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This report, commissioned annually by the Freelands Foundation, evidences the fifth consecutive year of data on the representation of female artists in the UK. This year it includes 36 additional evidences that help to further understand the role that gender plays in the career outcomes for artists.
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Representation of female artists in Britain during 2019

Introduction: Mapping Five Years of Inequality in the Visual Arts in Britain

Dr Kate McMillan

This report marks five years of data collection by the Freeland Foundation on the representation of female artists in Britain. Over this time, the research has grown from 12 evidences in 2015, to 36 in 2019. The research aims to increase our understanding of the ecology of the visual arts in Britain and its impact on the careers of female artists. This year, in addition to the data and its analysis, we have also commissioned two essays, the first by art critic and writer Jennifer Higgie, and the second, by art historian and writer Jennifer Higgie, on the importance of restoring women into the history of art. These texts support this research by providing an in-depth understanding of the long history of gender bias against female artists.

Each year we look at, and add to our understanding by examining expanded data sets. In 2019 we have added the gender ratios in five national art collections to our analysis, as well as Christie’s Contemporary Art Evenings Sales and statistics on the gender of students studying Art & Design subjects in A level. This additional research has enabled us to identify some positive changes in the sector, particularly, for example, recent initiatives in our collecting estates (evidence 12). The layout of the data sets over-representation to under-representation. On pages 21-57 highlights this narrative from first to second, by art critic and writer Hettie Judah on the history of gender bias against female artists. The impact of this should not be underestimated. National institutions are far more likely to display and curate artists when they have substantial holdings of their work. Those artists are also far more likely to be researched, written about, and have their works loaned out. It is a numbers game, but we must always be careful about which numbers we are counting.

Figures coming out of the auction houses continue to show incredibly slow progress (evidences 29 & 30): Sotheby’s increased the number of female artists across all their evening sales by just 2% compared to the previous year, and 80% of the ten highest-grossing sales were works by men. In this year’s report, we also counted data from Christie’s three evening sales for the first time, evidencing slightly fewer female artists represented than Sotheby’s. Misleading headlines such as ‘Women Artists Rear Their Heads as the New Age of Auctions Kicks Off’ in the June 2020 edition of Mutual Art imply there are significant improvements. The author notes that Helen Frankenthaler’s (1928–2011) work Royal Fireworks (1975) exceeded its estimate of $3 million, ‘exploding’ to $79 million; while also noting that Francis Bacon’s (1909–1992) Triptych Inspired by the Oresteia of Aeschylus (1981) sold for $80 million. It seems to indicate that auction houses, and those that commentate on them, are unable to fathom how grossly marginalised women’s contribution to art is, both in terms of value, and representation. It is hard to believe that a sculpture by Louise Bourgeois (1911–2010) can be purchased for just a few million pounds, when the works of arguably less important male artists are still selling for ten times that amount. Of the 112 artists whose works were sold in the three Christie’s evening sales in 2019 only 14 were women. Yet the auction houses continue to argue that they are bound by the market and are simply arbiters of existing supply and demand.2 But it is the auction houses themselves that set these estimates based on historical precedent, advise collectors and continue to speculate on future values. Female artists living today wear the burden of history, deregulation and unaccountability. The data from 2019 also tells us that progress is not linear. The number of solo shows in non-commercial spaces outside London by women artists has dropped by 4% (evidence 9). Similarly, solo shows by female artists during Frieze Week at London galleries declined in 2019, also by 4%

