

QUT Digital Repository:
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>



Furneaux, Craig W. and Brown, Kerry A. and McCabe, Angela C. (2008) *Managing multi-objective building contracts : public art in public building procurement*. In: 22nd ANZAM Conference 2008 : Managing in the Pacific Century, 2 – 5 December 2008, Auckland, New Zealand.

© Copyright 2008 [please consult the authors]

Managing multi-objective building contracts: public art in public building procurement

Craig Furneaux

School of Management, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Email: c.furneaux@qut.edu.au

Professor Kerry Brown*

School of Management, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Email: ka.brown@qut.edu.au

Angela McCabe

School of Management, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Email: a.mccabe@qut.edu.au

* Presenting author

Managing multi-objective building contracts: public art in public building procurement

ABSTRACT

While the procurement of public works such as schools, bridges, train stations and roads is a well accepted contract management role of government in most OECD countries, the management of the provision of public art as part of such activities is not as well known. This paper provides an in depth analysis of the specific case of public art embedded in public works procurement in Queensland. While confirming expected benefits identified in the literature, such as economic benefits for artist, this case study extends our understanding of the costs and benefits of managing public art projects through an extended analysis of the views of various stakeholders in the procurement process.

Key words: public art, stakeholder engagement, costs and benefits

Acknowledgement: Funding for this project was provided by the Cooperative Research Centre for Construction Innovation, as part of a larger grant examining a number of social policies embedded in public works contracts.

Governments in Australia are engaged in the contract management of the construction of a variety of public works such as roads, rail and schools. While the delivery of specific built assets is accepted as part of the role of government, the delivery of social outcomes embedded in such procurement activities is not as well known or understood. Watermayer (2000) suggests that procurement linked to social objectives may produce positive economic benefits including acting as a stimulant to economic activity, improving competitiveness with other sectors, redressing regional disparity, promoting employment of those in disadvantaged employment groups, allowing environmental sustainability and developing markets for locally sourced labour and products. However, the mix of market and state-driven imperatives in contractual arrangements is not without problems. Potential difficulties identified by Watermayer (2000) include issues of overburdening administrative capacity of governments in procurement oversight, creating unfair competition, compromising value for money in projects, creating a situation in which the private sector is unable to deliver efficient and effective projects and exposing government to high level risk.

However, embedding social outcomes in public works procurement contracts raises a number of challenges, as it adds to the complexity of the deliverables for a given contract and public art is no exception to this rule. Adding a requirement to produce functional, public artworks to the specification of contracts for the construction of public buildings is an innovative but complex policy instrument. Firstly, the specification of the artwork is difficult as perceptions of the quality and style of the artwork is not easy to distil from the 'public'. It is argued 'good art' is difficult to achieve contractually beforehand (McCarthy 2006) due to different perceptions between stakeholders about what 'good art' looks like. Even after completion, considerable controversy can surround a particular piece of art (Heartney 2005), and this can result in ongoing expense to improve or remove the artwork (Conner, Brockway and Henning 1994).

Thus public art is held to provide a number of costs and benefits, and perceptions of these appear to vary between various stakeholders. This paper undertakes an extended analysis of the perceived costs and benefits associated with the management of the provision of public art embedded in public works procurement in Queensland. Firstly, an overview of public art is undertaken and then the paper outlines the program of percent for art as a specific funding mechanism. The paper concludes that a percent for art program takes time to develop and implement, however, the overriding consideration in the management of percent for art programs that deliver functional art through multi-objective contractual arrangements, is that it delivers community artworks and an extended arts industry to the community.

BACKGROUND: WHAT IS PUBLIC ART?

Public art is aimed at the general community and is designed for open access viewing rather than 'private' viewing in galleries (Miles 1997; Fleming and Goldman 2005; Hein 2006). Public art includes traditional art, sculpture and installations as well as visual technological art pieces (Lacy 1995). Public art is typically installed in public space and public buildings (Armajani 2004). It is this very public, and often non-optional, viewing of public art which is a key distinction compared to private art which people choose to see. An art gallery displays art for interested parties to view, however public art is visible to those entering public buildings for another purpose, and citizens are exposed to the art on display in that location (Fleming and Goldman 2005). It is the propensity for art to challenge and critique the status quo, presents a particular

challenge for public art works, which clashes with the role of public space as an open community space that is free from confronting imagery¹ (Levine 2002). The visibility of public art thus creates difficulties due to its ‘inescapability’ (Sharp, Pollock and Paddison 2005).

Various funding mechanisms exist for the procurement of public art. The main approaches to the funding of public art are either through direct funding, in the form of tenders, subsidies, grants, and the various percent for art schemes, or to indirect funding, where government provides incentives or tax benefits for individuals and firms which subsequently invest in public art (Strom and Wyszomirski 2004). This report examines percent for art programs as specific funding mechanism for public art.²

Percent for art policies that require artworks to be included as part of the contractual arrangements for the construction of public buildings are prevalent in many countries of the world and form a significant part of funding for the visual arts (Hall and Roberston 2001). Buenders (2007, 49) notes that ‘percent of art’ policies in most countries in the West require that a certain percentage of the construction costs be spent on public, functional art in or outside a public building, and that these policies “were all about changing the environment – and the citizens themselves – for the better”.

