

**Cristina E. NICOLESCU,**  
**Dragoș V. DINĂ**  
*SNSPA, Faculty of Public Administration, Bucharest, Romania*

# CULTURE FINANCING IN THE EUROPEAN UNION IN COVID-19 TIMES

Case  
Study

---

## Keywords

*EU;*  
*Cultural sector;*  
*Public financing mechanisms;*  
*COVID-19;*

---

## JEL Classification

*Z10*

---

## Abstract

*This paper conducts a comparative analysis at EU Member States level focused on public funding mechanisms for the cultural sector over the period 2014-2019 and in the year of the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (2020). The analysis conducted and presented in this paper highlights the fact that the vast majority of EU Member States have stepped up their efforts to finance the cultural sector, starting from the lessons learned during the 2008 economic and financial crisis. Therefore, the states continued to implement increasingly coherent cultural policies, as evidenced by the fact that the states that used a mix of financial instruments in 2020 to combat imbalances in the cultural sector are generally the states that in 2014-2019 recorded a relative increase in general government expenditure on cultural services. The paper highlights the development pattern of cultural Europe with two ends, on the North-Center-South axis, by maintaining the gaps in terms of funding for the cultural sector, between the Northern and Central EU states, on the one hand, and the Southern and Eastern states of the EU, on the other hand.*

## INTRODUCTION

The health crisis generated by the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic affected more than one million people worldwide in less than three months in the first quarter of 2020 (OECD, 2020, p. 4) and more than 176 million a year one year from its onset (Worldometers, 2021). Pandemics affect the long-term capacity of the state to manage instability (Madhav, Oppenheim, Gallivan, Mulembakani & Rubin, 2017, p. 325), and the current severe pandemic unequivocally demonstrates this statement.

One year later, the impact of the pandemic continues to cause major socioeconomic shocks: social isolation, unemployment, declining domestic consumption, reduced resources for sectors of major interest - health, education, culture, investment, etc. Fear-induced behavioral changes of individuals are also added, such as: avoiding travel, avoiding meetings and public spaces, prophylactic absenteeism at work, etc. (Madhav et al., 2017, p. 324).

An index developed by Oppenheim and Greenhill<sup>(1)</sup> in 2017 revealed that at the level of the European Union, in 2019 no country was fully prepared for the management of a pandemic. However, statistically, all Member States were rated as very well prepared or well prepared for epidemics<sup>(2)</sup>, except for one, Romania, which was less prepared<sup>(3)</sup>.

In the new context, social distancing has become the global measure to limit the spread of Covid-19 infections. It is not a psychological distancing, but a physical one. The social/physical distance measures imposed by the current epidemiological context have majorly affected the cultural sector along with other sectors of activity such as hospitality or transport. The quantitative and qualitative data available reflect the huge impact the 2020 pandemic generated in this sector: Austria (1.5-2 billion Euro damage in the field of culture, which is a quarter of the annual added value), Croatia (large impact on one of the biggest cultural projects: Rijeka as the European Capital of Culture in 2020), France (an average revenue decline of 25% in 2020 compared to 2019 (22.3 billion euro)), Finland (average loss of a quarter of the value of the music sector by the end of summer 2020), Netherlands (between July 6th and August 31st, the cultural sector reported a huge loss of turnover to the Employee Insurance Agency, with an average loss of 62 percent), Spain (the variation of average cultural employment during 2020 (3 first quarters) has decreased with respect to the previous year by 5%) (The Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021).

At EU level, the negative effects on the cultural sector have been mitigated through a combined financial effort among the different levels of government, but also with resources that came from private funds (from organizations, foundations, associations and individuals). The beneficiaries of the measures were both employees, self-employed, individual businesses and companies with decreased turnover but also cultural institutions. Most of these public actions are not specifically aimed at cultural sector workers, but apply to larger portions of the population.

Based on the importance given to culture for ensuring sustainable development, this paper includes a comparative research on the evolution of public funding of the cultural sector in 2014-2019 and the main financial measures adopted in 2020 by EU Member States to reduce the impact of the health crisis of COVID-19 on the cultural sector.