from the previous year (evidence 13). Mirroring the conservative data we see in auction records, the number of deceased estates by female artists in commercial galleries also fell in 2019 (evidence 12). While this report covers details of our sector from 2019, I write this editorial in lockdown as our cultural community changes dramatically around me. What might the impacts of COVID-19 mean for female artists? In other research I am undertaking with Dr Lauren England, it is clear that existing inequalities will be further exacerbated during, and in the aftermath of the pandemic, possibly for years to come.1 The existence of the ‘second shift’ for artist mothers has become overwhelmingly visible during COVID-19, indicating that despite changes in the workplace and public policy, the personal is still political for most women.2 Artists still earn as little as £16,150 per annum8 Artists still earn as little as £16,150 per annum, with a gap of 17.3% in the UK is applied7 (reducing the average income by £2,795), it is likely female artists in the UK have an average income of £13,355; £4,783 less than the minimum wage in the UK of £18,138.4 There is currently no data on variations between the average income of male and female artists in the UK, but it is clear from the research in this report that the gender pay gap for the sector is likely to be far wider than national averages. The gender ratio of staff in the Art & Design Schools of UK universities also continues to worsen. The percentage of male top earners is increasing, while the percentage of female top earners is decreasing (evidences 31 & 32). The impact of COVID-19 on the Higher Education sector is also likely to create further inequalities in future years, with a particular impact on BAME staff, as enormous job losses have been predicted just as this report goes to print. The structure of art schools is a major contributing factor to the precarious lives of artists, with as much as 90% of teaching outsourced to artists on zero-hours contracts. Goldsmiths, at the University of London, is set to lose almost 500 casually employed staff in September.9 Research shows that female academics are also undertaking the lion’s share of the pastoral care and invisible labour, leaving less time for research during the pandemic.10 Many of these issues are explored in the two powerful essays by Jennifer Higgin and Hettie Judah commissioned for this year’s report. Judah has undertaken a substantial number of interviews with artists in an attempt to map the often unspoken impact of motherhood on female artists. While the visibility of motherhood is improving somewhat, many artists continue to feel that it is a choice between being an artist and having a family – there is rarely a ‘wife’ to take care of things, as is the case for many male artists. During COVID-19 this has already become increasingly pertinent, as female artists juggle income precarity along with domestic and parental labour more than ever before. In my own research on the impact of COVID-19 on female artists I have found that the complex ecology of day-to-day life for a female artist is marked by days that are diverse, outward-looking, collaborative, community and family-focused; and interspersed with cooking, walking, reading, working, making and caring. Rarely did the artists I interviewed describe their days locked away unencumbered by the pushes and pulls of the world. I wonder how we might re-write the narrative of an artist’s life to reflect this fullness. Can we use this time under COVID-19 to make the invisible, visible? Can we find a different way to value the unpaid work of artists and women and mothers? Yet Judah’s reference to Cyril Connolly’s now-infamous assertion from 1938 that, ‘There is no more sambre enemy of good art that the pram in the hall stubbornly lives on, even amongst women. Many artists, who are also mothers, will recall Tracey Emin declaring that it is not possible for female artists to be successful and have children, stating that, ‘There are good artists that have children. Of course there are. They are called men.”11 In her essay for this report, Jennifer Higgin makes clear that these battles have been fought for centuries. Despite hundreds of years of outstanding achievements, it wasn’t until well into the twentieth century that women were permitted to study in the art academies. Higgin states that, ‘Gender exclusion isn’t a theory; it’s a fact. The weight of this history maintains the value of male art over female art, the legacy of certain artists over others; and the stereotypes of what an artist looks like and how they behave. When Drusilla Modjeska found inspiration to write the two important female artists of the twentieth century – Stella Bowen and Grace Courson-Smith – she chose the title ‘Stravinsky’s Lunch’ after an anecdote describing how Stravinsky would insist that his family ate lunch in silence when he was mid-composition.12 It was rare then, and now, that female artists are ever able to demand these acts of devotion and support for their practice. But, as one of the artists that Judah interviewed so poetically notes: ‘The secret is that this is the best life. Fucking hard work, but full, messy and beautiful.’ We now have a sense of urgency for the survival of our artists and cultural organisations, but most importantly, an opportunity to re-imagine what our sector should look like. As artist Tai Shani notes in a recent article for ArtReview, responding to sector-wide redundancies, ‘What does solidary mean if it is so circumscribed, managed, and abstracted to the point of refusing to acknowledge how these struggles are all connected?’13 I believe this is a watershed moment in identifying ways to speed up the incredibly slow rates of gender equality typified in this report. But perhaps what is more crucial, is that we avoid a major step backwards as the impacts of COVID-19 unfold, not just for women, but for everyone whose story and whose labour has most often been rendered invisible.

Plain Facts: The Importance of Acknowledging Women Artists

Jennifer Higgie

In 1881 in Paris, the sculptor Hélène Bertaux – the founder of the newly established Union des Femmes Peintres et Sculpteurs (Union of Women Painters and Sculptors) – made her inaugural address. Pulling no punches, she proclaimed that:

The woman artist is an ignored, little-understood force, delayed in its rise! A social prejudice of sorts weighs upon her; and yet, every year, the number of women who dedicate themselves to art is swelling with fearsome speed.1

Despite the fact that more and more women were becoming professional artists when Bertaux made her speech, it was another 16 years until female students could study alongside men at Paris’s École des Beaux-Arts. Until well into the twentieth century, women were expected to be wives and mothers, not artists or writers; they had little or no political agency and, unless they had a father who was an artist (as Bertaux’s was), they had no access to any kind of professional training.

Gender exclusion isn’t a theory; it’s a fact. Notwithstanding the myriad restrictions they faced (and often still do), women have always been creative. Barred from the life room and the art academies, forbidden to work on scaffolds, or to become apprentices, women artists didn’t begin to be treated as equals until decades into the twentieth century – and then often begrudgingly. Yet, they persisted.

A good example is the history of London’s Royal Academy. In 1768 Sir Joshua Reynolds was made president and the 36 founder members were named; among them, two gifted artists, Angelica Kauffman and Mary Moser. Johan Zoffany was commissioned to commemorate this momentous occasion with a group portrait: The Academicians of the Royal Academy (1771–72). All of the founders are portrayed in the life studio – a room from which women were barred. As a result, rather than being depicted standing alongside their fellow artists, Kauffman and Moser are featured in two small, almost unrecognisable portraits that hang on the back wall of the studio.