Thus, percent for art policies are explicitly concerned with achieving multiple social outcomes through the procurement of public works.

Benefits of public art

A detailed overview of the perceived benefits of public art derived from the literature is provided in Table 1:

[insert Table 1 here]

Such benefits are not a free good however, and there are numerous costs associated with the delivery of percent for art programs.

¹ It is this propensity for public art to confront and provoke, which can prove to be a major difficulty for government funding of public art, a point which shall be returned to later.

² It is important to distinguish between the various funding mechanisms for public art, as different funding mechanisms (e.g. funding from a single cash pool) may introduce different organisational dynamics which in turn may affect the outcomes of the policy.

Costs of public art projects

For public art the specification and measurement of 'good art' is exceedingly difficult, as there can often be a difference of opinion between artists, government and community as to what constitutes 'good art'. The difference of opinion as to what is 'good' or 'poor' art takes a number of forms.

Firstly, public art can be viewed by artists as bland, or user friendly art (McCarthy 2006). The limitation here is that stakeholder bargaining sessions embedded in the procurement of Percent for Art process, tend to result in art that is more palatable to the majority of the public and is therefore less confronting or objectionable (Hein 2006), and, to artists, less like art. A second difference of opinion is where public art which is viewed by the community as objectionable (McCarthy 2006). Here the artist produces art without taking into consideration the needs, desires, or views of the community. It is when public art is objected to by its intended audience, that governments have the most difficulty, particularly as it was paid for by public funds (Brooks 2001). Many authors have argued that the best way to overcome this potential detrimental outcome, is to engage representatives of the community in the decision making process early and throughout the process of creating the public art (Lidman and Bisesi 2005). A third difference has been termed the 'commoditisation of art' (Miles 1997), where art is viewed as a commodity as opposed to meaningful expression of the artist or local community. The commoditisation of art involves artwork that does not hold any meaning for the local community and is art for art's sake, rather than public art. A fourth difference is where public art as a replication of official aims of the public sector (McCarthy 2006), and not necessarily of the community it is placed within. Examples of this might be art whose purpose is to further the objectives of a given government, which meant that it is government art, or public sector art, rather than public art. Finally, the last difference is where the art has multiple interpretations. The multiple interpretations may result in difficulty in reading and understanding public art (Hein 1996), or to a polarisation of the public perceptions on a particular piece of art.

Summarising these differing views then, Brecknock (1992, 6–7) argues that

...the big question with regard to true Public Art is how to achieve a blend between high standards of artistic merit while at the same time developing public ownership of the work. The challenge is to find ways of providing mechanisms for community consultation

and participation in decision making process. Without doubt this is one of the most complex issues facing the government agencies; they are caught between a rock and a hard place.

Percent for Art as a policy attempts to address this difficulty as the art work is procured as a percentage of a larger suite of public works, which means that the procurement of the artwork often involves the inclusion of a large range of stakeholders – the owners of the building, the architect, the department of public works who are managing the construction process, together with end users of the building (Department of Culture and the Arts 2003). It is this "partnership in public procurement" (Erridge and Greer 2002) which is held to enhance trust and other positive externalities, important elements which shall be returned to at a later point.

One of the potential sources of difficulties in engaging multiple parties to decision making process in Percent for Art projects, however, occurs when there are differing goals between artists, government and the public who are the end beneficiaries of any piece of public art (McCarthy 2006). Difficulties in this relationship emerge as the various stakeholders have different goals and these goals are in conflict (Trimarchi 2003, 373). The end outcome of a given percent for art project is also typically quite difficult to specify contractually, due to potential differences of opinion among those who are involved in the process (Brecknock 1992, 6–7). In this sense, the outcomes of public art projects are considered highly complex, as the specific outcome cannot be predetermined.

In percent for art projects, these information problems are typically compounded by the relatively large number of parties involved in the development of the art work. Parties include the artist, who is contracted to provide the art work; the art coordinator or curator, who provides expert advice on the planning and delivery of percent for art; community representatives – who provide specific information about the site, including information on the locality's history and inhabitants; the architect – who has to accommodate the percent for art into the overall project, and the public works coordinator who has overall supervision of the construction process (Department of the Arts 1990).

However, weighed against these contracting complexities are a number of other considerations. First, many percent for art schemes aim to promote an open dialogue between artists and the community members

(Lidman and Bisesi 2005). That is, percent for art schemes aim, in part, to maximise the number of participants and should, therefore, be evaluated, in part, against this objective. Fleming and Goldman (2005) argue additionally that the involvement of multiple individuals in the decision making process improves the quality of the art work (Fleming and Goldman 2005). Supporting this, a number of authors have identified that the inclusion of community via percent for art schemes helps reduce the risk of ‘plop art’ or ‘plonk art’, that is, artwork that is neither integrated to the building nor into the culture of the community, and is therefore derided by the community it was meant to benefit (Conner, Brockway and Henning 1994; Heartney 2005; Anderson 1998). Adams (1997) asserts further that community participation within the commissioning process of public art provides benefits for the community members. Specifically, the experience of being part of the development of public art may provide the opportunity for community members to develop “their capabilities as active citizens in shaping the environment in the future” (Adams 1997, 237).

