and in second jobs, in both cultural and total employment than the other three countries. The difference between the percentage of non-employees in cultural employment and in total employment is very wide in The Netherlands, when compared to the differences in the other three countries at this point. In this paragraph, the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in The Netherlands is closely explored for possible explanations which may indicate the role of the socio-economic model. Firstly, the context of research on the labour market in the cultural sector is described.

#### **6.3.1. Research in the cultural sector**

The CBS, the Central Office for Statistics in The Netherlands, researches different aspects of the labour market. There are some general data on the cultural sector available, like information on the number of arts organisations, cultural participation and government spending on culture. The data available on the labour market is only detailed on sector level, based on the classification of the *Standaard Bedrijfsindeling (SBI)*. Culture is classified under “Culture and other services” (SBI '93, 90-93: Cultuur en overige dienstverlening), which also includes environmental services, interest organisations, sports and recreation and other services.

In 2007, the first specified research on artists in The Netherlands was conducted (Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar, 2007), in order of the *Stichting Kunstenaars&CO*, a Dutch foundation who promotes the interests of artists, culture and entrepreneurship. The aim of the research was to get a better image of the persons working as an artist and their working circumstances. To see the similarities and differences between artists and the whole Dutch working population, these results of the study were compared to each other.

Similar like the research by Eurostat, the data on job characteristics were extracted from the *Enquête Beroepsbevolking*, the Dutch Labour Force Survey, an ongoing survey which is taken on a sample of the Dutch population (people from 15 to 64 years old who

are living in The Netherlands). The results of the survey are based on the situation of the respondents in the week the survey was taken. The results of the Labour Force Survey were complemented with demographical data from the *Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie* (a municipal database), and data on earnings from labour from the *Sociaal Statistisch Bestand* (a database with social statistics).

In cooperation with *Stichting Kunstenaars&CO*, the researchers extracted the occupations from the *Standaard Beroepenclassificatie 1992* (the Dutch standard occupational classification) which could be characterised as an artistic occupation. An important criterion to consider an occupation as an artistic one is the possibility to work with artistic autonomy in that occupation. Both artists working in the cultural sector and artists working outside the cultural sector are included in this research. Supporting staff in the cultural sector like technical workers or administrative workers are not included in this research. This research population is wider than the Finnish research population, where only artists with a membership in a professional arts association or state grant recipients are acknowledged. However, the Dutch research population is smaller than the English research population, where cultural occupations like technicians and artistic managers were included.

To make sure the results of the sample population are representative for the whole population of artists in The Netherlands, the results are weighted and incremented with fixed increment weights calculated for the *Enquête Beroepsbevolking*. The number of artists in The Netherlands is not large enough to get reliable and detailed results from the *Enquête Beroepsbevolking* taken in one year. Therefore, the *Enquête Beroepsbevolking* of three years (2004, 2005 and 2006) are used. The results in this research are the averages of these three years together. Davies and Lindley (2003) used the same methodology in their research in England, where the research population of cultural occupations in one year also was too small to get reliable data from. Because there are so many artistic occupations and the number of artists working in these occupations is rather small, the research can not give detailed and reliable information on specific occupations. To keep the results reliable, the occupations of artists are aggregated into three clusters: design & architecture; dance, theatre and music; and visual arts, language & other.

### 6.3.2. Part-time employment

The European research on cultural employment by Eurostat (2007) gave an indication on the division of full-time and part-time employment in cultural employment (58.6 percent of workers with part-time jobs) and total employment (45.5 percent of workers with part-time jobs) in The Netherlands. The definition of part-time employment gave no

information on the actual hours a week cultural workers are hired. The Dutch research (Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar, 2007) makes a division of 0 - 19 hours; 20 - 34 hours; and more than 35 working hours a week. The research from Eurostat (2007) indicated that 58.6 percent of workers in cultural employment have a part-time job. The data in table 6.6. only includes artists working in- and outside the cultural sector.

*Table 6.6. Artists and working people by working hours a week\**

	Artists	Working people
0-19 hours	15	19
20-34 hours	26	24
>35 hours	58	56
Total	100	100

\*Averages 2004-2006, in %.

*Source:* Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar, 2007: 27.

Most artists (58 percent) are working more than 34 hours a week, which can be considered as a full-time job. 26 percent is working 20 - 34 hours a week; 15 percent is working 19 hours or less. When the working hours a week in of working persons are compared to the working hours a week of artists, there are no great differences. The percentages of all working people correspond to the percentages of artists concerning the working hours a week. When the percentage of artists in The Netherlands are compared to the percentage of workers in cultural employment (58.6 percent of the workers have a part-time job (Eurostat, 2007) ), it states that workers in cultural employment generally work less hours a week than artists working in- and outside the cultural sector. However, we do not exactly know whether the research population of Eurostat (2007) differs that much from the research population in Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar (2007). The vague definition of part-time employment in the research by Eurostat makes it difficult to compare the data. This could be the main reason why the results of the two research projects are very different.