Another story: when, in the mid-eighteenth century, the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna acquired a self-portrait from 1554 by the great Cremonese artist Sofonisba Anguissola, it was considered so extraordinary that a woman should be an artist that her painting was hung amongst the Cabinets of Curiosities2 – even though she had been trained by Michelangelo, appointed court painter to Philip II of Spain and praised by Giorgio Vasari in the second edition of his Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architettori (The Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects, 1568).

In fifteenth and sixteenth-century Italy, we know of at least 120 women who were working as professional artists,2 and yet much of what they created is either lost or – we can assume – misattributed.

Take, for example, the Venetian writer and artist Irene di Spilimbergo, who was considered so gifted that when she died at only 19 in 1559, she was praised not only by Vasari but by no less than 140 poets. Nothing she created has survived.3 Likewise, no works by di Spilimbergo’s contemporary Lucrezia Quistelli, (who was also praised by Vasari) definitively exist. (There is some debate around attributions.)4

North of Italy, one of the most prolific portraitists of the seventeenth century was the Dutch painter Judith Leyster, the only woman amongst 30 men to be accepted as a member of the Haarlem Guild of St Luke. Soon after she died in 1660, Leyster was seemingly forgotten; and until the late nineteenth century most of her paintings were credited to either her rival Frans Hals, or to her husband, Jan Miere Molenaer.

In France, the prodigy Elisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun became Marie-Antoinette’s favourite artist. At her death in 1842, she left behind a staggering 600 or so paintings – and yet her first retrospective took place in Paris in 2015. These are just a few examples: the list is long – and increasingly so, thanks to the dedicated scholarship of art historians.

Even though there are countless examples of pre-twentieth-century women artists, most people can’t name even one. This isn’t surprising: how is anyone to know anything if it’s been treated as a secret for so long? Take, for example, two of the best-known textbooks of the twentieth century: EH Gombrich’s Story of Art (1961) and HW Janson’s History of Art (1962). Although they have been updated in recent years, in their original printing, not a single woman artist is mentioned. Bluntly speaking, until recently, art history has been understood as a record of male achievement. It’s ironic, then, that Janson himself was fully aware that knowledge is a work in progress. In his introduction to the original edition he wrote:

There are no ‘plain facts’ in the history of art – or in the history of anything else, for that matter, only degrees of plausibility. Every statement, no matter how fully documented, is subject to doubt and remains a ‘fact’ only so long as nobody questions it.6

I recently interviewed the Director of Tate Modern, Frances Morris, about her time studying art history at Cambridge University and at The Courtauld Institute in the 1970s and 1980s.7 She was blunt about the ‘plain facts’ she had been taught: not one female artist was mentioned in the entirety of her studies apart from, curiously, the Bauhaus weaver Anni Albers, possibly because she was the first female textile artist to be granted the honour of a solo exhibition at New York’s Museum of Modern Art in 1949. I studied painting at art school in Canberra and Melbourne in the 1980s and 1990s. Apart from a few feminist artists of the late twentieth century, I can only recall, at best, a couple of pre-twentieth-century women artists being mentioned. It wasn’t until I read two dazzling surveys – Germaine Greer’s The Obstacle Race: The Fortunes of Women Painters and Their Work (1979) and Griselda Pollock and Rozsika Parker’s Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology (1981) – that I became aware of the gender discrimination that beat at the heart of my art education. I had no idea that so many successful women artists were working in the Renaissance and the Baroque periods, let alone in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But although these books

---

2 Confirmed in email dated 3 February 2020 from Jasper Sharp, curator at the Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum.
7 Frieze Academy, Art and Feminism: Re-thinking Art History, Frances Morris and Jennifer Higgie in discussion, 18 July 2018.
Essays were published four decades ago, and much has been written on the subject since then, still the bias persists. Four years ago, I began a daily Instagram account in order to honour female artists from the past. At first, it was a struggle to fulfil my brief, as you have to dig deep to uncover lesser-known women artists. Anecdotes flowed my way from readers astonished about the ongoing levels of discrimination. One friend told me that in her seven-year-old daughter’s art class, the teacher had devoted a week to studying great artists and hadn’t included one woman. And this, in 2020.

Even today, although many more women than men graduate from art schools, commercial galleries, on the whole, represent significantly more men and important collections are heavily weighted to male achievement. That women are increasingly being given solo exhibitions and their work is finally being acquired by museums is a sign that things are moving in the right direction, but there’s still a long way to go. In 2018, for example, I visited an exhibition at the Palazzo Strozzi in Florence. Titled *Dawn of a Nation*, it explored the intertwining of art and politics from the 1950s to the late 1960s – a period in which many remarkable women artists were working in Italy. It included more than 80 works of art and yet only one was by a female artist: Giosetta Fioroni.