METHODOLOGY

Case studies provide for in-depth analysis of a particular issue or technology as it impacts an organisation or industry. Case studies in the area of policy have been called for as a way of advancing public policy practice (Osborne & Brown, 2005).

Semi-structure interviews were used to collect data from industry participants on the costs and benefits of percent for art policies. Semi-structured interviewing was selected as it is important when conducting exploratory studies – particularly in order to find out what is actually happening in practice (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2000, p.245). The sample was based initially on purposive sampling (Zikmund, 2003, p.383) as respondents with particular expertise concerning public art procurement were considered the most critical informants for this research. A total of 13 in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with stakeholders in Queensland. Interviews were conducted with a range of stakeholders involved in the planning and delivery of public art projects in Queensland, including Artists, Client Representatives, Curators, Project Managers and Policy Officers over a period of 6 months.

Interviewees were provided with opportunities to review and correct interview summaries and summary tables of the research, by which means members of the sample checked both the data and the interpretation

of the data for accuracy, thereby considerably strengthening the internal validity of the research (Mertens, 2005). A summary of the interviews undertaken is below in Table 2:

[insert table 2 here]

Individual informants have been de-identified and any commercial in-confidence information has not been divulged. The names of specific government policies have not been obscured as most of this information is already freely available, either on the Internet or in public libraries.

FINDINGS

The Art Built-In Policy of the Queensland Government

The Queensland policy for inclusion of public art as a percentage of building works is the *Art Built-In* policy³.

The stated purpose of the *Art Built-In* policy was:

... allocating 2% of the total value of State Government capital works building projects for public art. The purpose of the policy is to ensure that cultural expertise and contemporary discourse and an integral part of shaping the built environment and influencing the spirit of place. The policy aims to maximise the social, cultural and economic benefits that will result from a heightened quality, experience and understanding of Queensland's public places (Art Built-In Policy and Guidelines 2004).

The *Art Built-In* policy is implemented through requiring capital works projects valued at more than \$250,000 to allocated 2% of the total budget (excluding government fees and charges), and this allocation occurs at the business case stage of the planning of new capital works, as part of the *Capital Works Management Framework*. Over \$27 million dollars worth of art has been commissioned in Queensland since the inception of the program, generating significant employment opportunities for artists in Queensland. Academic research into the costs and benefits of public art projects, such as *Art Built-In*, are very limited.

³ It is important to note that the *Art Built-In* policy has been recently replaced in Queensland by the *art+place* policy, following a review by the Queensland Government. As no new commissioned public art projects funded under this new policy have yet to be finalised, it is not possible to undertake research on the implications of the new policy. Consequently this report will focus on the *Art Built-In* policy instead.

Arts Queensland, through its Public Art Agency is the sponsoring body of the *Art Built-In* policy and is responsible for its implementation. Specifically the Public Art Agency assists in best practice commissioning of public art, providing assistance to government agencies to audit and manage their existing public art collection, providing policy advice on allocation of monies for public art from capital works budgets. The Public Art Agency provides ongoing evaluation of the *Art Built-In* policy, for the provision of ongoing policy advice to government and to government agencies. The Public Art Agency also is responsible for developing a whole of government strategy for the audit and management of the Government Public Artworks Collection, including de-accessioning and disposal of artworks. The Public Art Agency also has an advocacy role in promoting public art in Queensland.

The focus of the analysis is on the costs and benefits of the Art Built-in policy as perceived by the various stakeholders. The costs and benefits associated with the Art Built-in policy are analysed based on data collected through interviews with significant stakeholder groups, including artists, client representatives, curators, project managers and policy officers. This data identified each groups' perceptions of the costs and benefits involved with the policy.

The costs and benefits associated with the Art Built-in policy varied depending on the stakeholder group involved. Within the report, costs and benefits mentioned are considered significant if the costs and benefits have occurred across at least two interviewees within each interview category.

Costs of the Art Built-In Policy

Time was the main cost associated with the Art Built-in policy. Time involved the extra time required to complete projects, project delays, and the time to coordinate meetings. For Artists it is the time needed to research concept ideas and artwork materials, and for Clients it is the time required within extra meetings.

As noted in the literature review, a key public policy difficulty in delivering public art policies is the need to develop a high calibre art product, which is at the same time valued by the communities in which they are located (Brecknock 1992, 6–7). This difficulty is overcome in the *Art Built-In* policy through investment

of time by all of the stakeholders in regular meetings. Extended dialogue ensures that poor art is avoided – both for the artist as well as for the client. Thus time, while a significant cost mentioned by all stakeholders, was considered an essential ‘investment’ in order to create a ‘good’ outcome for the project. Another cost associated with the Art Built-in policy was the financial pressure on the Artists, and the costs involved in developing new skills. A summary of the costs indicated in the interviews is provided in Table 3, below.