The percentages of part-time jobs in cultural employment and in total employment in The Netherlands do not differ much, while they are very high compared to the percentages of the other countries. This means an explanation for the high percentage of part-time employment should not be found in special characteristics in the cultural sector, but in the socio-economic system of The Netherlands. Since France is also a Continental country with the same socio-economic model as The Netherlands, but does not have a

similar high rate of part-time employment, a country-specific explanation must be searched for. Earlier researches display the rise in female employment in The Netherlands as the cause for the exceptionally high occurrence of part-time employment. Until the 1970's, female participation in the Dutch labour market was below averages when compared to other countries (Visser, 2002). After this time period, female participation in the labour market expanded quickly to a level above the European average. An especially high number of married women entered the labour market. Women were able to follow higher education and shifted from housewifery to paid employment. The government supported employees and employers to make part-time working relationships, to increase labour market participation of the youth and women. Since childcare provision was not supported by the Dutch government, women managed part-time jobs with their family life. During the eighties, part-time jobs expanded rapidly, most of these jobs were occupied by women (Visser, 2002). The Dutch government created a social safety net for part-time workers. The protection for flexible workers like part-time workers was greater than in other countries. In combination with a modest level of social security this makes it possible for people to work in part-time employment, this is also called 'flexicurity' (Gorter, 2000).

### **6.3.3. Multiple jobs**

The percentage of second job holders in The Netherlands is larger in cultural employment than in total employment, but both percentages are proportionally higher than the percentages of second job holders in the other three countries. The Netherlands is a country where second jobs has already been established. In the research by Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar (2007), no further information on multiple jobs of artists in The Netherlands is present. As we read in chapter two, the occurrence of second jobs can be linked to other forms of flexible labour relations, like part-time employment and self-employment. Since The Netherlands also has exceptionally high rates of part-time employment in both cultural and total employment compared to other countries, this relates to the high percentages of second jobs.

### **6.3.4. Non-employment**

The research by Eurostat (2007) shows that The Netherlands has the highest percentage of non-employees in cultural employment, namely 35.1 percent. In total employment, 10.9 percent is self-employed. Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar (2007) use the same definition of non-employment (but call it self-employment) and also cover the year 2005. table 6.7.



shows that 55 percent of all artists working in and outside the cultural sector is self-employed.

*Table 6.7. Artists and working people by labour market position\**

	Artists	Working people
Employed	46	89
Self-employed	55	11
Total	100	100

\*Averages 2004-2006, in %.

*Source:* Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar, 2007: 28.

Since the Dutch research only includes artistic occupations in- and outside the cultural sector and the European research also includes non-artistic occupations inside the cultural sector, the higher percentage of self-employed in the Dutch research indicates that especially people working in artistic occupations in- and outside the cultural sector are self-employed. Data on the percentages of self-employed specified by sectors provide a better insight in the division of self-employed artists among sectors.

*Table 6.8. Artists working in self-employment by most common sectors\**

Artists working in self-employment apropos to all artists	
Industry	22
For-profit service activities	55
Culture and other non-profit services	74
Total	54

\*Averages 2004-2006, in %.

*Source:* Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar, 2007: 10.

As we can see in table 6.8., the percentages of self-employed artists working outside the cultural sector (in the sectors Industry (22 percent) and Business services (55 percent) ) are lower than the percentages of self-employed artists working inside the cultural sector (and other services). The artists working inside the cultural sector are more often self-employed, namely 74 percent. We can conclude that the inclusion of non-artistic cultural

workers in the European research explains the lower rate of self-employees in the European research (although we are not completely sure about the definition of cultural occupations used in the research by Eurostat, 2007). Compared to the total of working people, especially artists working inside the cultural sector are much more often self-employed.

Table 6.9. shows self-employment among artists by clusters.

*Table 6.9. Self-employment among artists by clusters\**

	Design and architecture	Dance, theatre and music	Visual arts, language and other art forms
Employed	57	49	17
Self-employed	43	52	88
Total	100	100	100

\*Averages 2004-2006, in %.

*Source:* Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar, 2007: 28.

In the visual arts, language and other art forms, most artists are self-employed (88 percent). In dance, theatre and music 50 percent all workers are self-employed. Design and architecture is the cluster with the least self-employed artists, namely 43 percent.

A striking fact about the flexibility in the labour market of cultural workers is that the percentage of self-employed in The Netherlands is higher than in the other countries, while the percentage of self-employed in total employment in The Netherlands is close to the percentages of self-employed in total employment in the other countries. Artists in The Netherlands, especially artists working inside the cultural sector, are proportionally more self-employed than non-artistic occupations compared to the other three countries. Similar like in other countries, artists working in the visual arts, language and other art forms are mostly self-employed. The percentage of self-employed in dance, theatre and music in the Netherlands is relatively high. There is one typically Dutch special form of regulation, which concerns performing artists and could be a possible explanation for the high rate of self-employment among performing artists. This special tax rule only concerns the non-employed performing artists and is called the *Artiesten- en beroepsportersregeling* (Performing artists and professional athletes scheme). Performing artists who are not employed and can not meet the requirements to be declared as an independent artist, fall in between two labour groups: the employed, whose employers pay income taxes and have right to social security benefits, and the self-employed, who pay

their own income taxes and do not have right to unemployment benefits. For this group of freelance artists, a special law is made to let them be able to claim social security benefits (Wijn, 2004). A fictive employment relation occurs between the one who gives the mission and the worker. The firm pays labour taxes and the artist has right to social security benefits when needed. This special rule is only valid for agreements for a period shorter than three months. At the beginning of 2004, 13.000 current fictive labour relations between firms and performing artists existed (Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid, 2005: 28). According to Jenje-Heijdel and ter Haar (2007: 28), the average number of self-employed artists in dance, theatre and music between 2004 and 2006 was 8.900. Although these data are hard to compare, it is clear that the fictive labour relation between artists and firms is very common among performing artists in The Netherlands. Molenaar (2004) questions the effectiveness of the *Artiesten- en beroepssportersregeling*, because some artists who are not declared to be self-employed do not have access to the employees insurances. Comparing the percentages of self-employed in different cultural occupations in The Netherlands to the same data in other countries could give more insight on whether the explanation of a high percentage of self-employed in the cultural sector compared to the total labour market in The Netherlands indeed can be explained by the *Artiesten- en beroepssportersregeling*.