Deeply entrenched biases take generations to fully redress. It’s essential that a very bright light continues to be cast on the dark spaces of discrimination that continue to flourish in the arts. Annual statistics revealing the degrees to which women’s work is exhibited, represented, rewarded, collected and written about are invaluable: no-one can argue with plain facts. The sheer variety and volume of paintings and sculptures by women that have been erased from history is staggering – and, quite simply, it’s no longer acceptable. History is a story told in words as well as deeds: if the accomplishments of creative women aren’t acknowledged, they may as well have never existed.

---

8 Dr Kate McMillan, ‘Representation of Female Artists in Britain,’ Freelands Foundation, 2019.
Full, Messy and Beautiful
Hettie Judah

“If it weren’t for you, I’d have been a famous artist,” my furious red-headed mother used to say.”

“I remember complaining to him once, ‘Jeff Wall doesn’t have to make peanut butter and jelly sandwiches in the middle of his photo shoots!’ And he, age four, replying, ‘Oh yeah? What else does Jeff Wall not have to do?’”
Justine Kurland, ‘Six Years on the Road, as an Artist and a Mother’, The New Yorker (2016)

The taboo of motherhood as a subject for art has been broached recently in shows including Birth at TJ Boulting (2019) and Matrescence / Maternality at Richard Saltoun Gallery (2019/20). Yet we seldom discuss the impact motherhood has on the artist, her ability to make, show and sell work.

The parting of fortunes for men and women artists begins in the period between early career recognition (e.g. selection for New Contemporaries) and gallery representation.¹ In other words, at around the time they become parents. The statistics make the impact of motherhood on female artists’ career apparent, but the question of why – and what we might do to change things – is complex.

The observations below are drawn from some 50 interviews with artist mothers responding to a public invitation in April 2020.² These artists come from a range of regions and socioeconomic backgrounds and were interviewed at various stages of motherhood, ranging from late pregnancy to grandparenthood.³

In Utero

The impact of motherhood can be felt as soon as an artist knows she is pregnant. Already there may be a shift in the behaviour of curators, gallerists and commissioning bodies.⁴ One pregnant artist had performances cancelled without consultation. Another experienced tension with a gallerist who did not approve of her decision to start a family.⁵ Others report work drying up, and diminishing communication from institutions, galleries and funding bodies. It is therefore hardly surprising that many artists worry they might lose work and choose to hide their pregnancy with voluminous clothing for as long as possible.⁶ Within an already insecure and unpredictable profession, pregnancy adds another layer of worry: will you be able to complete projects in time? Will you lose out on commissions? Will you be able to work afterwards?⁷

Who’s (still) carrying the baby?

At the Royal Academy Schools in the 1980s, a tutor sternly instructed students not to marry another artist because their careers would be in competition.⁸ Ignore that tutor: artists with partners in the creative industries are far more likely to share childcare than those with a spouse in a more traditional profession.⁹ Otherwise, there is seldom a question of who will take responsibility for children: with a family to support, and art rarely offering a stable income, it is the artist mother who tends the family, and the salaried father who pursues a career. These roles are cemented with subsequent decisions made for logistical and administrative aspects of running a family.¹⁰ All this is physical and mental energy that is no longer being used for art.

Objects in time and space

Newborns have scant respect for mothers’ other forms of creativity. Before birth it seems inconceivable that feeding, cleaning and comforting a newborn could be a full-time process. As a result, there is an enduring notion that an artist might continue working in her studio while a baby slumbers contentedly alongside her.

Perhaps a few artist mothers achieve this idyll: more however receive a rude shock and find themselves fed, educated, attended to, delivered, collected, inculturated, medicated.¹¹ Even artists who shared childcare with a partner felt that as the mother, they carried the ultimate responsibility for logistical and administrative aspects of running a family.¹² All this is physical and mental energy that is no longer being used for art.

Making art needs time and focus – even for artist mothers who continue working, the 10 or 12-hour days that she might have pursued in the studio before, become a thing of the past.¹³ Motherhood can also change an artist’s access to space. With less freedom to work, and the financial pressure of a family, many give up their studio while their children are young, and work instead, from home. This has an impact on the work, which, through necessity, often becomes smaller – art of a domestic scale historically associated with women artists. Many also switch to media better suited to a few stolen hours: video, sound, photography and even textile work rather than painting.¹⁴ Working from home, too, precludes materials, tools or a messy environment potentially hazardous to a young child.¹⁵

Blood, sweat, tears and heartache

There are artist mothers who make it work, achieving a successful career, while shouldering childcare. In all cases the effort is formidable. One artist with four children, who are now in their late teens and twenties, describes a working regime that started at five am, painting for three hours before her partner left for work, spending the day with the children, then painting again once they were in bed.¹⁶