[Insert Table 3 here]

As this table shows, while a number of costs had been predicted in the literature, there were also a number of novel findings from the interviews. While time was expected – the extent of time being mentioned (virtually every interviewee) was surprising. It should be emphasised however, that time was seen as necessary in order to produce a good outcome. Indeed in order to produce ‘good art’ as outlined in the introduction, adequate engagement with stakeholders is a matter of necessity.

What was not expected, was the extent of skill development required by artists to be successful. Skills identified by artists included project management skills, small business management, preparing and presenting art proposals, and working with other people involved in the project. Additionally, while the income from Art Built-In was considered very valuable, the small amounts involved in some projects created challenges for some artists.

Benefits of the Art Built-in policy in Queensland

A number of benefits from the Art Built-in policy have been identified through the interview process. The major benefits derived from the Art Built-in policy included benefits for the Artists, benefits for the building, cultural benefits and potential benefits. These are summarised in Table 4 below.

[Insert Table 4 here]

As with costs, while a number of benefits from the Art Built-In policy have been anticipated from the literature, there are a number of novel findings from our research as well. The first of these was the number of respondents who indicated that being involved in the development of the Percent art project was considered an enjoyable experience. This certainly was not noted at all in the literature, and is a very interesting finding. Community benefits of enhancing the standard of community arts in Queensland, diffusion of the policy to private firms and local government, and providing a vehicle for engagement of wider community groups in government projects – particularly young people and Indigenous communities is a very welcome outcome of the Art Built-In policy. For the building, increased aesthetics was expected, but the ability of public art to enhance the achievement of the building’s purpose is a novel outcome, as was enhanced morale of building users. Enhanced economic development was also anticipated for artists – but in Queensland, some high profile artists have developed multi-million dollar businesses from delivering public art works. The public art policy provided them with a platform which increased their exposure and recognition as artists in Queensland. While increased recognition was noted in the literature, the possibility of the development of a multi-million dollar international business out of public art is a novel finding.

Summary of Costs and Benefits of the Art Built-in Policy in Queensland

There are a number of recurrent themes in the interviews of the Queensland Art Built-in policy. These costs and benefits are summarised in Table 5.

[Insert Table 5 here]

CONCLUSION

Public art has been held to deliver a range of benefits particularly improved aesthetics, building quality, economic development for artists, and a range of other social and community benefits. This research has extended these findings by also identifying a range of additional benefits, such as a vehicle for community engagement, enhancing the performance of the building itself, and visual arts in general. Likewise a range of costs has been identified in the literature including the actual cost of planning and delivering the art work. However, the sheer amount of time involved by all stakeholders was not anticipated, nor was the high level

of skill development required by artists for successful implementation of a public art project, or the financial pressure which resulted from smaller works being commissioned. That at least some artists developed a multi-million dollar international business out of the profile that public art provided for them is certainly a novel finding.

The provision of public art poses a set of problems for governments, particularly as it seeks to provide high quality public art, while at the same time promoting public ownership of the art (Brecknock 1992). This challenge is overcome in the *Art Built-In* policy by ensuring high levels of consultation in the design of the art work. This strategy overcame the difficulties noted in the literature review concerning the ownership of the art by the intended audience, and the difficulties in ensuring high quality art. The consultative process resulted in another cost being introduced into the process – that of expenditure of time, which was mentioned by every stakeholder group. What is interesting here though is that this cost was not considered significant – and simply part of the process in ensuring there was a good outcome for all involved. In economic terms the indirect costs of the involvement of representatives of the community in the planning and delivery of the public art work, ensured that the externalities (ownership of public art work by the community) were positive. While this is a case study from a single jurisdiction, the manner in which the risks of ‘bad art’ were addressed is of considerable interest to other jurisdictions. While generalization from a single study is not possible to all public arts projects, consulting key stakeholder groups in order to ensuring art is valued by all parties, is a logical process which has merit for consideration in other jurisdictions.

A figure which summarises the costs and benefits, anticipated and novel, is provided below in Figure 1.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