#### **6.4. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in France**

In chapter five we saw that France is not extremely deviating in any form of flexible employment compared to the other countries. One striking thing was that the difference between temporary contracts in cultural employment and temporary contracts in total employment is proportional higher in France than in the other three countries. In this paragraph we find an explanation for this detail.

##### **6.4.1. Research in the cultural sector**

The official statistical organisation which collects data on the economy and employment in France is *l'Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques* (l'INSEE). L'INSEE produces data on the French population and employment, but there are no specific data available on employment in the cultural sector. There are statistical departments of ministries who collect data on specific topics. For culture this is the *Département des Études et de la Prospective et des Statistiques* (DEPS), which is a part of the French Ministry of Cultural and Communication. DEPS produces statistics on cultural employment, funding of cultural activities and cultural education.

Every year, DEPS produces key figures on the cultural sector in France: Les Chiffre Clés (Lacroix, 2009). Next to detailed data on different forms of art, also government expenditures on culture, artistic education and cultural employment are published. Data come from different sources. The main source is *l'enquete Emploi de l'Insee*, the French Labour Force Survey. In *l'enquete Emploi de l'Insee*, two approaches are used apart from each other to classify the respondents. First, working people are classified according to the *nomenclature nationale des professions et categories socioprofessionnelles* (PCS, which can be compared to the Dutch SBC), the French occupational classification in which working people are classified to their (cultural) occupation. The second approach is the *Nomenclature d'activites francaise* (Naf, which can be compared to the Dutch SBI), the classification which classifies working people into the sector of activities they are working in. Another source used in this research is the *Caisse des conges spectacles* which collects data from people working in the live performances sector. The *Centre de sociologie du travail et des arts* (CESTA) analysed these data and made them usable.

#### 6.4.2. Temporary employment

The difference between temporary work in cultural and in total employment is much greater in France than in the other three countries. In table 6.10. we see that the percentage of temporary contracts in cultural employment is almost three times as high as temporary contracts in total employment.

Table 6.10. Cultural occupations and total active workforce by permanence of jobs\*

	Audiovisual and live performance	Visual arts and crafts	Literature	Total cultural occupations	Cultural occupations	Total active workforce
Temporary	58	18	15	34		13
Permanent	42	82	85	66		87
Total	100	100	100	100		100

\*Averages 2005, in %.

Source: Lacroix, 2009: 218.

Table 6.10. also provides a distinction in cultural occupations. This distinction shows that not all cultural occupations have a high percentage of temporary contracts. Especially

people working in cultural occupations in the audiovisual and live performance sector are temporary employed (58 percent).

Table 6.11. makes a distinction between performing artists and supporting staff in the audiovisual and live performance sector.

*Table 6.11. Audiovisual and live performance occupations by permanence of jobs\**

	Performing artists	Supporting staff
Temporary	81	42
Permanent	19	58
Total	100	100

\*Averages 2005, in %.

*Source:* Lacroix, 2009: 218.

Table 6.11. shows that especially the performing artists working in audiovisual and live performance occupations are more often temporarily employed (81 percent), compared to the supporting staff (42 percent).

In France, temporary workers are called *intermittents*, which means in between jobs. Lacroix (2009) shows more detailed information on *intermittent* workers in 2005. This information was provided by the *Caisse des congés spectacles* and analysed by the *Centre de sociologie du travail et des arts*. The *Caisse des congés spectacles* is a state-approved employer's association which provides a paid holiday service for live performing artists and technicians who are not continuously employed by one employer, the *intermittents* ([www.conges-spectacles.com](http://www.conges-spectacles.com)). Just like employees who are continuously employed, live performing *intermittents* have rights to get a paid holiday, no matter what type of employment contract they have. A restriction is that the working period must be at least 24 weeks or the employee must have 24 payslips during one year. Employers are obligated to subscribe to the *Caisse des congés spectacles* and pay contributions. These data only contain information on intermittent employees who are reported by their employers to the *Caisse des congés spectacles*, other labour activities or income sources of the *intermittents* are excluded. Self-employed are not included in these dates, but among cultural occupations in the live performing arts most artists are employed (88 percent employees against 12 percent self-employed, averages in 2005 (Lacroix, 2009: 218)).

Table 6.12. Labour market of the intermittents du spectacle\*

	1990	2000	2005
Actual intermittents ( <i>persons</i> )	57 254	110 914	125 808
Intermittent contracts ( <i>thousands</i> )	371	1 104	1 794
Total volume of work ( <i>thousand days</i> )	4 441	6 750	7 666
Average duration of a contract ( <i>days</i> )	12,0	6,1	4,3
Average number of contracts per intermittent	6,5	10,0	14,3
Average annual volume of work per intermitents ( <i>days</i> )	77,6	60,9	61,0

Source: Lacroix, 2009: 224.

Table 6.12. gives an insight into how many *intermittent* workers and contracts are present. It appears that the *intermittents* on average had 14,3 contracts in 2005. The average duration of an *intermittent* contract was 4,3 days, which means the average days an *intermittent* works a year in their *intermittent* status was 61 days. This is not very extensive, compared to the number of working days of employees hired on a permanent basis.

Table 6.13. Intermittents du spectacle by cultural occupation\*

	Total ( <i>persons</i> )	Average annual volume of work ( <i>per intermittent in days</i> )
Performing artists	66 601	44
Supporting staff	22 577	87
Technicians	31 610	74
Scenery workers	4 609	84
Other	411	77
Total	125 808	61

\*2005.