Motherhood can bring creativity and energy, keen focus and renewed drive: many artist mothers also experience a subsequent crash,¹⁷ bouts of depression, and persistent anxiety from constantly working on borrowed time.¹⁸ The struggle to work has an impact, too, on artist’s relationships. Once the children have been accounted for, often the choice is between time with a spouse or making art.¹⁹

---

¹ Dr Kate McMillan, ‘Representation of Female Artists in Britain’, Freeland’s Foundation, 2000.
² All interviews were conducted over Zoom and via email.
³ All artist participants were either born or based in the UK.
⁴ Rong, Wahid, et aliae.
⁵ Myrsicough.
⁶ Fowler, et aliae.
⁷ Bonfield.
⁸ MacArthur.
10 Faram, Franks, et aliae.
11 Hart, Leyton, Thomas, et aliae.
12 Ibid.
13 Faram, et aliae.
14 Woods, Zia.
15 Johnson, Soliz, et aliae.
16 Many, Zia, Berthon-Moine, et aliae.
17 Berthon-Moine.
18 Martha.
19 Boulton, Corker, et aliae.
20 Marlene, et aliae.
21 Zia, et aliae.
The Witching Hours
Few aspects of the art world better illustrate its power structures than the persistence of the witching hours, the six to eight pm private views, during which, artists, gallerists, collectors and the press socialise, exchange gossip and do business. Making art can be a solitary occupation and these periods away from the studio, building and maintaining a network are important.
Spending time with a peer group has an impact on an artist’s career: this is an industry that relies to a large degree on word of mouth, and that legendary, intangible quality of ‘buzz.’ Artists who are respected by their peers will often in turn attract the attention of dealers and collectors. Out of sight risks being out of mind. To put it simply, six to eight pm is when artists come into contact with their industry.
For parents of nursery and primary school aged children, six to eight pm are witching hours of a different kind, occupied by the immovable trinity of supper, bath and bedtime.23 There is a direct and very evident clash for anyone in the art world responsible for young children.
But children aren’t mute accessories – they may be tired and fractious. They will require attention from a partner on hand to share the wrangling (or decide against starting a family) because they fear they will not be taken seriously.24

A More Global Art World
For artists responsible for children, travel to biennales and fairs, to investigate new markets, or to install exhibitions becomes difficult if extended childcare isn’t available at home or offered by the host institution.25 Residencies, which provide crucial time and space to think about and make work, are likewise out of the question for many artist mothers, though it was noted that artist fathers seldom seem to see parenthood as an impediment to such opportunities.26 Even on a residency for women artists, the request for a young child to travel with an artist was framed as a ‘choice’: the fact that the artist would need to have her child with her was not established as the norm.27

The Persistence of Bohemia
Superficial but true: image remains part of this industry. Artist mothers unable to participate in the ‘bohemian lifestyle’ – the nightlife, parties and wild behaviour – have found themselves cut off from their peer groups.28 One described the switch to motherhood as an experience akin to selling out or joining the bourgeoisie.29 Artist mothers re-entering the art world in their forties and fifties experience an image problem: not old enough to be a late-career discovery, not young enough to be a fresh talent, and unlikely to be established in the way her male contemporaries are.30

Historically, the infamous ‘pram in the hallway’ has been regarded with suspicion,31 if not hostility, within the art world. While things are starting to change, the prejudice lingers. One artist felt ‘eccentric’ for carrying work to a gallery in the base of her pram.32 Another was informed by an art world insider that they couldn’t think of any women artists whose career had continued to flourish after having children.33 This narrative is remarkably persistent: artists put off having children (or decide against starting a family) because they fear they will not be taken seriously.34

The Selfish Mother
The guilt experienced by artist mothers is rooted in broader cultural issues: art doesn’t come with a fixed wage or an established career trajectory, the making of it doesn’t have an easily quantifiable value. With childcare costly, how dare you spend money to work without guaranteed financial reward? How dare you take time for your work away from your children?35 How dare you bring children into the insecurity of an artist’s lifestyle?36
With guilt, too, comes concern that the artist will be considered a selfish mother.37 Mothers are meant to be selfless. How can they demand time and space for their own work? Yet if they do not, and continue to fit art making around the demands of a family, they are belittled as hobby artists.38 Art becomes something nice that mummy does.39

No Such Thing as a Level Playing Field
There are abundant modifying factors that affect the impact of motherhood on an artist: the number of children she has, her financial situation, the existence and level of assistance from extended family, the health of her children, herself and her family. Artists, like other women, may suffer postnatal depression, miscarriages, difficulties in conceiving, abusive or controlling partners, or bouts of severe illness, they may be widowed and left to support a family alone, find themselves responsible for extended families of step children, or have children whose special educational needs demand a career break of many years.40 They may also be responsible for other kinds of caregiving, such as looking after elderly parents.