The research is structured in two sections. A first section demonstrates the importance of public funding (especially national) in the development of the cultural sector by comparative analysis of the evolution of cultural employment and general government expenditure on cultural services indicators in EU Member States in 2014-2019. The second section presents the financial measures dedicated to the cultural sector and implemented directly by public authorities and institutions in some Member States in 2020.

The correlation of the information resulting from the analyzes contained in the two sections reflects the fact that the states that resorted to a mix of financial instruments are generally the states that in the period 2014-2019 registered a relative increase in general government expenditure on cultural services.

The correlation of the information resulting from the analysis contained in the two sections reflects the fact that the states that used a mix of financial instruments are generally the states that in the period 2014-2019 registered a relative increase in general government expenditure on cultural services.

At the same time, the same pattern of development of the cultural sector at the level of EU member states presented in the literature in 2017 (Manda, Nicolescu & Mortelmans, 2017) is outlined, namely that of a cultural Europe with two ends/peripheries.

The methodology used is based on the mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) and the profile data used from studies, legislation, research or other national, European and international reference databases, such as Eurostat (culture statistics) and the online database "The Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends".

## CULTURAL EMPLOYMENT AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE ON CULTURAL SERVICES AT EU MEMBER STATES LEVEL (2014-2019)

At EU level, since the last economic and financial crisis in 2008, the cultural sector has received increasing attention from the EU, reflected in both a New European Agenda for Culture (The European Commission, 2018) and 2019-2022 Work Plan for Culture, as well as by increasing EU spending on cultural services in absolute terms. For example, in the period 2014-2019, although the share of total EU public spending on cultural services was 1.0%, in absolute terms, the overall value of these expenditures increased by 15.59% <sup>(4)</sup>. Moreover, the "Creative Europe" program benefits for the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2021-2027 from an increase in its funding by about 70% compared to the MFF 2014-2020 (1.46 billion euros), reaching 2.44 billion Euro <sup>(5)</sup>.

Culture is an important pillar of sustainable development and should not be understood as a separate superstructure, but as a catalyst and integrator of public interventions (UNESCO, 2000; Rish Lerner, 2005). Culture is an important asset for the economy that directly contributes to job creation, growth and foreign trade.

In 2006, the cultural sector contributed 2.4% to the gross domestic product of the 30 countries composing the EU / EEA (Direction générale de l'éducation et de la culture de la Commission européenne, 2010, p. ii), and in 2012 the contribution of the cultural and creative sectors amounted to 4.2% of the EU's gross domestic product (The European Commission, 2018). Moreover, in the EU, cultural employment increased steadily between 2011 and 2019, reaching 7.4 million, 8% more than in 2014 (6.8 million) in the EU, cultural employment increased steadily between 2011 and 2019, reaching 7.4 million, 8% more than in 2014 (6.8 million) (Eurostat, 2021a). Also, cultural employment represented 3.6% of total employment in 2016 and 3.7 % in 2019, which means that cultural employment grew slightly faster than total employment (*Ibidem*). For the period 2011-2019, at the level of most Member States the share of cultural employment <sup>(6)</sup> in total employment increased, the highest relative increase was recorded by Malta (1.3 pp from 3.9% to 5.2%). For the 2014-2020 programming period, according to the latest Eurostat data, only 16 EU-27 Member States (seven) recorded a relative increase in this indicator.

Regarding the public financing of the cultural sector, in the period 2014-2019, the share of EU total general government expenditure on cultural services was 1.0 % (Eurostat, 2021b). At national level, only 16 Member States have seen an increase

in the share of expenditure on cultural services in total public expenditure <sup>(8)</sup>, for 8 of these countries the increase is also supported by a surplus in the financing of cultural services by local authorities <sup>(9)</sup>. Table 1 shows that in the period 2014-2029, in general, the increase in budget allocations for cultural services was supported mainly by the national level and not the local level. However, in some Member States local authorities have stepped up their efforts and it is worth noting Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovakia, where there is a relative increase in local spending of over 0.5 pp (in other countries the increase is much smaller).

Also, in Italy and Romania local public financing registers a relative increase in the conditions in which the evolution of the governmental allocations is negative (Romania) or constant (Italy).