Source: Lacroix, 2009: 225.

Table 6.13. shows that the *intermittent* performing artists have the least days of work a year. Supporting staff (87 days), technicians (74 days), scenery workers (84 days) and other

workers (77 days) all have an amount of working days above the average. Workers in supporting occupations work more days a year than performing artists.

The Netherlands, which has the same socio-economic model as France, does not have a great difference between temporary contracts in cultural and in total employment. A special unemployment insurance scheme for *intermittent* artist and technicians in the live performance sector in France is the reason why the percentage of temporary contracts in cultural employment is substantially higher than the percentage of temporary contracts in total employment in France. The French law sets *intermittent* employees with a temporary employment contract on the same level as employees with a permanent contract, since they both are contracted by an employer with a decision-making authority (Menger and Gurgand, 1996). This scheme gives *intermittent* employees the same rights as permanent employees, *intermittent* workers also have rights to an unemployment insurance. The fees for the unemployment insurances are paid by both employers and employees. As long as a performing artist, technician or other supporting worker spends enough employed hours in their cultural occupation in the performing arts, they can make use of the unemployment scheme. The minimum hours which must be worked in one year to meet the qualification requirements for unemployment insurances for *intermittent* workers is 507 hours (Menger and Gurgand, 1996: 380). Next to this special scheme for *intermittent* performing artists, there is another scheme which *intermittent* workers can also apply for: the French Act on continuing vocational education ([www.afdas.com](http://www.afdas.com); Ijdens and Langenberg, 2008). This scheme gives employees, including temporary employees, rights to follow professional training throughout the year, until a certain amount of hours. The scheme is funded by the firms, who pay a certain percentage of the employees' wage as a contribution. The fact that this scheme is also accessible for temporary workers indicates that temporary workers in the cultural sector in France have special rights, just like long-term employees, which is not very common in every country.

## **6.5. Conclusion**

The hypothesis tested in this chapter is:

*H2) The socio-economic model is the explanation for the differences in labour market flexibility in the cultural sectors of different countries.*

For all the details found in the data-analysis of chapter five, is explored whether or not they could be explained by differences in the socio-economic model of a country.

*Differences between the four countries*

The following findings from chapter five are differences between the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in the different countries.

- I. The United Kingdom has an exceptionally low percentage of temporary employees in both cultural and total employment compared to the other three countries.

The exceptionally low percentage of temporary employees can be explained by the absence of government regulation which prevents employers to fire employees who have a permanent contract. Employers do not have exceptionally high costs when they fire permanent employees because this is not very well restricted. It is not necessary to hire employees on a temporary basis. This socio-economic characteristic is typical for Anglo-Saxon countries.

- II. The Netherlands has an exceptionally high percentage of part-time labour relationships in both cultural and total employment compared to the other three countries.

The rise of female participation in the labour market and the support of part-time labour relations by the government caused an exceptionally high percentage of part-time labour relationships in both cultural and in total employment in the Netherlands. It does not concern an explanation by the socio-economic model, but a country-specific explanation.

- III. The Netherlands has an exceptionally high percentage of second jobs in both cultural and total employment compared to the other three countries.

The exceptionally high percentage of second jobs in both cultural and in total employment can be linked to the high percentage of part-time jobs in both cultural and total employment in The Netherlands. The explanation for a high occurrence of part-time employment in The Netherlands is country-specific.



### *Differences between cultural and total employment*

The following findings from chapter five are differences between the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector and the flexibility of the total labour market within the different countries.

- IV. The difference between part-time employment in cultural and total employment in the United Kingdom is negligible compared to the other countries.

Based on the available data on the labour market in the cultural sector in the United Kingdom, there is not found a logical possible explanation for the small difference between the occurrence of part-time jobs in cultural and total employment.

- V. The difference between temporary employment in cultural and total employment in Finland is negligible compared to the other countries.

Due to the lack of relevant data on temporary employment in the cultural sector in Finland, there is not found a logical possible explanation for the small difference between cultural and total employment.

- VI. The difference between non-employment in cultural and total employment in The Netherlands is exceptionally greater than in the other countries.

The *Artiesten- en beroepssportersregeling*, a country-specific form of regulation in The Netherlands which gives self-employed performing artists rights to social insurances, can be an explanation for the high occurrence of non-employment in cultural employment.

- VII. The difference between temporary employment in cultural and total employment in France is exceptionally greater than in the other countries.

A special unemployment insurance scheme and a professional training scheme accessible for temporary employed workers in the performing arts in France is the explanation for the high occurrence of temporary employment in the cultural sector in France. This is a country-specific explanation.

This thesis started with a theoretical exploration in chapters two and three, followed by the research design in chapter four. Actual data analysis was carried out in chapter five and six, which leads to this concluding chapter: the answer to the main research question. In the second paragraph of this chapter some implications for further research will be set out.

#### 7.1. Answer to the research question

Before answering the main research question, first the sub questions will be answered.

*SQ1. Labour market flexibility in the cultural sector:*

- a. What is understood by a flexible labour market?