References

- “10% Training Policy” for Queensland Government building and construction contracts n.d. Retrieved May 8, 2007, from <http://www.build.qld.gov.au/industry/industry05.asp#10tp>
- Adams, D. and A. Goldbard. 1995. *New Deal Cultural Programs: Experiments in Cultural Democracy*. Webster's World of Cultural Democracy. <http://www.wgcd.org/policy/US/newdeal.html> (accessed 8 December, 2006).
- Anderson, Peter. 1998. Against the 'plonk' approach to public art. [The bay of Mooloolaba, a structure created by two architects and a host of artists.] [online]. *Artlink*, v.18, no.2, June/ Aug 1998: 40-41. Availability: <http://search.informit.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/fullText;dn=981010813;res=APAFT ISSN:0727-1239>. [cited 18 Dec 07].
- APCC 2002. Client Skills: Skills required by Government as the Construction Industry Client. Canberra: APCC. Downloaded from <http://www.apcc.gov.au/docs/ClientSkillsSep2002.pdf> on 10 February 2006.
- Armajani, S. 2004. Public art and the city. In *Public art: a reader*, ed. F. Matzner, 67-71. Ostfildern-Ruit, Germany: Hatje Cantz.
- Artz, K.W. and Brush, T.H. 2000. Asset specificity, uncertainty and relational norms: an examination of coordination costs in collaborative strategic alliances. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* Vol. 41, pp, 337–362.
- Baxter, M. 1995. The continuing march of Western Australian sculpture. [Review of Sculpture Survey 1995 at the Gomboc Gallery and One Hundred Years of Sculpture 1895/ 1995 at the Art Gallery of Western Australia.] [online]. *Artlink*, v.15, nos 2-3, Winter-Spring 1995: 96-99.
- Baxter, M. 1998. Good or bad idea?: The community as public art practitioner: Artists cannot any longer be expected to work with the community unless there is a realistic time frame and budget. *Artlink*, 18 (2): 73-75.
- Becker, G. 1975. *Human Capital*. 2nd ed. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bennett, J. & Iossa, E. 2005, 'Building and Managing Facilities for Public Service', Working Paper Series No. 05/137, Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol.
- Beunders, H. 2007. The end of arrogance, the advent of persuasion: Public Art in a Multi-Cultural Society *Social Analysis* 51(1), pp.42–57.
- Blom-Hansen, J. 2003, 'Is private delivery of public services really cheaper? Evidence from public road maintenance in Denmark, *Public Choice*, Vol. 115: 419-438.
- Brecknock, R. 1992. Public Art – Public Places – Public Money *Culture and Policy* Volume 4. <http://web.archive.org/web/20020805113105/www.gu.edu.au/centre/cmp/4-07-Brecknock.html> accessed on 20 December 2007,
- Buy Local Policy*. Retrieved October 20, 2006, from <http://www.ssc.wa.gov.au/procurement03.apc>.
- Carver, R. 1989, 'Examining the Premises of Contracting Out', *Public Productivity & Management Review*', Vol. 13, No. 2: 27-40.
- Coakley, L. 2007. 'Sea, Sail, Steam and Emigration': The imagining of a heritage tourist town in the Republic of Ireland *Geography* Vol 92(1), pp.13–24. Accessed from <http://www.geography.org.uk/download/Geog%20Spr%2007%20Journal.pdf> on 18 December 2007.
- Demirag, I. 2004. "Towards Better Governance and Accountability: Exploring the Relationships between the Public, Private and the Community" *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 15: 19 – 26.
- Department of Housing and Works (DHW) 2005. . Department of Housing and Works Annual Report 2004-05. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://www.dha.wa.gov.au>.
- Department of Culture and the Arts (2003) *Integrating Views: A review of the state government's percent for art scheme*. Perth: Department of Culture and the Arts.
- Department of the Arts. 1990. A Strategy for Public Art 1988-1990. Ministerial Task Force on Public Art. Western Australian Government.
- Department of the Arts (WA) 1993. A review and evaluation of process and some strategies for the nineties. In *A strategy for public art development in WA: The story so far*, ed. P. A. Taskforce. Perth, Western Australia.
- DHW 2006. . Retrieved October 18, 2006, from http://www.dhw.wa.gov.au/585_412.asp.
- Domberger, S. & Jensen, P. 1997, 'Contracting out by the Public Sector: Theory, Evidence, Prospects', *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 13(4): 67-78.

