

A Study on the Multidimensional Construction and Innovative Pathways of Art Sponsorship Models

Ruojing Lin

*Department of Art Management, China Conservatory of Music, Beijing, China
olivea233@163.com*

Abstract. Art sponsorship serves as a crucial mechanism to address the lack of creativity in art product creation and the dilemma of sustainable development. Its systematic construction holds significant theoretical and practical significance in the context of the current cultural governance transformation. However, the existing relevant research is limited in quantity and lacks systematicness, failing to form a complete theoretical framework. This paper systematically reviews the relevant literature on art sponsorship at home and abroad in the past decade, integrates various academic viewpoints, aiming to clarify the subject relationships, behavioral motivations, model types, and effectiveness evaluation mechanisms of art sponsorship, analyzes the research commonalities and development trends, and summarizes them into three major research directions: sponsorship subjects and relationships, motivations and value cognition, and sponsorship models and effectiveness evaluation. The study finds that art sponsorship is a dynamic system shaped by diverse subjects, motivations, models, and evaluation mechanisms. Moreover, effective coordination among stakeholders and scientific evaluation are essential for sustainable development. In the future, attention can be paid to the power dynamics in crisis situations, the interaction between globalization and local culture, and the application of digital models in practice.

Keywords: Art sponsorship, Model construction, Subject relationship, Effectiveness evaluation, Globalization

1. Introduction

Art sponsorship, as a key mechanism to solve the problems of insufficient creativity in art product creation and sustainable development dilemmas, urgently needs theoretical support and practical breakthroughs for its systematic construction. Art sponsorship is not only an important channel for art products to obtain resources but also a crucial link to regulate the relationship between the government, the market, and society. It has far-reaching significance in stimulating the vitality of art creation, optimizing the allocation of cultural resources, and promoting the diversified development of culture. Currently, the art sponsorship system faces multiple challenges, including policies, social participation, and resource allocation efficiency. However, the relevant research literature is scarce, and the research depth is insufficient, failing to form a systematic theoretical framework. This paper analyzes the types, functions, and interaction methods of sponsorship

subjects, explores the reasons and formation processes of sponsorship behaviors, and examines the operations and effects of different sponsorship models. Through literature review, comparative analysis, and case studies, this paper summarizes the relationships between various subjects, behavioral characteristics, model operation mechanisms, and evaluation methods, aiming to reveal the deficiencies in the existing research and the issues to be deepened.

2. The subjects and relational mechanisms of art sponsorship

2.1. Types and functions of sponsorship subjects

In the typology of art sponsorship, sponsoring entities can be divided into five types: government, enterprises, social organizations, art institutions, and individuals. Each of these entities performs different functions within the system. And the modern system involve multiple stakeholders, whose interactions shape sponsorship efficiency and cultural influence, as shown in Table 1. For example, between 1616 and 1711, the Bishop of Palencia in Spain funded church decoration and altarpieces. This reinforced the religious identity of the diocese and simultaneously demonstrated ecclesiastical authority and cultural influence [1]. This shows that, within specific social contexts, art sponsorship not only promotes cultural development but is also closely intertwined with political power.

Table 1. Types of art sponsorship entities and their core functions

Entity Type	Core Functions	Typical Forms
Government	Public resource allocation, policy guidance, cultural accessibility	National arts funds, special cultural funds
Corporate	Brand marketing, corporate social responsibility, cultural value integration	Corporate naming sponsorships, cultural public welfare projects
Social Institutions	Resource integration, professional operation, targeted funding	Arts foundations, intermediary organizations
Arts Institutions	Creative production, project execution, talent cultivation	Theaters, art museums, arts academies
Private Individuals	Support for cultural preferences, expression of social recognition	Private collections, family foundations

2.2. Evolution and structural characteristics of sponsorship relationships

The relationship of art sponsorship has evolved along with changes in social systems, economic conditions and power structures. Its nature and functions have shown significant differences in different historical periods. In the early stage, patronage relations dominated by royal families and aristocracy reflected power domination and resource dependence. Art sponsorship primarily served political and social functions, thereby reinforcing the sponsor's social status and influence. With capitalist and corporate involvement, sponsorship relations became more goal-oriented, forming reciprocity between art development and sponsor interests. Economic resources directly influenced the direction of artistic production, closely linking artistic creation with economic capital. During the Renaissance, improvements in artists' skills and identity construction interacted with patrons' political capital accumulation. This mutual empowerment promoted the formation of artistic schools revealing complex relationships among artistic creation, social resources, and power structures [2].