In chapter two, the flexibility of labour markets was explained. The need for more flexible labour markets is the result of the growing competition pressure in the economy, which forces organisations to be as effective and efficient as possible. To be able to adjust their production capacity to the rapidly changing economic circumstances, organisations need to have possibilities to make adjustments in the production factor labour. Flexible labour relations give them this opportunity. There are different forms of labour market flexibility: numerical, functional and wage flexibility. Numerical flexibility can be divided into external numerical flexibility, where employers can make adjustments in the scope of labour in their organisations through the hiring and firing of employees; and internal numerical (or working time) flexibility, where changes in the working hours a week or year of employees are made. The other two forms of labour market flexibility are functional flexibility, where employees (partly) change functions; and wage flexibility, where levels and structures of employees' wages are changed. There are three different flexible labour relations: self-employment, part-time employment and temporary (or fixed-term) employment. The different labour relations can also be combined, fixed-term contracts can be on a part-time basis for example. These flexible labour relations indicate the scope of internal and external numerical flexibility. It is difficult to research functional flexibility and wage flexibility, the changes made in functions and wages is hard to measure. Flexible

labour markets are indicated by high ratings of flexible labour relations like self-employment, part-time employment, temporary employment and multiple-jobholding.

b. How flexible is the labour market in the cultural sector?

The labour market in the cultural sector was explored in the second chapter. The scope of the labour market in the cultural sector depends on which definition of the cultural sector is used. The cultural sector in a strict sense only includes the artists who create cultural products. The broader definition also includes cultural workers producing, distributing and retailing the cultural products. There are some characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector: the rate of self-employment is high, the distribution of income is very skewed, there is an oversupply of workers, multiple-jobholding is a very common phenomenon and artistic training is not that significant for a job in the cultural sector. These characteristics imply that the labour market in the cultural sector tends to be more flexible than the general labour market. Explanations for this statement are the unstable demand which combines with cultural products and services and the project-based character of the cultural sector.

*SQ2. The influence of the socio-economic model:*

a. What is the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of markets?

As earlier explained in chapter three, the structure, scope and power of labour market institutions on the labour market and cultural preferences characterises the socio-economic model. Labour market institutions, like the market principles itself; the government; community institutions and social networks; and interest organisations; influence their regulative power on four areas of the labour market: the scope of employment protection; working time regulation; the determination of wages; and the scope of social security. The flexibility in these four areas as a result of governance by the labour market institutions determines the flexibility of the labour market.

b. What are the characteristics of the different socio-economic models in Europe?

The four socio-economic models distinguished in Europe were described in chapter three: the Anglo-Saxon countries; the Scandinavian countries, Continental Europe and Southern

Europe. The influence of institutions on the labour market differs across the socio-economic models. The Anglo-Saxon countries are characterised by decentralisation, a small influence of the government and low levels of social security. In the Scandinavian countries, the influence of the government is large, decision making processes are centralised and social security levels are high. In Continental Europe, citizens are well protected by the government and the level of social security are modest. In Southern Europe, the role of the family is very important, social security levels and family services are minimally developed. Within these socio-economic models, there are national variations.

*SQ3. What is the dominant factor considering labour market flexibility in the cultural sector:*

- *the influence of the socio-economic model or*
- *the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector?*

To answer this question, two hypotheses were tested in chapters five and six.

*H1) The differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in countries with a different socio-economic model are relevant.*

In chapter five, in the four countries the occurrence of flexible labour relationships (self-employment, temporary employment, part-time employment and multiple job-holding) in the cultural sector was compared to each other, by means of a secondary-data analysis of a European research report (Cultural Statistics, 2007). The conclusion of that chapter was that there are indeed differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the different countries, but not as striking as expected based on the theoretical background. The main findings were that The Netherlands (twice) and the United Kingdom are relevantly deviating from the other countries on different aspects of labour market flexibility. Another striking finding in the data analysis in chapter five was that in some countries the differences between flexible employment in cultural employment and total employment within the country was strongly deviating from the differences between flexible employment in cultural and in total employment within other countries. In the United Kingdom and Finland there was no relevant difference in some cases, while you would expect the labour market in the cultural sector to be more flexible than the total labour market. In two other cases the difference between flexibility in cultural and in total

employment in France and in The Netherlands was larger than would be expected when looking at the differences within the other countries.

*H2) The socio-economic model is the explanation for the differences in labour market flexibility in the cultural sectors of different countries.*

Whether or not the relevant differences between the countries we found in chapter five are caused by socio-economic factors was researched in chapter six by analysing data on the labour market in the cultural sector in the specific countries. The conclusion from that chapter is that differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in the four countries can be explained by socio-economic (in the case of the United Kingdom) or country-specific characteristics (in the case of The Netherlands). Very small differences between flexible employment in cultural and in total employment within a country can not be explained based with the available data. Extremely great differences between flexible employment in cultural and in total employment within a country can be explained by country-specific factors (in the case of The Netherlands and France).

The answer to the question whether the influence of the socio-economic model or the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector is the dominant factor concerning labour market flexibility in the cultural sector can not be clearly given. In general, there are dominant differences between the labour market in the cultural sector and the total labour market in every country (except in the case of two forms of flexible labour relations in the United Kingdom and in Finland). In some cases of flexible labour relations in some countries this difference between cultural and total employment is larger. When the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in different countries is compared, the role of the socio-economic model is visible, however this role differs across countries and across the different forms of flexible labour relationships. When the influence of governance in the socio-economic model (or country) is large, the special characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector are even more visible. The influence of the socio-economic model and the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector can not be seen apart from each other. It can not be determined which factor has a greater influence on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector, because the socio-economic model influences the special characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector.