The mere interlinking, cultural employment and general government expenditure on cultural services does not anticipate a clear pattern of causality, but reflects the fact that an increase in budget allocations is extremely important and leads either to a slight growth of cultural employment than total employment, or to a consolidation of cultural employment and therefore of the cultural sector.

Thus, there are states that have registered a relative growth or relatively constant evolution of cultural employment at the same time as a relative increase in budget allocations, either at all administrative levels (Belgium, Greece, Portugal and Slovakia), be it only one of them, governmental (Cyprus, Estonia, Netherlands, Poland, Spain) or locally (Italy and Romania). There is also the situation of the states that have registered a relative decrease or relatively constant evolution of cultural employment at the same time as a relative decrease or relatively constant evolution of budget allocations at government level (Lithuania and Bulgaria), locally (Bulgaria, Croatia and Denmark) or at both levels (Latvia). These situations would highlight a direct causal relationship between the amount of budget allocations and the evolution of the cultural sector.

But there is also the situation in which the states have registered a relative increase in cultural employment at the same time as a relative decrease or relatively constant evolution of the general budgetary allocations (Finland, France, Malta, Slovenia and Sweden) or, on the contrary, a relative decrease in cultural employment at the same time as a relative increase or relatively constant evolution of general budget allocations (Hungary, Ireland and Luxembourg). Such a correlation leads to an inversely proportional causal relationship between the two indicators. But if one considers the evolution of sub-indicators *the share of employees having a permanent job* and the share of

*self-employed persons* then it can be seen that the decrease, increase and relatively constant evolution of budget allocations (general, governmental and/or local) have a direct impact on the cultural sector. In no case has the constant increase or maintenance of budget allocations led to a simultaneous decrease in the two sub-indicators, but on the contrary, at least one of these two sub-indicators has increased (Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Slovenia and Sweden). Moreover, maintaining the share of government spending on cultural services at a constant level has led to the consolidation of the two sub-indicators (Malta and France).

### **THE PUBLIC FINANCING TO MITIGATE THE IMPLICATIONS OF COVID-19 ON CULTURAL SECTOR IN SOME EU MEMBER STATES (2020)**

Starting from the role and importance given to public funding for cultural development, are further analyzed the financial measures dedicated to the cultural sector and implemented directly by public authorities and institutions in some Member States to mitigate the implications of COVID-19 in this sector in 2020. For the analysis, were retained only the states for which data are available in the online information and monitoring platform "The Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends" which provides information on cultural policies, statistics and trends <sup>(10)</sup>. With the declaration of the pandemic by the WHO on March 11, 2020, in accordance with the instructions by the health authorities, cultural venues (theaters, cinemas, concert halls, museums, archaeological sites, etc.) have been closed.

The financial measures dedicated to the cultural sector consisted of both direct and indirect financial benefits and are classified into nine categories: *employment aid, fiscal leniency, fund/grant, grant leniency, legal, liquidity aid, loan, loan leniency and medical aid*.

1. Employment aid was used by public authorities in four states. In Belgium and Germany, federal states, according to cultural policy competencies <sup>(11)</sup> this type of measure was implemented by Flemish Community (Belgium) and The Federal State of North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany). The measures consisted either in economic support granted temporarily to cultural professionals (Germany, Greece and Romania), or to companies that suffered financial losses (Belgium). The German state has provided support of five million euros for the self-employed and Greece 13 million euros for 10,000 cultural professionals.

2. From the category "fiscal leniency" only at the level of four states were identified measures dedicated to the cultural sector, beneficiaries being self-employed (Belgium and Romania), employed

(Romania), small business / enterprises (Belgium and Ireland) or cultural institutions (Belgium, Croatia and Greece). Regarding the private environment, Belgium supported small business/enterprises and the self-employed in the audiovisual productions and performing arts fields. Romania has instituted leniency for taxes obtained in Romania by non-residents from activities carried out in the sector of organizing events - cultural, artistic, sportive, scientific, educational or entertainment - as well as from the effective participation to this kind of events (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021f). Ireland has provided support by the Scree Ireland as the national development agency for the creative screen industry, totaling € 150,000 for financial planning, additional marketing and distribution for upcoming Irish film and TV releases (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021d).