In the modern stage, the introduction of legal and market mechanisms has institutionalized and standardized sponsorship relations, improving the efficiency and transparency of resource allocation while reducing direct power intervention. Besides, by emphasizing multi-stakeholder collaboration, transparency, and institutional guarantees, modern systems enhance cooperation stability and boost resource efficiency and cultural innovation capacity. The operational effectiveness of modern art sponsorship systems depends on resource balance, information symmetry, and the regulation of relational networks and contextual conditions, shaping cooperation depth and sustainability among actors and profoundly influencing cultural industry development and social value realization [3].

2.3. Interaction mechanisms between sponsorship subjects

In modern art sponsorship systems, interaction mechanisms among stakeholders mainly involve information coordination, resource exchange, project matching, and performance feedback. Besides, comparative evidence shows these mechanisms are shaped by institutional and social structures. For example, France promotes cultural diversity through a combination of state-led governance and decentralized management [4]. Moreover, in Japan, intermediary organizations reduce information asymmetry between enterprises and art institutions, hence improving sponsorship efficiency. Russia emphasizes tripartite collaboration among government guidance, public demand, and corporate investment for efficient allocation [5, 6]. In contrast, the United States (U.S.) integrates government support, market flexibility, and the resource integration capacity of private institutions to form a diversified cooperation system [7].

The Shanghai International Arts Festival adopts full, project-based, and designated sponsorship models to integrate cultural characteristics with commercial attributes through project matching, while private foundations like the Luo Zhongli Scholarship connect academia and society through exhibitions and education, providing career support for young artists [8, 9]. These practices show that an effective interaction mechanism not only depends on the total amount of resources but also on the reasonable allocation of information transparency, cooperation models, and power structures, and ensures the continuous optimization of the system and flexible response to environmental differences through standardized evaluation and dynamic feedback [10, 11].

3. Motivations and value cognition of art sponsorship behaviors

3.1. Sponsorship motivations and behavioral driving factors

Art sponsorship motivations include commercial, philanthropic, cultural, and personal preferences, which are often interwoven in practice. Sponsorship activities must balance commercial objectives with artistic freedom to safeguard artistic value. Art sponsorship is not only financial support but a strategic action. Public relations and cultural marketing theories show that sponsorship strengthens brand identity via cultural resonance, contingent on alignment between projects and organizational mission [12].

In crowdfunding and public art projects, philanthropic motivation is often more effective than commercial incentives in driving public support. From a neoclassical economics perspective, public support for art is shaped not only by individual economic interests but also by evaluations of overall social welfare, influenced by personal preferences, policy environments, and perceptions of funding [13]. The limitations of market mechanisms in the arts have also been confirmed, as markets tend to prioritize consumption and entertainment and struggle to ensure artistic quality, while traditional funding models may constrain institutional flexibility [14]. Different motivations play differentiated

roles across contexts: commercial motives dominate in market-oriented sectors, philanthropic motives prevail in public art projects, and cultural motives alongside personal preferences run through private sponsorship and foundation funding.

3.2. Formation mechanism and logic of sponsorship behaviors

The formation of art sponsorship behaviors is comprehensively affected by four factors: subject interaction, resource flow, policy environment, and market feedback. Subject interaction determines the establishment, maintenance, and adjustment of sponsorship relationships. Resource flow affects the scale and sustainability of behaviors. The policy environment provides institutional constraints and incentives, while market feedback shapes behavior through public perception and performance evaluation. Corporate art sponsorship can enhance brand image, reputation, and public trust, but its effect depends on participation intensity and public perception. Long-term or frequent involvement may generate negative perceptions, weakening sponsorship effectiveness [15].