Now the sub questions of this research are answered, an answer to the main research question can be formulated:

*What is the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector?*

Because the exact influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector is hard to define, the influence of the socio-economic model is compared to the influence of the characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector in the third sub question, the answer to the third sub question is already given. The characteristics of the labour market in the cultural sector can not be excluded, because they influence the degree of flexible labour relations. Just like in the total labour market, the socio-economic model of a country influences the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector. The influence of the socio-economic models differs across different forms of flexible labour relations and across countries. In countries where the government plays a larger role in the socio-economic model, the influence of the socio-economic model strengthens the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector compared to the total labour market.

## **7.2. Implications**

In this thesis, an effort is made to research the influence of the socio-economic model on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector. This research is not exhaustive. As a student, it is impossible to conduct a research in different countries yourself which includes all artists and their flexible labour relations to get a complete view on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector. This thesis is based on the analysis of available data collected by other researchers. Although the data used in the analysis of the different countries in chapter five are perfectly comparable, there is still some ambiguity on the exact definitions used in the research. As a result, it is not very clear what is exactly meant by the labour market in the cultural sector. That makes it difficult to further research the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in the particular countries in chapter six, since in national research again other definitions of the cultural labour force are used.

From every socio-economic model, one or two countries which are best documented on the labour market in the cultural sector are chosen to represent the socio-economic model. These countries represent the national variations on the socio-economic models. To actually research the influence of the socio-economic model, all labour markets in the

cultural sector in all countries of a socio-economic model should be researched. These results can be compared to the results of countries in another socio-economic models to get a complete impression on the influence of the socio-economic model. However, before the different countries can be compared, the research on the labour market in the cultural sector in every country should be comparable.

More European discussion about researching the labour market in the cultural sector and more exchanges of thoughts on research in the cultural sector are needed. Even within national research, methodological problems on researching the cultural sector are present. An attempt to uniform statistics is already made by the research of Eurostat in 2007, but this research is not exhaustive. More collaboration between the statistical offices of different countries is needed, not only to develop international research but also to learn from each other to improve national research on the labour market in the cultural sector.

It would also be interesting to carry out research on which aspects of the socio-economic model influence labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in every country. In chapter six an attempt is made to explain differences between flexibility in the countries by prominent aspects of the socio-economic model (or national variations on it). Very exhaustive research on the exact influence of government regulation on the occurrence of different flexible labour relations in countries is not done but would be interesting. Other countries can learn from these findings, however they should be interpreted with care because the regulation in one socio-economic model may have a different effect on labour market flexibility in another socio-economic model.

### *Discussion*

Looking back at the research of Benhamou (2000), which was the motivation for this research, there are some similarities between this research and hers. In both researches, the data used had its limitations, which makes it hard to draw clear conclusions. However, both researches coped with the methodological difficulties and concluded with some interesting findings which can be explained by country-specific differences. Comparing these findings to theories on the differences between the socio-economic models and the influence of the socio-economic model on labour market performances, we may conclude that not the socio-economic model predominates differences in labour market performances, but country-specific elements could be better explanations for differences between labour market flexibility in the cultural sector in different countries. In this research, some special government schemes are pointed out which influence the occurrence of labour market flexibility in the cultural sector. It must be kept in mind that these special schemes may influence the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural

sector in one country, they may have another effect on the flexibility of the labour market in the cultural sector in another country. Like discussed earlier, not only government regulation or the influence of labour market institutions are forms of country-specific elements, also cultural preferences can play a major role in labour market performances.



### 8.1. Literature

Abbing, H. 2002. *Why are artists poor? The exceptional economy of the arts*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Abbing, H. 2003. Support for artists. In: R.M. Towse (ed.) *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 437-444.

Adler, M. 1985. Stardom and talent. *American Economic Review*, 75 (1), 208-12.

Adnett, N. 1996. *European labour markets. Analysis & policy*. London: Longman.

Adnett, N. and S. Hardy. 2005. *The European Social Model. Modernisation or Evolution?* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Alexander, V.D. 2003. *Sociology of the arts: exploring fine and popular forms*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Benhamou, F. 2000. The opposition between two models of labour market adjustment: the case of audiovisual and performing arts activities in France and Great Britain over a ten year period. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 24 (4), 301-319.

Blanchflower, D.G. 2000. Self-employment in OECD countries. *Labour Economics* 7, 471-505.

Borjas, G. J. 2005. *Labor economics*. New York: McGraw - Hill / Irwin.

Brinkhorst, L.J.; M.C. van der Laan and K. van Gennip. 2005. *Ons creatieve vermogen. Brief cultuur en economie*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur & wetenschap.

- Capiau, S., A. Wiesand et al. 2006. *The status of artists in Europe*. Brussels: European Parliament. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/expert/eStudies.do?language=EN>
- Creigh-Tyte, A. and B. Thomas. 2001. Employment. In: S. Selwood (ed.) *The UK Cultural Sector; Profile and Policy Issues*. London: Policy Studies Institute, 251-274.
- Davies, R. and R. Lindley. 2003. *Artists in figures. A statistical portrait of cultural occupations*. Arts Council England, Research report 31.
- Deakin, S. and H. Reed. 2000. River Crossing or Cold Bath? Deregulation and Employment in Britain in the 1980s and 1990s. In: G. Esping-Andersen and M. Regini (eds) *Why Deregulate Labour Markets?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115-147.
- European Commission. 2000. *Cultural Statistics in the EU. Final report of the LEG*. [http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/dsis/edtcsl/library?l=/public/culture/leg\\_culture\\_report/EN\\_1.0&a=d](http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/dsis/edtcsl/library?l=/public/culture/leg_culture_report/EN_1.0&a=d)
- European Communities. 2003. *The European Union labour force survey. Methods and definitions - 2001*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Parliament. 2000. *Presidency Conclusions. Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March*. [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm)
- Eurostat. 2007. *Cultural Statistics*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Ferrara, M., A. Hemerijck and M. Rhodes. 2003. Recasting European Welfare States. In: J. Hayward and A. Menon (eds) *Governing Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 346-366.
- Filer, R. K. 1986. The “starving artist”-myth or reality? Earnings of artists in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94 (1), 56-75.
- Frey, B.S. and W.W. Pommerehne. 1989. *Muses and Markets. Explorations in the Economics of the Arts*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gorter, C. 2000. The Dutch Miracle? In: G. Esping-Andersen and M. Regini (eds) *Why Deregulate Labour Markets?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 181-210.