What might make a difference?
Access to affordable childcare has a huge impact: artists who share childcare with a partner, or who have extended family on hand can continue working,41 while others struggle. The prohibitive cost of childcare in Britain is an issue for most working mothers: without a steady or guaranteed income, artists may find it hard to justify unless...
they need to meet a specific deadline.\textsuperscript{46} Could studio complexes offer crèche facilities – perhaps cooperatively run by artist parents?\textsuperscript{47} A number of artists raised the fact that childcare could not be counted among artists’ costs when making an application to Arts Council England.\textsuperscript{48} There are calls for more specific funding, more opportunities, more dedicated spaces and residencies for parents and children.\textsuperscript{49} Museums provide well for family visitors; this same welcome should be extended to the artists they work with.\textsuperscript{50}

Certain institutions go out of their way to support artist mothers, offering a template for best practice: The Fruitmarket Gallery in Edinburgh, for example, anticipated that an artist would need to travel with her child, and provided care while the artist was installing her exhibition, for the opening event and even for the morning after.\textsuperscript{51} Another artist found galleries willing and helpful, reprogramming shows to suit her, and making sure that she was well looked-after when travelling pregnant or with newborn twins.\textsuperscript{52}

Support doesn’t need to be costly: a gallery that is flexible, loyal and communicative with artist mothers can make a big difference.\textsuperscript{53} Flexibility on the part of art institutions would include the assumption that an artist will need to bring a child with them on a residency, will need childcare while finishing work and installing an exhibition, and while being present at openings and exhibition events. If these requirements continue to be framed as a ‘choice’, the burden of flexibility is placed on the artist herself, together with associated costs. In not being flexible, and assuming all artists can work 10 to 12 hour working days, galleries miss out the work of artists of diverse backgrounds and life experiences.\textsuperscript{54}

With its evening events and international travel schedule, the art world pre COVID-19 was not well suited to artist parents. Perhaps the pandemic will force a change, a softening, a focus on local scenes, or change in tone that could make it more inclusive?\textsuperscript{55}

Where are the artist mother heroines to look up to?\textsuperscript{56} Where are successful artist mothers represented in popular culture?\textsuperscript{57} Brilliant artist mothers exist – celebrating them is important if we are to shift the enduring cliché that a woman cannot be both.

This Story Has a Happy Ending

A paradigm shift is necessary precisely because motherhood is not a catastrophe: it should be a cause for celebration.

Artist mothers have described a renewed focus,\textsuperscript{58} a new direction in their work,\textsuperscript{59} and even inspiration for a complete change of career.\textsuperscript{60} Some enjoy making work with their children and bring family life into their art.\textsuperscript{61} Others maintain two separate spheres. A shift is already underway: where artists of an earlier generation who were upfront about motherhood are now regarded as pioneers,\textsuperscript{62} younger artists are already experiencing acceptance and even celebration of their motherhood within the art world.\textsuperscript{63} This has been facilitated by a new generation of curators, writers, academics and artists who no longer feel obliged to prove themselves within old patriarchal structures, but instead feel liberated to explore territory that has for too long been dismissed or overlooked.\textsuperscript{64}

As one artist mother puts it: ‘The secret is that this is the best life. Fucking hard work, but full, messy and beautiful.’\textsuperscript{65}
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Evidence 1
Gender of GCSE graduates in England from 2015–2019

This evidence, captured here for the first time, indicates that over the last five years, young women have selected Art & Design subjects at a far higher rate than their male peers.

Evidence 2
Gender of A Level Art & Design Graduates in England from 2015–2019

The percentage of female students who selected Art & Design subjects rose from 65% at GCSE, to between 75% and 80% at A Level.
Evidence 3
Undergraduates Studying Art & Design from 2008–2019

The percentage of female students choosing to undertake BA programmes in Art & Design continues to increase, mirroring similar percentages seen at GCSE level.

Evidence 4
Applications for Postgraduate Study in Creative Arts & Design from 2009–2018

At postgraduate level, the number of women applying to study Creative Arts & Design courses continues to rise, while the number of applications from male peers continues to decline.
Evidence 5
Graduates Studying Postgraduate Courses in Creative Arts & Design 2014–2019

In 2018/19, the number of women studying Postgraduate Courses increased by 1% to 66%. Over the last five years there have been annual increases of 1%, from 63% in 2014/15.

Evidence 6
Emerging Artists Selected for New Contemporaries 2010–2019

Over the last ten years 51% of selected artists were women, and over the same period an average of 63% of applicants were women. This competition is notable as the only ‘blind competition’ of its kind, meaning the judges only view the work and do not have access to the applicants’ names or history. It is one of the few areas where gender parity is consistently met.
Evidence 7

In 2019, the amount of overall funding for artists decreased by 20% (£1,509,493), although the number of grants awarded increased by 59. The decrease in overall funding led to a decrease of funding for women of 24% as compared with 2018, and of 17% for male artists. However, individual grants saw an increase of 7% to women and 24% to men. 2018 saw an increase of funding for women of 1% as compared to 2017. But, as the table shows, funding for female artists was at its lowest point in three years during 2019.