In enterprise-nonprofit art cooperation, alignment between brand value and artistic mission is central to behavioral formation [16]. And government or institutional funding can prevent excessive commercialization and sustain innovation, but excessive intervention may lead to market distortion and unfair competition [17]. The market feedback mechanism adjusts resource allocation and cooperation through performance evaluation and public perception, optimizing sponsorship behavior. Overall, the formation of sponsorship behaviors depends on the constraints and incentives provided by the institutional environment. The dynamic interaction of institutional, market, social, and art institutional environments jointly determines the stability and efficiency of sponsorship behaviors [3].

3.3. Multidimensional value embodiment of art sponsorship

The value of art sponsorship is reflected in four dimensions: culture, economy, society, and public life. In particular, cultural value supports artistic creation, develops art genres, and ensures cultural inheritance. It is complemented by economic value, which promotes cultural industry development, creates employment, and builds brand assets. Besides, social value further boosts public art literacy, facilitates cultural dissemination, and improves social welfare. Meanwhile, public value reflects the public nature of cultural policy and fulfills social responsibility.

Currently, the art sponsorship system is still immature, with insufficient policy incentives and generally low public awareness of sponsorship. Institutional guidance and art education play a key role in improving the public's aesthetic level and are directly related to the realization of social and public values [18]. The development of art foundations marks the trend towards specialization and standardization of sponsorship, providing channels for personal influence, corporate image, and social welfare. However, the limited number and insufficient capital scale still restrict the full play of their functions [19]. The proportion of funded works in awards can be used as an evaluation criterion for funding effectiveness. However, there are significant differences in the survival status of different opera genres, and a balance needs to be found between overall promotion and targeted support, policy support and self-reliance, and award guidance and market cultivation [20]. The practice of musical-theater funding shows that by controlling the scale of funding, improving project quality, expanding communication and profit channels, and strengthening the construction of composite management talents and review teams, multidimensional values can be more effectively realized [21]. The degree of value realization not only reflects the efficiency of fund use but also

affects the health and sustainability of the art ecosystem. Therefore, a scientific evaluation system and precise policy design are the key mechanisms for realizing multidimensional values.

4. Construction and effectiveness evaluation of art sponsorship models

4.1. Types of art sponsorship models

Art sponsorship models can be divided into the following four categories. The state - led model relies on government financial investment and policy guidance, emphasizing cultural inclusiveness and the realization of public values [21, 22]. The enterprise - led model is driven by brand marketing and social responsibility, combining cultural values with commercial interests [5]. The foundation or private model achieves targeted funding through professional operation, with strong flexibility and pertinence [9]. The social - mixed model integrates the resources of multiple subjects and gives full play to the advantages of all parties through a collaborative mechanism [6]. Table 2 summarizes the operation logic, advantages, limitations, and applicable conditions of each model.

Table 2. Types of art sponsorship models and their applicable conditions

Model Type	Operational Logic	Advantages	Limitations	Applicable Conditions
State-Led Model	Government investment, policy guidance	Stable resources, broad coverage	Relatively low efficiency, insufficient dynamism	Basic cultural infrastructure, universal arts programmes
Corporate-Led Model	Brand marketing, value integration	Market responsiveness, flexible resources	Poor stability, high utilitarianism	Arts activities with clear commercial potential
Foundation/Private-Led Model	Professional operation, targeted grant-making	High specificity, innovative flexibility	Limited scale, weak sustainability	Experimental arts, emerging/young artists
Hybrid Social Model	Multi-sector collaboration, resource sharing	Complementary strengths, ecological optimisation	Complex coordination, high institutional requirements	Large-scale festivals, cross-regional cultural projects
Global Strategic Model	Cross-border brand synergy, cultural capital integration	Substantial resources, extensive influence	Risk of cultural homogenisation, power asymmetry	International arts festivals, transnational cultural programmes

In practice, each model shows different characteristics. Transnational brand linkage and digital practices are promoting resource integration and value innovation, but they also bring problems like cultural homogenization, power asymmetry, and management complexity [23]. Model selection should be combined with project characteristics, resource conditions, and target values to achieve the synergy of cultural, economic, social, and public values [8].