Ijdens, T. 2002. *Schots en scheef. Artistiek werk tussen markt en organisatie*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Ijdens, T. and B.J. Langenberg. 2008. *Dancers Keep Moving. International careers and transition*. Tilburg: IVA Policy Research and Consultancy.

Jenje-Heijdel, W. and D. ten Haar. 2007. *Kunstenaars in Nederland*. Voorburg / Heerlen: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, Centrum voor Beleidsstatistiek, Publication no. 07005.

Karhunen, P. and K. Rensujeff. 2002. *Preliminary Findings from a Survey on the Economic and Labour Market Situation of Finnish Artists*. Helsinki: Arts Council of Finland.

Klau, F. and A. Mittelstadt. 1986. *Labour Market Flexibility*. OECD Economics and Statistics Department. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/25/35558438.pdf>

Lacroix, C. 2009. *Chiffres Clés 2009. Statistiques de la Culture*. Paris: La Documentation Française, Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication.

Langenberg, B.J. and P.-W. Zuidhof. 2001. *At best an impressionistic collage: organisation and funding of the performing arts in the European Union*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Reserach Centre for Arts and Culture.

Langenberg, B.J. 2008. *Syllabus De Arbeidsmarkt in de Culturele Sector*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit Roterdam.

Lodovici, M.S. 2000. The dynamics of labour market reform in European countries. In: G. Esping-Andersen and M. Regini (eds) *Why Deregulate Labour Markets?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 30 - 65.

Marshall, A. 1989. The sequel of unemployment: The changing role of part-time and temporary work in Western Europe. In: G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers (eds) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation: The growth of atypical employment in Western Europe*. Brussels: International Institute for Labour Studies, 17-48.

Menger, P.-M. 2001. Artists as workers: Theoretical and methodological challenges. *Poetics* 28, 241-254.

Menger, P.-M. and M. Gurgand. 1996. Work and compensated unemployment in the performing arts. Exogenous and endogenous uncertainty in artistic labour markets. In: V.A. Ginsburgh and P.-M. Menger (eds) *Economics of the Arts - Selected Essays*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 347-381.

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. 2005. *Adviesaanvraag over de Personenkring werknemersverzekeringen*. <http://parlis.nl/pdf/bijlagen/BLG7084.pdf> (Annex: [http://docs.minszw.nl/pdf/35/2005/35\\_2005\\_3\\_8479.pdf](http://docs.minszw.nl/pdf/35/2005/35_2005_3_8479.pdf))

Molenaar, D. 2004. De illusies van de artiesten- en beroepssportersregeling. *Weekblad fiscaal recht* 6587, 19 augustus, 1111-1118.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2000. *OECD Employment Outlook Chapter 5: The partial renaissance of self-employment*. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/44/2079593.pdf>

Office for National Statistics (ONS). 2006. *LFS Classifications*. Labour Force Survey User Guide Volume 5. [http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme\\_labour/Vol5.pdf](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_labour/Vol5.pdf)

Paxson, C.H. and N. Sicherman. 1996. The Dynamics of Duo Job Holding and Job Mobility. *Journal of Labor Economics* 14 (3), 357-393.

Regini, M. 2000. The dilemmas of labour market regulation. In: G. Esping-Andersen and M. Regini (eds) *Why Deregulate Labour Markets?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 11 - 29.

Rensujeff, K. 2003. *The Status of the Artist in Finland - Report on Employment and Income Formation in Different Fields of Art (English Summary)*. Helsinki: Arts Council of Finland, Research Reports of the Arts Council of Finland, Publication no. 27.

Rosen, S. 1981. The economics of superstars. *The American Economic Review* 71 (5), 845-858.

Seale, C. 2004. Using data archives for secondary analysis. In: C. Seale (ed) *Researching Society and Culture*. London: SAGE Publications, 355-366.

Shisko, R. and B. Rostker. 1976. The Economics of Multiple Job Holding. *The American Economic Review* 66 (3), 298-308.

Throsby, D. 1994. A work-preference model of artist behaviour. In: A. Peacock and I. Rizzo (eds.) *Cultural Economics and Cultural Policies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 69-80.

Towse, R. M. 2001. Creativity, Incentive and Reward. An Economic Analysis of Copyright and Culture in the Information Age. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ven, G. van de, H. Don and S. Ederveen. 2008. Terugkeer naar de veertigjarige werkweek. *ESB* 93 (4540), 460-462.

Visser, J. 2002. The first part-time economy in the world: a model to be followed? *Journal of European Social Policy* 12 (1), 23-42.