Evidence 8
Solo Shows in Non-commercial Galleries in London 2015–2019

The data across all non-commercial institutions in London did not change from the previous year. However, in the four major London institutions we measured (Tate Modern, Tate Britain, the V&A and Serpentine Galleries), it was down 18% as compared to 2018. In institutions receiving between £500–£1 million, 53% of solo shows were by women artists. This increased significantly in organisations with less than £500K, where 67% of solo shows were by women artists, mirroring a similar ratio of female university graduates.
Evidence 9
Solo shows in Non-commercial Galleries outside London 2015–2019

The proportion of solo shows for female artists in non-commercial galleries outside London peaked in 2017, but in the last two years it has been declining. In 2019 it dropped by 4% as compared to 2018.

Evidence 10
Artists Selected for UK Triennials and Biennials since 2017

The data for 2019 remains unchanged from 2018. In the most recent iterations, both the Glasgow International and Liverpool Biennale exceeded gender parity.
Evidence 11
Gender of Artists Commissioned for Public Art Projects between 2018–2019

13 commissioning agencies were active across the UK in 2019 on 77 projects. 53% of those projects were awarded to female artists, slightly down from 54% in 2018. The number of mixed gender partnerships increased in 2019. The year-on-year data is difficult to make comparisons from, as the number of projects vary significantly from year to year. In 2018 for example, only 36 projects were commissioned and completed.

Evidence 12
Artists Represented by London Major Commercial Galleries and Deceased Estates 2016–2019

In 2019, 35% of artists represented by 27 commercial galleries in London were women, a 3% increase from 2018. In 2016 only 29% were women, which indicates a 1% increase each year. Deceased men represented 12% of all artists; and 3% of all artists were deceased women, a decline of 1% from the 2018 and 2017.
Evidence 13
Solo Shows at London’s Major Commercial Galleries during Frieze 2016–2019

27 London commercial galleries held 41 shows during Frieze Week in 2019. We included solo booths at Frieze, as well as off-site and gallery solo exhibitions. 27 (66%) were by male artists and 14 (34%) were by female artists, which represented a 4% decline from the previous year. In 2016, 42% of solo shows were by women during Frieze week. In 2017 it dropped to 21%, which underlines that gains are not linear over time.

Evidence 14
Gender of Artists Reviewed in National Newspapers 2018–2019

We have been mapping the gender of artists reviewed in five national newspapers for two years. In 2019, reviews where women were mentioned declined across the board. Named female artists in group shows decreased by 11%; reviews of solo shows by female artists were down by 6% and single-gender group shows decreased by 18% (but were still 50%). The newspaper that consistently reviewed more women across all categories was The Times, followed by The Guardian and The Financial Times. The Telegraph reviewed the fewest, followed by The Observer.
Evidence 15
Turner Prize Winners
2009–2019

This data remained stable in 2019 and 2018, after increasing 10% from 2017. Over this ten-year span, 67% of Turner Prize Winners have been women.

Evidence 16
Artists Representing Britain at the Venice Biennale 1997–2019

Over the last ten years 50% of the artists representing Britain at the Venice Biennale have been women. This compares to the data over twenty years, which shows that 36% of the artists were female and 64% male.
Of the 668 works that came into the Tate Collection in 2018/19, 447 (67%) were artworks by male artists and 219 (33%) were works by women, while two works were attributed to an ‘unknown artist’.

Works by 137 separate artists and artist collectives were acquired by Tate in the 2018/19 period, which included work by 78 (57%) male artists and 59 female artists (43%). This meant that while almost half of the artworks Tate collected were by women, when they collected work by men, they collected a significantly higher number of works.
Evidence 19

Government Art Collection
Artworks and Artists

The Government Art Collection houses 14,411 works. Of those, 10.7% of works are by female artists. Of the artists represented in the collection, 14.3% are female.

Evidence 20

Government Art Collection
Artists Acquired 2017–2019

In 2017/18, 116 works were acquired (2 commissions, 3 gifts, 59 purchases, 47 transfers, 5 accessioned into the collection with uncertain legal status, e.g. may have been found in a government department). In 2018/19 42 works were acquired (1 commission, 3 gifts, 38 purchases), which included 39 (93%) individual female artists and 40 (95%) works by women. The significant shift displayed between 2018 and 2019 data is evidence of a concerted shift in collection policy at the Government Art Collection, which shows an attempt to begin to rectify the disparity between the number of works by male and female artists in the collection.
Evidence 21
The National Gallery Collection