3. The "grant leniency" instrument was used only by two states, the beneficiaries being both cultural institutions (Austria) and self-employed (Estonia). Estonia provided subsistence support totaling EUR 4.8 million by adjusting the terms of application and qualifying criteria of the existing Creative Persons and Artistic Associations Act (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021b).

4. The liquidity aid instrument was applied by the authorities of five Member States (Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece and Spain), following the liquidity of event organizers. The measures generally consisted in the adoption of legal rules that allow organizers to issue vouchers to reimburse tickets of canceled concerts and performances (Austria, Czech Republic, Germany and Greece). Instead, Catalonia Community through the Catalan Financial Institute (ICF) granted loans to meet the need for liquidity of the cultural companies (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021g).

5. The "legal" instrument was used only by Romania and targeted Self-employed and cultural institutions (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, Country report: Romania). Thus, the online Institute of the Cultural Sector was launched by The National Institute for Cultural Research and Training, an interactive platform for monitoring the cultural domain in Romania during the COVID-19 crisis. The information collected in the Register will substantiate the future national strategy in the field of culture.

6. The "loan" measure was used directly by public authorities only in the Netherlands, the beneficiaries of the measure being only for cultural institutions. The financial effort amounted to 80 million euros and targeted non-subsidized institutions, as well as the monuments (through the National Restoration Fund) (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021e).

7. The loan leniency measure was only used by Ireland by the Scree Ireland. The financial effort amounted to one million euros and aimed to support the creative screen industry with 90% funding upfront on all development loans (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021d).

8. The medical aid measure was used only by Estonia, but was applied through the Cultural Endowment of Estonia, a legal person in public law, the activity of which is regulated by the Cultural Endowment of Estonia Act (RT I 1994, 46, 772), 1994. The Estonian Cultural Endowment's system for supporting culture and sports is unique in the world and is based on excise revenue. The beneficiaries of the measure are self-employed and also consider providing medical subsidies for individuals who have excelled in the field of culture (The Cultural Endowment of Estonia, 2021).

9. The fund / grant measure was used by the authorities of all Member States, and the beneficiaries were self-employed, employed, unemployed, small businesses / enterprises, non-profit organizations, cultural institutions.

Grant leniency, legal, medical aid and loan instruments were used by national authorities. Employment aid, fiscal leniency and liquidity aid have been applied both nationally and regionally.

Fund/grant measures were arranged among the different levels of government, depending on the competencies held by the cultural authorities. Thus, at national level the measure was applied in Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania. At the regional level, financial measures have been adopted in Belgium, Germany, Greece and Spain. At the municipal level, the fund/grant measure was applied only in Belgium, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Romania and Spain.

## CONCLUSIONS

The development of the cultural sector experienced a period of financial growth in the programmatic period 2014-2020. Most Member States have increased the share of budget allocations for this sector, which has been severely affected by the economic and financial crisis of 2008. Their own national allocations for culture have also been supplemented by significant external funds such as those from the European Union.

The comparative analysis of the evolution of the cultural employment indicators and general government expenditure on cultural services at the level of EU Member States for the period 2014-2019 reflects the role and importance of public

funding of culture. In general, an increase (or at least maintaining a constant level) of the share of general government expenditure on cultural services has been reflected in the consolidation of cultural employment.

In 2019, statistically, all EU Member States were prepared to face a possible epidemic. However, the impact of the COVID-19 health crisis has led to an unprecedented slowdown in most sectors of activity, and the cultural sector is among the sectors most affected by the social distance imposed by the epidemiological context triggered in 2020. The conclusions drawn from the data presented in this paper highlight the fact that all EU Member States have provided short, medium and long-term solutions to mitigate the consequences of the pandemic on the cultural sector. The forms of government financing of the cultural sector were both direct and indirect, the financial measures adopted by public authorities coming mainly from the governmental/regional level and less from the local level.

The states that have used the two forms of government funding in a complementary way are also the states that registered in the period 2014-2020 a relative increase or a constant maintenance of general government expenditure on cultural services. States that have used at least three categories of financial measures are also those that have recorded a relative increase in general government expenditure on cultural services.