Wijn, J.G. 2004. *Evaluatie Artiesten en Beroepssportersregeling*. 's Gravenhage: SDU Uitgevers. Kamerstukken II 2003/04 , 29 606, nr. 1. (Obtained through <http://parlando.sdu.nl/cgi/login/anonymous>)

WRR. 2006. *De verzorgingsstaat herwogen. Over verzorgen, verzekeren, verheffen en verbinden*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

WRR. 2007. *Investeren in werkzekerheid*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

## **8.2. Internet resources**

AFDAS (Fonds d'assurance formation des secteurs de la culture, de la communication et des loisirs, France)

[www.afdas.com](http://www.afdas.com)

Arts Council England

<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/>

Arts Council of Finland

<http://www.taiteenkeskustoimikunta.fi/>

Caisse des congés spectacles (Fund of Employment Leave, France)

<http://www.conges-spectacles.com/>

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (Central Bureau of Statistics, The Netherlands)

<http://www.cbs.nl/>

European Commission

<http://ec.europa.eu/>

European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research

<http://www.ericarts.org/>

Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques (National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, France)

<http://www.insee.fr/>

International Labour Organisation

<http://www.ilo.org/>

Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication (Ministry of Culture and Communication, France)

<http://www.culture.gouv.fr/>

Ministerie van Economische Zaken (Ministry of Economic Affairs, The Netherlands)

<http://www.ez.nl/>

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, The Netherlands)

<http://www.minocw.nl/>

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, The Netherlands)

<http://www.minszw.nl/>

Office for National Statistics, United Kingdom

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/>

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

<http://www.oecd.org/>

Statistics Finland

<http://www.stat.fi/>

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (Scientific Council for Government Policy, The Netherlands)

<http://www.wrr.nl/>

## EU Classification of Economic Activities

### NACE Rev 1.1

NACE Rev. 1.1 is the EU classification of economic activities. It is built on a four-digit level:

level 1: 17 sections identified by letters A to Q;

intermediate level: 31 sub-sections identified by two-letter alphabetical codes;

level 2: 62 divisions identified by two-digit numerical codes (01 to 99);

level 3: 224 groups identified by three-digit numerical codes (01.1 to 99.0);

level 4: 514 classes identified by four-digit numerical codes (01.11 to 99.00).

Cultural activities can be found under sections D, G, K and O of the NACE Rev.1.1 classification.

The detailed list of classes partly or totally including cultural activities is as follows:

#### **D Manufacturing**

DE Manufacture of pulp, paper and paper products; publishing and printing

22 Publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media

22.1 Publishing

22.11 Publishing of books

22.12 Publishing of newspapers

22.13 Publishing of journals and periodicals

22.14 Publishing of sound recordings

#### **G Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal and household goods**

GA Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal and household goods

52 Retail trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles; repair of personal and household goods

52.4 Other retail sale of new goods in specialised stores

52.47 Retail sale of books, newspapers and stationery



## **K Real estate, renting and business activities**

### KA Real estate, renting and business activities

#### 74 Other business activities

74.2 74.20 Architectural and engineering activities and related technical consultancy

## **O Other community, social and personal service activities**

### OA Other community, social and personal service activities

#### 92 Recreational, cultural and sporting activities

##### 92.1 Motion picture and video activities

92.11 Motion picture and video production

92.12 Motion picture and video distribution

92.13 Motion picture projection

##### 92.2 92.20 Radio and television activities

##### 92.3 Other entertainment activities

92.31 Artistic and literary creation and interpretation

92.32 Operation of arts facilities

##### 92.4 92.40 News agency activities

##### 92.5 Library, archives, museums and other cultural activities

92.51 Library and archives activities

92.52 Museums activities and preservation of historical sites and buildings

This list does not cover the cultural field exhaustively. Some cultural activities cannot be identified and measured. Either they are included in or hidden under a class at a higher level or they are distributed between several classes, e.g. the antiques trade. Some cultural activities are not classified at all in the NACE Rev. 1.1 nomenclature, e.g. multimedia and video games. The new revised NACE Rev. 2 nomenclature introduces a fuller list of cultural activities, thus offering better coverage of the cultural field.

*Source:* Eurostat, 2007: 171-172.

## International Standard Classification of Occupations

### ISCO 88

The International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) is one of the main international classifications for which the ILO (International Labour Organisation) is responsible. It belongs to the international family of economic and social classifications.

**ISCO-88 (COM)** is the European Union variant of the International Standard Classification of Occupations. ISCO-88 (COM) should not be regarded as a different classification from ISCO-88, but rather as the result of a coordinated effort to implement ISCO-88 for census and survey coding purposes. There are 10 levels in the ISCO-88 (COM) classification and cultural classes can be found under levels 2 “Professionals” and 3 “Technicians and associate professionals”.

### **ISCO-88 (COM) classes covering cultural occupations**

214 Architects, engineers and related professionals

2141 Architects, town and traffic planners

243 Archivists, librarians and related information professionals

2431 Archivists and curators

2432 Librarians and related information professionals

245 Writers and creative or performing artists

2451 Authors, journalists and other writers

2452 Sculptors, painters and related artists

2453 Composers, musicians and singers

2454 Choreographers and dancers

2455 Film, stage and related actors and directors

313 Optical and electronic equipment operators

3131 Photographers and image and sound recording equipment operators

347 Artistic, entertainment and sports associate professionals

3471 Decorators and commercial designers

3472 Radio, television and other announcers

3473 Street, night-club and related musicians, singers and dancers

3474 Clowns, magicians, acrobats and related associate professionals

This list does not cover the cultural field exhaustively. Some cultural occupations cannot be identified and measured. Either they are distributed between several classes or they are included in or hidden under a class at a higher level. Film producers, for example, are included in class 1229 “Production and operations managers not elsewhere classified”. Some cultural occupations are not classified at all in the ISCO-88 (COM) nomenclature (e.g. multimedia artists).

*Source:* Eurostat, 2007: 172-173.