Well known as having the worst gender ratio in the country, The National Gallery is home to 2,624 works, of which only 28 are by 17 women. 11 works came into the National Gallery Collection in the 2018/19 financial year through donation and purchase. The total value of works was £9,547,825. Two of the works were by women, totalling £3,886,558 (40.7%); and nine works were by male artists, totalling £5,661,267 (59.3%). All nine works by male artists were gifts or accepted via HMRC in lieu of inheritance tax. Both works by women (Artemisia Gentileschi’s *Self Portrait as Saint Catherine of Alexandria* (1615–17) and Bridget Riley’s *Messengers* (2019) were bought through the support of various National Gallery patrons.
Evidence 23
The British Council Collection Artworks and Artists

The British Council Collection is home to 8,820 artworks. Of these works, 1,243 (14%) are works by female artists and 7,260 (86%) are by male artists.

Of the 1,474 artists represented in the collection, 351 (23%) are female and 1,123 (77%) are male.

Evidence 24
The British Council Collection Artworks Acquired 2017–2019

In 2017/18, 25 works were acquired by 16 artists. 17 (68%) works were by 8 (50%) male artists. In 2018/19 16 works entered the collection by 11 artists. 8 (50%) works were by 4 (36%) male artists, and 8 (50%) works were by 7 (64%) female artists.
Evidence 25
Arts Council England Collection
Artworks and Artists

Arts Council England house 7,958 works in their collection. 6,433 (81%) works are by male artists, and 1,429 (18%) are by female artists. 10 works are by non-binary artists and 29 works are unknown (1%), shown here as ‘other’. The percentage of non-binary artists was too small to be shown in ‘Total artists in collection’. 2,228 individual artists are represented in the ACE Collection. This includes 533 (24%) women and 1,695 (76%) male artists.

Evidence 26
Arts Council England Collection
Artworks Acquired 2017–2019

In 2017/18, works were acquired by 14 female artists and 24 male artists. In 2018/19 the collection acquired work by 18 female artists and 6 male artists. If we look at the number of overall works, ACE Collection acquired 47 new works in 2017/18, of which 23 were by women and 24 by men. In 2018/19 64 new works were acquired, of which 29 were by women and 25 by men. Therefore, even though the work of only six men was acquired in the recent financial year, more individual works by those artists came into the ACE Collection.
The number of female artists whose work has sold at the three contemporary art evening sales has slowly increased over the last five years. However, the number of highest-grossing works compiled by gender has not changed over this time. 86% of the lots in 2019 were works by male artists, while only 3% of the top highest-grossing sales were works by female artists in 2018 and 2019. Once again, we see very little change over the five-year period, which has a direct impact on who is being represented in commercial galleries, which in turn affects who is being programmed into institutional shows across the country.

This year we also analysed the data from the three evening sales at Christie’s. Overall there were 112 lots, which included 98 (87.5%) men and 14 women, slightly lower than Sotheby’s. The work by women accounted for between 6–10% of the total income for each evening sale, indicating that not only was the work of women less likely to be auctioned, but that these lots also sold for less.
Evidence 29
Academic Staff Teaching Creative Arts & Design in UK Universities 2014–2019

57% of the highest-paid staff were male, decreasing from 61% in 2014/15. The number of highest-paid female staff has increased at approximately 1% a year over the same time. There is also a far higher number of male staff earning less than £25K (67%), which suggests that higher numbers of employed male staff at the beginning of their careers translates to higher numbers of senior male staff.

Evidence 30
Professorial vs Zero-Hour Contract Staff in Creative Arts & Design Universities 2014–2019

Over the last five years female staff with the title of ‘Professor’ have increased, from 35% in 2014/15, to 40% in the 2018/19. But, as we see in other data, progress is not always assured, as in 2015/16 it dropped to 32%. This is the inverse of the percentage of female staff teaching in UK Art & Design courses on zero-hour contracts, which in the 2018/19 academic year rose to 60%.
We assessed the gender of 27 directors of commercial galleries in London and found that 44% of directors were women. This remains stable since 2018.

In 2019, across all non-commercial institutions in London (33), 52% of directors were women. This is down from 58% in 2018.
In 2019, of the 11 major institutions in London that receive more than £1 million in ACE/DCMS funding, only 36% of directors are female, as opposed to institutions receiving less than £1 million in funding, where 63% of directors are female.

In 2019, 56% of all gallery directors in non-commercial institutions outside London were female and 44% were male. This did not change from the previous year.
Evidence 35
Gender of Non-Commercial Gallery Directors in Major Institutions outside London

The number of female directors of institutions receiving more than £500K in funding increased by 7% from the previous year to 31%.

Evidence 36
The ArtReview Power 100 2016–2019

30% of entries on the complete list were women, which has decreased by 7% since 2018, which had in turn decreased by 3% from 2017. 35% of the artists included on the list were women, which decreased by 10% from 2018. In 2016, almost 80% of the artists were men.
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