The exception in the latter case is Romania, which for the period 2014-2020 registered a relative decrease in general government expenditure on cultural services. However, Romania's use of a mix of financial measures is also explained by the fact that it is the only Member State with 100% of its cultural workforce employed on a full-time basis (2014-2019).

The correlation of the data regarding the budgetary allocations dedicated to the cultural sector in the period before the pandemic, 2014-2019 and in its full beginning (2020) outlines two important conclusions:

1) Learning from the global crisis of 2008, Member States are demonstrating the adoption of increasingly coherent policies for the development of the cultural sector. In the midst of a pandemic, states have continued their efforts to strengthen funding for this sector, adopting medium- and long-term measures in line with EU objectives.

2) There is a development of the *pattern of a two-ended cultural Europe*, on the North-Center-South axis, by maintaining the gaps in terms of financing the cultural sector, between the Northern and Central EU states, on the one hand, and the Southern and Eastern EU, on the other hand.

## Biographical sketch

### Cristina E. NICOLESCU

Professor at the National University of Political Studies and Public Administration (SNSPA), Faculty of Public Administration (FAP), from Bucharest, Romania. Contributor' relevant experience in the field of comparative public policy and public administration.

### Dragoş V. DINCĂ

Large professional experience in central and local public administration, also in teaching and researching in higher education in Romania. Professor at the SNSPA -FAP. Contributor' relevant experience in the field of local development and public administration.

## REFERENCE LIST

### Journal article

- [1] Greenhill, K.M., Oppenheim, B. (2017). Rumor Has It: The Adoption of Unverified Information in Conflict Zones. *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 61, Issues 3, pp.660-676.
  - [2] Madhav, N., Oppenheim, B., Gallivan, M., Mulembakani, P., Rubin, E. & Wolfe, E. (2017). Chapter 17: Pandemics: Risks, Impacts, and Mitigation. In D.T. Jamison, H. Gelband & S. Horton, et al. (Eds.), *Disease Control Priorities: Improving Health and Reducing Poverty* (3rd ed, pp. 315-347). Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank. Retrieved from Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition, Volume 9 (nih.gov).
  - [3] Manda, C.C., Nicolescu, C.E., & Mortelmans, D. (2017). Financing culture institutions in European context. *SEA-Practical Application of Science*, Volume No.V (Issue No.13/2017), pp. 179-186.
  - [4] Oppenheim B., Gallivan, M., Madhav, N.K., Brown, N., Serhiyenko, V., Wolfe, N. & Ayscue, P. (2019). Assessing global preparedness for the next pandemic: development and application of an Epidemic Preparedness Index. *BMJ Glob Health* 2019; 4: e001157. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001157.
  - [5] Rish Lerner, E.M. (2005). *El valor de la cultura en los procesos de desarrollo urbano sustentable* [The value of culture in the processes of sustainable urban development], Catalunya: Generalitat de Catalunya, Departamento de Cultura.
  - [6] The European Commission (2018). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, A New European Agenda for Culture, COM/2018/267 final.
  - [7] UNESCO (2000). *World Culture Report. Cultural diversity, conflict and pluralism*, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Other sources
- [8] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021a). Country report: Belgium. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/be/>, accessed on June 7, 2021.
  - [9] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021b). Country report: Estonia. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/es/>, accessed on June 7, 2021.
  - [10] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021c). Country report: Germany. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/germany/>, accessed on June 7, 2021.
  - [11] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021d). Country report: Ireland. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/ir/>, accessed on June 7, 2021.
  - [12] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021e). Country report: The Netherlands. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/nl/>, accessed on June 8, 2021.
  - [13] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021f). Country report: Romania. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/ro/>, accessed on June 8, 2021.
  - [14] Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021g). Country report: Spain. Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/covid-19/country-reports/sp/>, accessed on June 8, 2021.
  - [15] Cultural Endowment of Estonia Act (RT I 1994, 46, 772) (1994). Retrieved from Cultural Endowment of Estonia Act – Riigi Teataja.
  - [16] Direction générale de l'éducation et de la culture de la Commission européenne (2010). *Rapport final. Évaluation intermédiaire du Programme Culture 2007-13*. [Final report. Intermediate evaluation of the Culture Program 2007-13]. Bruxelles: Ecorys.
  - [17] Eurostat (2021a). Cultural employment by sex. Retrieved from: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/cult\\_emp\\_sex/default/table?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/cult_emp_sex/default/table?lang=en)
  - [18] Eurostat (2021b). General government expenditure by function (COFOG). Retrieved from:

- [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/gov\\_10a\\_exp/default/table?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/gov_10a_exp/default/table?lang=en)
- [19] OECD (2020). *Impacto territorial de la COVID-19: gestionar la crisis en todos los niveles de gobierno* [The territorial impact of COVID-19: Managing the crisis across levels of government]. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/impacto-territorial-de-la-covid-19-gestionar-la-crisis-en-todos-los-niveles-de-gobierno-7d27f7d9/>.
- [20] The Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends (2021). Retrieved from: <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/>, accessed on June 5, 2021.
- [21] The Cultural Endowment of Estonia (2021). The Cultural Endowment of Estonia. Retrieved from: <https://www.kulka.ee/en>
- [22] The European Commission (2021). The Creative Europe programme. Retrieved from: <https://ec.europa.eu/culture/creative-europe>
- [23] Worldometers (2021). Coronavirus. Retrieved from: <https://worldometers.info/coronavirus/>

## NOTES

- (1) The epidemic preparedness index (EPI) draws on indicators from the World Health Organization, World Bank, United Nations agencies, and nongovernmental sources. As stated by the authors Madhav et al. (2017), „The index illustrates global variation in institutional readiness to detect and respond to a large-scale outbreak of infectious disease and focuses on measuring underlying and enabling institutional, infrastructural, and financial capacities such as the following: Public health infrastructure capable of identifying, tracing, managing, and treating cases; Adequate physical and communications infrastructure to channel information and resources; Fundamental bureaucratic and public management capacities; Capacity to mobilize financial resources to pay for disease response and weather the economic shock of the outbreak; Ability to undertake effective risk communications.” Madhav et al. *Op.cit.*, p.320.
- (2) According to the authors Madhav et al. „Well-prepared countries have effective public institutions, strong economies, and adequate investment in the health sector [and the] poorly prepared countries may suffer from political instability, weak public administration, inadequate resources for public health, and gaps in fundamental outbreak detection and response systems.” Madhav et al. *Op.cit.*, p. 320.
- (3) The EPI score varies between one (best prepared) and five (least prepared). For EU Member States the EPI score is one or two except for Romania which obtained the score three (Oppenheim, Gallivan, Madhav, Brown, Serhiyenko, Wolfe & Ayscue, 2019, p. 5).
- (4) From EUR 58,226.1 million to EUR 67,304.4 million. Source: Eurostat (2021b).
- (5) Creative Europe is the European Union's most important funding program to support the creative, cultural and audiovisual fields. It was created for the MFF 2014-2020, bringing together the "Culture" Program (2007-2013) and the "Media" Program (2007-2014). See more at The European Commission (2021).
- (6) Cultural employment statistics cover all economic sectors and occupations relevant for culture, as defined by the ESSnet-Culture and the Eurostat Working Group „Culture statistics”.
- (7) Belgium (0.2 pp), Estonia (0.5 pp), Spain (0.2 pp), France (0.1pp), Italy (0.1 pp), Cyprus (0.3 pp), Malta (0.7 pp), Netherlands (0.2 pp), Austria (0.2 pp), Poland (0.1 pp), Portugal (0.3 pp), Romania (0.1 pp), Slovenia (0.2 pp), Slovakia (0.3 pp), Finland (0.3 pp), Sweden (0.2 pp). Source: Eurostat (2021a).
- (8) Belgium (0.1 pp), Czech Republic (0.2 pp), Estonia (0.2 pp), Greece (0.1 pp), Spain (0.1 pp), Croatia (0.2 pp), Cyprus (0.1 pp), Lithuania (0.4 pp), Luxembourg (0.2 pp), Hungary (0.9 pp), Netherlands (0.1 pp), Austria (0.1 pp), Poland (0.2 pp), Portugal (0.1 pp), Slovakia (0.4 pp), Iceland (0.2 pp). Source: Eurostat (2021b).
- (9) Belgium (0.2 pp), Greece (0.6 pp), Spain (0.2 pp), Lithuania (0.8 pp), Luxembourg (0.5 pp), Hungary (1.3 pp), Portugal (0.1 pp) Slovakia (0.6 pp). The number of states that have registered a surplus for funding the cultural sector by local authorities is higher. The eight states are joined by three other states: Italy (0.2 pp), Romania (0.2 pp), Finland (0.1 pp). Source: Eurostat (2021b).
- (10) The database is available at Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends | Culture Policy Database. The Compendium database does not include information for Bulgaria, Denmark, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden.
- (11) In both Belgium and Germany, according to constitutional norms, there is a division of responsibility and competencies among the different levels of government. In Belgium, although cultural policy is foremost a competence of the Communities, the Federal State still holds a number of important competencies. In Germany, the regional level (federal states) has the most competences in terms of cultural policy (art. 30 of the German Constitution) (Compendium of Cultural Policies & Trends, 2021a; 2021c).