4.2. Operation mechanisms of sponsorship models

In sponsorship models, four core components operate: resource matching, information coordination, policy guidance, and performance feedback. Resource matching enhances fund-project alignment through bidirectional coordination. Information coordination reduces transaction costs and improves information symmetry. Besides, policy guidance shapes the institutional environment and incentive structures, influencing resource allocation and behavioral choices. Performance feedback facilitates subsequent cooperation and model refinement through evaluation outcomes [5-7, 21].

These mechanisms are realized via the participation of government, enterprises, art institutions, and social actors, thus achieving resource allocation and value realization through institutionalized, decentralized, and network-based arrangements [8, 9]. Specifically, resource matching determines funding scale and precision, while information coordination affects cooperation efficiency. Besides, policy guidance structures the institutional environment, while performance feedback drives model refinement. Consequently, the operational mechanism reduces transaction costs, improves resource utilization efficiency, and strengthens mutual trust among stakeholders, ensuring the sustainable functioning of sponsorship models.

4.3. Effectiveness evaluation methods of art sponsorship

The effectiveness of art sponsorship is evaluated based on public value theory, using a performance management framework to quantify multidimensional value and improve allocation efficiency and process transparency [10]. Accordingly, the evaluation covers four dimensions: cultural influence, economic contribution, social benefits, and public value, reflecting multidimensional value analysis. In terms of methodology, commonly used approaches include the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), the Balanced Scorecard (BSC), Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation (FCE), and Key Performance Indicators (KPI) [10, 11]. Specifically, AHP determines indicator weights, BSC emphasizes multidimensional balance, DEA enables efficiency comparison, FCE handles fuzzy evaluation, and KPI focuses on key outcomes. Evaluation indicators include cultural influence (art quality, innovation, cultural diversity), economic contribution (industry development, employment creation, return on investment), social benefits (public participation, art dissemination, social recognition), and public value (policy goal achievement, fair resource allocation, and social accountability). Existing studies suggest that indicator selection should follow principles of rigor, systematization, conciseness, independence, comparability, and forward-looking relevance. Moreover, qualitative indicators can be quantified and compared with benchmark values. Performance evaluation is developmental, summative, and continuous, measuring project outcomes while optimizing policy design and public accountability, thus enabling oversight and improvement [10, 11]. A scientific evaluation system provides decision-making support for sponsorship models and, through data feedback, enables precise funding and dynamic adjustment, building a stable and sustainable sponsorship ecosystem.

5. Conclusion

This paper focuses on subject relationships, behavioral motivations, model types, and effectiveness evaluation, revealing the structure and operation logic of art sponsorship. The study shows that sponsorship actors are diverse, with differing functional roles and interaction mechanisms. At the same time, the interaction effect is jointly affected by information coordination, resource exchange, project matching, and performance feedback. On this basis, crisis situations may significantly

change power relations, highlighting the necessity of establishing a flexible interaction framework to ensure art autonomy and fair resource allocation. In addition, sponsorship behaviors are driven by commercial, public welfare, cultural, and personal motivations, and their formation is shaped by policy environments, stakeholder interactions, resource flows, and market feedback. Therefore, art sponsorship can not only enhance organizational image and brand value but also must take into account artistic values and public interests to achieve a multi-dimensional balance of cultural, economic, social, and public values. This logic further supports the operation and evaluation of different models. Specifically, art sponsorship models are diverse and operate effectively through resource matching, information coordination, policy guidance, and performance feedback. In the context of globalization, the tension between transnational capital flows, cultural festivals, and local cultural protection highlights the issues of model adaptability and sustainability. Effectiveness evaluation provides decision-making support for model optimization through a multi-dimensional indicator system and quantitative and qualitative methods. Scientific evaluation not only improves the efficiency and transparency of resource allocation but also provides a basis for policy-making, project selection, and long-term planning. However, the current research still has limitations such as limited literature coverage and insufficient empirical data. Therefore, in the future, it is necessary to further expand cross-cultural comparisons, analyze power dynamics in crisis situations, and study the impact of digitalization and globalization on art sponsorship models to deepen theoretical understanding and guide practice.