- Edwards, F. & Stevens, B. 1978, 'The Provision of Municipal Sanitation Services by Private Firms: An Empirical Analysis of the Efficiency of Alternative Market Structures and Regulatory Arrangements', *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 27(2):133-147.
- Ehrenburg, R. and Smith, R. 2005. *Modern Labour Economics: Theory and Public Policy*. 9th ed. Boston: Pearson Education
- Erridge, A. and Greer, J. 2002. Partnerships and public procurement: Building social capital through supply chain relations. *Public Administration* Vol. 80(3), pp. 503-522.
- Fleming, R. L. and M. T. Goldman. 2005. Public art for the public. *Public Interest*, Spring 2005 (159): 55-76.
- Frey, B.S. 1999. State support and creativity in the arts: Some new considerations *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23, pp. 71–85.
- Furneaux, C.W., Brown, K.A., Allan, D., McConville, S., McFallan, S., London, K. and Burgess, J. 2006. "Client capabilities and capital works procurement policies: A comparative analysis of Australian jurisdictions" in Brown, K., K. Hampson and P. Brandon. *Clients Driving Construction Innovation: Moving Ideas into Practice*. Brisbane: Cooperative Research Centre for Construction Innovation, Icon.Net Pty Ltd.: 62 – 71
- Gablik, S. 1995. Connective Aesthetics: Art After Individualism. In *Mapping the terrain : new genre public art*, ed. S. Lacy, 74-87. Seattle Wash: Bay Press.
- Globerman, S. & Vining, A. 1996, 'A Framework for Evaluating the Government Contracting-Out Decision with an Application to Information Technology ', *Public Administration Review*, 56(6): 557-586.
- Goldblatt, J. and Perry, J. 2002. Re-building the Community with Fire, Water, and Music: The WaterFire Phenomenon *UTS: Event Research Conference* 15 to 16 July 2002, Sydney, pp. 539–563. Accessed from <http://www.acem.uts.edu.au/pdfs/Proceedings.pdf> on 18 December 2007.
- Gooding, M. 1998. Public art: space: Introductory essay. In *Public--art--space : a decade of Public Art Commissions Agency, 1987-1997*, ed. M. Gooding, 13-20. London: Merrell Holberton.
- Gopnik, A. 2005. Introduction: Art in the city. In *City art : New York's Percent for Art Program*, ed. M. Heiferman., 9-13. London ; New York: Merrell.
- Hall, T and Robertson, I. (2001) Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debates *Landscape Research* Vol. 26(1), 5-26.
- Hampson, K & Brandon, P. 2004. *Construction 2020: A Vision for Australia's Property and Construction Industry*, Brisbane: Cooperative Research Centre for Construction Innovation.
- Hart, O, Shleifer, A. & Vishny, R. 1997, 'The Proper Scope of Government: Theory and an Application to Prisons', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*: 1127-1161.
- Heartney, E. 2005. The city as laboratory: Two decades of New York's percent for art program. In *City art : New York's Percent for Art Program*, ed. M. Heiferman, 15-23. London ; New York: Merrell.
- Hein, H. 1996. What is public art?: Time, place, and meaning. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 54 (1): 1-7.
- Hein, H. 2006. *Public art: thinking museums differently*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Hoffman, B. 1992. Law for Art's Sake in the Public Realm. In *Art and the public sphere*, ed. W. J. T. Mitchell, 113-146. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holcombe, R. 1991, 'Privatization of Municipal Wastewater Treatment', *Public Budgeting & Finance*, Fall: 28-42.
- Holmstrom, B. & Milgrom, P. 1991, 'Multitask Principal-Agent Analyses: Incentive contracts, Asset Ownership and Job Design', *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 7: 24-52.
- Indigenous Employment Policy for Queensland Government Building and Civil Construction Projects n.d.* Retrieved May 8, 2007, from <http://www.build.qld.gov.au/industry/industry05.asp#10tp>
- Jensen, M.C. 1994. . "Self-Interest, Altruism, Incentives & Agency Theory" *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance* 7(2): 40- 45
- Jensen, P. & Stonecash, R. 2004, 'The Efficiency of Public Sector Outsourcing Contracts: A Literature Review', Melbourne Institute Working Paper No. 29/04, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.
- Kins. 1998. Percent for art in the West: Western Australia is a boom state for public art because of percent for art agreements. *Artlink*, 18 (2): 76-77.
- Lacy, S. 1995. Introduction: Cultural Pilgrimages and Metaphoric Journeys. In *Mapping the terrain: new genre public art*, ed. S. Lacy, 19-47. Seattle, Wash: Bay Press.
- Lally, J. A. 1998. A moment of reflection: Public art, the Art for Public Places program, models for commissions and the matter of percent for art in South Australia. *Artlink*, 18 (2): 60-64.