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1  
**Cultural employment and general government expenditure on cultural services (2014-2019) and culture specific public financial measures (2020) at EU member states level.**

Share of cultural employment in total employment (pp)	Cultural employment: Share of employees having a permanent job (pp)	Cultural employment: Share of self-employed persons (pp)	General government expenditure on cultural services Sector: General government (pp)	General government expenditure on cultural services Sector: Central government (pp)	General government expenditure on cultural services Sector: Local government (pp)	Culture specific public financial measures (2020) (N/R/M) N=National R=Regional M= Municipal
<b>Group 1: States with relative growth or constant value of cultural employment and growth of general government expenditure on cultural services</b>						
Slovakia (0.3) ↑ (Central Europe)	Slovakia (-2) ↓	Slovakia (-2) ↓	Slovakia (0.4) ↑	Slovakia (0.4) ↑	Slovakia (0.6) ↑	not available n.a.
Belgium (0.2) ↑ (Western Europe)	Belgium (-4) ↓	Belgium (-1) ↓	Belgium (0.1) ↑	Belgium (0.1) ↑	Belgium (0.2) ↑	Employment aid (R) Fiscal leniency (N, R) Fund/grant (R, M)
Spain (0.2) ↑ (Southern Europe)	Spain (0)	Spain (1) ↑	Spain (0.1) ↑	Spain (0)	Spain (0.2) ↑	Liquidity aid (R) Fund/grant (R, M)
Portugal (0.3) ↑ (Southern Europe)	Portugal (-1) ↓	Portugal (9)	Portugal (0.1) ↑	Portugal (0.1) ↑	Portugal (0.1) ↑	Fund/grant (N)
Cyprus (0.3) ↑ (Southern Europe)	Cyprus (2) ↑	Cyprus (-5) ↓	Cyprus (0.1) ↑	Cyprus (0.1) ↑	Cyprus (0)	Fund/grant (N)
Netherlands (0.2) ↑ (Northern Europe)	Netherlands (0)	Netherlands (1) ↑	Netherlands (0.1) ↑	Netherlands (0.1) ↑	Netherlands (0)	Loan (N) Fund/grant (N, N/M, M)
Estonia (0.5) ↑ ↑EN	Estonia (2) ↑	Estonia (5) ↑	Estonia (0.2) ↑	Estonia (0.1) ↑	Estonia (-0.4) ↓	Grant leniency (N) Medical aid (N) Fund/grant (N)
Poland (0.1) ↑ (Central Europe)	Poland (5) ↑	Poland (1) ↑	Poland (0.2) ↑	Poland (0.3) ↑	Poland (-0.2) ↓	Fund/grant (N)
Austria (0.2) ↑ (Central Europe)	Austria (0)	Austria (2)	Austria (0.1) ↑	Austria (n.a.)	Austria (n.a.)	Grant leniency (N) Liquidity aid (N) Fund/grant (N)
Greece (0) (Southern Europe)	Greece (2) ↑	Greece (-1) ↓	Greece (0.1) ↑	Greece (0.1) ↑	Greece (0.6) ↑	Employment aid (N) Fiscal leniency (N) Liquidity aid (N) Fund/grant (N, R)