References

- [1] Fernández, A. L. (2020). *Mitra and ornament: The artistic patronage of the bishops of Palencia (1616–1711)* [Doctoral dissertation, University of León].
- [2] Liao, R. (2017). *The relationship between patrons and artists in the Renaissance* [Master's thesis, Hubei Institute of Fine Arts].
- [3] Liu, S. Y., & Dong, F. (2023). Formation mechanism of China's art funding system. *Art Sea*, (11), 10–14.
- [4] Qi, Y. (2017). A study on the French art funding system. *Journal of Henan Institute of Education (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 36(5), 29–42.
- [5] Cheng, Y. M. (2015). Corporate cultural sponsorship: A case study of the Japan Association for the Promotion of Mecenat. *Japan Issues Studies*, 29(1), 20–30.
- [6] Wang, Y. (2021). The revival of Russian art sponsorship and its implications for China. *Ancient and Modern Cultural Creation*, (34), 92–94.
- [7] Zhang, S. H., & Tan, R. (2021). Sponsorship mechanisms, orderly planning, and community building: Contemporary directions of public art in the United States. *Art Panorama*, (6), 142–145.
- [8] Xu, Y. W. (2013). Preliminary study on art sponsorship models in the Shanghai performance market: A case study of the Shanghai International Arts Festival. *Cultural Industry Research*, (0), 210–216.
- [9] Zhang, Y. (2017). Private sponsorship models in art education and the potential of foundations: A case study of the Luo Zhongli Scholarship. *Contemporary Artists*, (6), 70–71.
- [10] Ma, W. J., & Ma, M. (2022). Performance evaluation of government publishing funds from the perspective of public value theory. *China Publishing Journal*, (2), 39–44.
- [11] Yuan, K. K. (2022). *A study on the performance evaluation system of public cultural services in Japan* [Master's thesis, Central China Normal University].
- [12] Carney, B. (2011). The place of arts and culture sponsorships within the theory and practice of public relations.
- [13] Akimov, D. (2020). Specifics of sponsorship as a technology of ensuring access of population to works in art marketing. *Collection of Scientific Works Art Studies Notes*, (37).
- [14] Qian, Z. Z. (2015). Construction of the economic support system for non-profit performing arts troupes: Implications of Western art sponsorship for reform of state-owned performing arts institutions. *Art Hundred Schools*, 31(5), 43–47+143.
- [15] Stokburger-Sauer, N. E., & Hofmann, V. (2017). Art sponsorship success: An empirical investigation into sponsor recall and the ambiguous role of visitors' involvement. *Marketing: ZFP – Journal of Research and Management*, 39(1), 3–14.

- [16] Fene, L. (n.d.). *Non-profit brand and corporate sponsorship in performing arts organizations* [Doctoral dissertation, Toronto Metropolitan University].
- [17] Abbing, H. (2002). The government serves art: Do art subsidies serve the public interest or group interests? In *Why are artists poor?: The exceptional economy of the arts* (pp. 203–231).
- [18] Wang, Z. (2018). A brief discussion on art sponsorship. *Journal of Sichuan Cadre Correspondence Institute*, (2), 28–30.
- [19] Huang, J. (2018). Art sponsorship and foundation investment. *Financial Times*, (2018-05-04), 011.
- [20] Ma, M. K. (2024). Research on the development of opera under the National Art Fund: A case study of Zhejiang and Sichuan. *Sichuan Drama*, (4), 128–131+135.
- [21] Ma, M. K., & Li, Y. (2024). Research on musical theatre development under the National Art Fund support perspective. *Grand Stage*, (3), 75–78.
- [22] Mutlu, E. (2019). Art and culture sponsorship and festivalism in the globalising world. *Alinteri Social Sciences Journal*, 3(1), 1–21.
- [23] Kellman, W. (2016). Between a rock and hard place: Local-global dynamics of funding and sponsorship in Caribbean art. *Open Arts Journal*, 5, 81–91.