- Local Industry Policy n.d. Retrieved May 11, 2007, from <http://www.sdi.qld.gov.au/dsdweb/v3/documents/objdirctrlled/nonsecure/pdf/3760.pdf>
- Lynn, C. 2000. Profiling the Competent Project Manager. In *Project Management Research at the Turn of the Millennium*, 3 - 15. 21 - 24 June 2000, Paris.: Project Management Institute.
- MacGowan, Tempe. 2000. Heroism in the public domain [online]. *Artlink*, v.20, no.4, Dec 2000: 37-42. Availability: <http://search.informit.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/fullText;dn=200106297;res=APAFT ISSN: 0727-1239>. [cited 18 Dec 07].
- Manseau, André and Seaden, George 2001. "Analytical Framework" in André Manseau and George Seaden (Eds) *Innovation in Construction: An International Review of Public Policies*. New York: Taylor & Francis, pp. 7 – 18.
- Martin, S. K. Hartley and A. Cox. 1999. Public procurement diirectoives in the European Union: A study of local authority purchasing. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 387–406.
- Mazza, I. 2003. Public choice. In Towse, R. *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 379–388.
- McCarthy, J. 2006. Regeneration of cultural quarters: Public art for place image or place identity. *Journal of Urban Design*, 11 (2): 243–262.
- McCrudden, C. 2004. Using procurement to achieve social outcomes *Natural Resources Forum* 28, 257–267.
- Miles, M. 1997. *Art, space and the city: public art and urban futures*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. 1992. Introduction: Utopia and Critique. In *Art and the public sphere*, ed. W. J. T. Mitchell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, P. W. G. 1994. *The Management of Projects: A New Model*. London: Thomas Telford.
- Park, M. and G. E. Markowitz. 1998. New deal for public Art. In *Critical issues in public art: content, context, and controversy*, eds. H. F. Senie and S. Webster, 128-141. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press
- Phillips, P. C. 1995. Public constructions. In *Mapping the terrain: new genre public art*, ed. S. Lacy, 60-71. Seattle, Wash: Bay Press.
- Phillips, R. 2004. Artful business: Using the arts for community economic development *Community Development Journal* Vol 39(2), pp. 112–122.
- Quiggin, J. 1996. "Private sector involvement in infrastructure projects" *Australian Economic Review*, 96(1), pp. 51- 64.
- Reca, J. & Zieg, K. 1995, 'Privatization – An Analysis of Contracting Out of Government-Provided Services, *National Contract Management Journal*, 26(2): 51-64.
- Rimmer, S. 1994, 'Competitive Tendering and Contracting: Theory and Research', *The Australian Economic Review*, 3: 79-85.
- Robbins, L. 1963. Art and the state. In *Politics and Economics: Papers in political economy*, 53–72. London: Macmillan
- Robbins, L. 1971. Unsettled Questions in the Political Economy of the Arts. *Three Banks Review* No. 91 (September), pp. 3–19.
- Sharp, J., V. Pollock and R. Paddison. 2005. Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 42 (5/6): 1001–1023.
- Shaw, G.B. 1903. *Man and Superman* New York: Brentano's.
- Shuster, J.M. 1999. The other side of the subsidized muse: Indirect aid revisited *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23, pp. 51–70.
- Strom, E. and Wyszomirski, M. 2004. New directions in Arts and Cultural Policy *Review of Policy Research* Vol. 21(4), pp. 465–467.
- Taylor, R. 2002. Public art gets serious: focus on inner city and regional sites in Western Australia. *Artlink*, 22 (3): 25-29.
- Taylor, Robyn. 1998. Shelf life, use by date and other related issues: public art, when the honeymoon is over [online]. *Artlink*, v.18, no.2, June/ Aug 1998: 16-(18). Availability: <http://search.informit.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/fullText;dn=981010804;res=APAFT ISSN: 0727-1239>. [cited 18 Dec 07].
- Throsby, D. 2003. Cultural capital. In Towse, R. *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 166–170.
- Towse, R. 2003. *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- Trimarchi, M. 2003. Principal-agent analysis in Towse, R. *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 373–378.
- Trimarchi, M. 2003. Principal-agent analysis in Towse, R. *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 373–378.
- Watermayer, R. 2000. The use of Targeted Procurement as an Instrument of Poverty Alleviation and Job Creation in Infrastructure Projects. *Public Procurement Law Review*, Vol. 5, pp. 226-250.
- Williams, Linda. 2004. Active citizenship and the role of the artist: [Paper in: *The Vocal Citizen*, Patmore, Glenn and Jungwirth, Gary (eds.)] [online]. *Labor Essays*, 2004: 195-206. Availability: <http://search.informit.com.au.ezp01.library.qut.edu.au/fullText;dn=200402295;res=APAFT> ISSN: 0158-9245. ISBN: 0959818170. [cited 18 Dec 07].
- Worsham, J. and Gatrell, J. 2005. Multiple principals, multiple signals: A signalling approach to principal-agent relations *Policy Studies Journal* Vol. 33(3), pp. 363–376.

Tables

Table 1: Public Art – Benefits identified from the academic literature

Benefits	Description
Amenity	Enhanced public spaces – aesthetically, functionally, and by adding meaning (Gopnik 2005, 11; Robbins 1963, 55; Taylor 2002)
Artist	Skill development (Taylor 2002), employment opportunities (Kins 1998; Sharp et al. 2005), and creative opportunities
Economic	Tourism and urban regeneration and flow on effects to suppliers and manufacturers (Miles 1997; Sharp et al. 2005; McCarthy 2006; Coakley 2007). Local branding or marketing benefits (Sharp et al. 2005; McCarthy 2006).
Building	Building design and complement architecture.
Community	Provide memorial, historical, and education benefits (Hein 1996; Hein 2006; Eccles 2004, 12).
Social psychological	Enhancement of civic pride and identity (Adams 1997; Miles 1997; Goodling 1998; Sharp et al 2005; McCarthy 2006). Enhancement of social inclusion, emotional satisfaction and enjoyment (Dissanayake 2001, 27-28).

Table 2 : Summary of interviews undertaken

Stakeholder group	Date of interview	Number of Interviews
Artists	November to December 2007	5
Client Representatives	November to December 2007	5
Curators	December 2007	1
Project Managers	October 2007	1
Policy Officers	April 2008	2

Table 3: Costs of the Art Built-In policy According to Key Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder group	Costs
Artists	<p>Time and financial pressures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project schedule delays. The delays have further impacts on the other jobs of the artists ○ Also not enough research time for artists <p>Financial pressures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extra outlay of expenses by artists ○ artists are unable to ‘live off’ payment from a single Art Built-in project <p>Skill development demands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Artists are required to quickly develop skills in administration and project management ○ This can be particularly difficult for new artists
Client Representative	<p>Time pressures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extra meetings ○ Coordination difficulties ○ Extra time and effort required to complete projects
Curators	<p>Extra time and effort required by the Artist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Remuneration does not cover the extra time and effort of the Artists
Project Managers	<p>Time and effort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extra time and effort to complete projects ○ Although a burden, can also be appositive as the extra time and effort helps to develop closer working relationships
Policy officers	<p>Time and effort:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Time required to produce a good outcome ○ Tendering time required <p>Administrative costs Costs for the art work itself Skill development for artists</p>