<b>Group 2: States with a relative increase or constant value of cultural employment and a decrease in general government expenditure on cultural services</b>						
Malta (0.7) ↑	Malta (0)	Malta (6) ↑	Malta (-0.1) ↓	Malta (0)	Malta (-0.6) ↓	Fund/grant (N)
France (0.1) ↑	France (1) ↑	France (3) ↑	France (-0.2) ↓	France (0)	France (-0.3) ↓	Fund/grant (N)
Bulgaria (0)	Bulgaria (0)	Bulgaria (1) ↑	Bulgaria (-0.2) ↓	Bulgaria (0)	Bulgaria (-0.6) ↓	n.a.
Romania (0.1) ↑	Romania (0)	Romania (3) ↑	Romania (-0.3) ↓	Romania (-0.2) ↓	Romania (0.2) ↑	Employment aid (N) Fiscal leniency (N) Legal (N) Fund/grant (N, M)
<b>Group 3: States with a relative decrease in cultural employment and an increase in general government expenditure on cultural services</b>						
Hungary (-0.1) ↓	Hungary (2) ↑	Hungary (1) ↑	Hungary (0.9) ↑	Hungary (1.3) ↑	Hungary (1.3) ↑	Fund/grant (N)
Luxembourg (-0.9) ↓	Luxembourg (1) ↑	Luxembourg (-2) ↓	Luxembourg (0.2) ↑	Luxembourg (0.3) ↑	Luxembourg (0.5) ↑	n.a.
Croatia (-0.2) ↓	Croatia (0)	Croatia (1) ↑	Croatia (0.2) ↑	Croatia (0.6) ↑	Croatia (-0.7) ↓	Fiscal leniency (N) Fund/grant (N)
Czechia (-0.2) ↓	Czechia (1) ↑	Czechia (1) ↑	Czechia (0.2) ↑	Czechia (0.2) ↑	Czechia (0)	Liquidity aid (N) Fund/grant (N, M)
Lithuania (-0.1) ↓	Lithuania (0)	Lithuania (8) ↑	Lithuania (0.4) ↑	Lithuania (0)	Lithuania (0.8) ↑	Fund/grant (N)
<b>States with a relative decline in cultural employment and general government expenditure on cultural services</b>						
Latvia (-0.5) ↓	Latvia (-3) ↓	Latvia (1) ↑	Latvia (-0.5) ↓	Latvia (-0.6) ↓	Latvia (-0.3) ↓	Fund/grant (N)
Denmark (-0.2) ↓	Denmark (1) ↑	Denmark (2) ↑	Denmark (-0.1) ↓	Denmark (0,1) ↑	Denmark (-0.1) ↓	n.a.
<b>Group 4: States with constant value for the general indicator government expenditure on cultural services</b>						
Finland (0.3) ↑	Finland (0)	Finland (2) ↑	Finland (0)	Finland (-0.1) ↓	Finland (0.1) ↑	Fund/grant (N)
Slovenia (0.2) ↑	Slovenia (5) ↑	Slovenia (1) ↑	Slovenia (0)	Slovenia (0)	Slovenia (-0.2) ↓	n.a.
Sweden (0.2) ↑	Sweden (5) ↑	Sweden (-2) ↓	Sweden (0)	Sweden (0)	Sweden (-0.1) ↓	n.a.
Italy (0.1) ↑	Italy (-4) ↓	Italy (1) ↑	Italy (0)	Italy (0)	Italy (0.2) ↑	Fund/grant (N)
Ireland (-0.5) ↓	Ireland (3) ↑	Ireland (0)	Ireland (0)	Ireland (0.1) ↑	Ireland (-1.5) ↓	Fiscal leniency (N) Fund/grant (N)
Germany (-0.1) ↓	Germany (1) ↑	Germany (0)	Germany (0)	Germany (n.a.)	Germany (n.a.)	Employment aid (R) Liquidity aid (N) Fund/grant (N, R)

*Source: Eurostat (2021a; 2021b)*