Table 4: Benefits of the Art Built-in policy According to Key Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder group	Benefits
Artists	<p>Personal benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the enjoyment of challenging projects ○ the satisfaction of working on a public building <p>Artist benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ exposure and recognition from public art ○ development of new skill set and also project management skills ○ relationship building between artists in collaborative work teams (unexpected) <p>Cultural and community benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ enriching community ambience ○ enriching people’s lives ○ educate the community ○ enrich public culture in Brisbane ○ and art can provide iconic features to the building which the community can enjoy <p>Building benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ artwork creating an environment for the building ○ educate about the building ○ also naming the site
Client Representative	<p>Artist benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ financial gains ○ opportunity to develop new skills, particularly in administration and project management ○ gain public recognition and exposure ○ generation of new jobs <p>Building benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ include storying telling and educational functions ○ the artwork can also add to the experience of the building visitors and to the enjoyment of the building inhabitants <p>Community and cultural benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ artwork as a cultural investment ○ art appreciation ○ add to atmosphere of Brisbane <p>Potential benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Art Built-in providing a source of publicity ○ Positive media attention can combat any negative public perception regarding financial cost of the artwork. ○ Also, artwork has potential for tourism and economic benefits from tourism <p>Personal benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ enjoyment from working on a fun and interesting project ○ Also benefited from working on a ‘big’ project

Stakeholder group	Benefits
Curators	<p>Building benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ artwork attracting people to the building ○ Site specific artwork is the best at doing this <p>Artist benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ development of new skills such as project management ○ the opportunity to practice their art and extend their private practice ○ New Artist practically gains from the experience ○ relationship building between artists in collaborative work teams (unexpected) <p>Community benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ education functions of the multi-layered artwork <p>Personal benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ enjoyment of working on an interesting project outside a gallery
Project Managers	<p>Artist benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ financial and economic gains ○ achieve artistic recognition and help launch careers ○ Also career development opportunities ○ opportunity to have a large project <p>Building benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ educational functions of the artwork ○ artwork helping people connect to the building ○ Artwork potential to help the building achieve or enhance its environmental quote <p>Client benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ artwork acting as a tool in their marketing campaign <p>Community benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ artwork as a community asset ○ artwork educating about history of building and place ○ art appreciation ○ Also can foster community engagement
Policy Officers	<p>Artist benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ financial support ○ opportunity to develop new skills, particularly in administration and project management ○ generation of new jobs interstate and overseas <p>Building benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhanced recovery times in hospitals ○ Media opportunities for government <p>Community and cultural benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhancing the public appreciation for the arts ○ Enhancing the standard of visual arts in Queensland ○ Promoting tourism and regional identity ○ Promoting a sense of place ○ Respect for cultural heritage and enhancing cultural diversity ○ Providing a vehicle for community expression, Indigenous

Stakeholder group	Benefits
	representation and the inclusion of young people <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="596 226 1361 293">○ Diffusion of the policy as it is adopted by private firms, and local government

Table 5: Overall Summary of the Costs and Benefits of the Qld Art Built-in Policy compared to the literature review.

Qld Art Built-in outcomes	
Costs	Benefits
<p>Time (unexpected)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The additional time of the stakeholders was not expected. However the majority of interviewees did consider the extra time as important to developing a good outcome. <p>Financial pressures (unexpected)</p> <p>Skill development demands (unexpected)</p> <p>% of the building costs (expected)</p>	<p>Personal benefits for interviewees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ enjoyment of a challenging process (unexpected) <p>Artist benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ exposure / recognition (expected) ○ skill development (expected) ○ financial and economic gains (expected) ○ career development opportunities (expected) ○ relationship building between artists in collaborative work teams (unexpected) <p>Community benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ artwork as a community asset (expected) ○ educational role of the artwork ○ community art appreciation (expected) ○ enhance cultural atmosphere of Brisbane (expected) ○ provide iconic buildings for Brisbane (expected) ○ Enhancing the standard of visual arts in Queensland (unexpected) ○ Promoting tourism and regional identity (expected) ○ Promoting a sense of place ○ Providing a vehicle for community expression, Indigenous representation and the inclusion of young people (unexpected) ○ Diffusion of the policy as it is adopted by private firms, and local government <p>Building benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attracting people to the building by helping people connect with the building (unexpected) ○ Enhancing the experience of building users (unexpected) ○ Artwork potential to help the building achieve or enhance its environmental (unexpected) ○ Enhanced enjoyment and work morale of building occupants (unexpected) <p>Potential benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Source for potential

	<p>positive media (unexpected)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Potential for tourism and tourism economic benefits (expected)
--	---

Figure 1: Summary of Costs and Benefits of Art Built-In

