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Abstract. Forced virtualisation and digitisation – such as the COVID-19 pandemic – significantly affect the quality of the creative process within the aesthetic situation, depending on the form of participation in visual arts. The visual arts creator, managing the creative process within the aesthetic situation, must take into account the new optics concerning the components of the aesthetic situation because otherwise, his work will be incomprehensible or unattainable for the recipients – not due to the low quality of the artwork, but because the artwork in new virtualised circumstances may change its features. The features of the aesthetic situation vary depending on the optics of the visual arts creator and the visual arts recipient. This paper focuses on the creator’s perspective. Management in the field of visual arts may have three dimensions: self-management, managing the aesthetic situation and managing a cultural institution. Each of these dimensions is characterised by different issues; however, they also have common denominators in the need to consider the metaphysical nature of the essence of the aesthetic situation. This work aims to analyse changes in the artistically creative process understood as the management of the aesthetic situation depending on the form in which participation in visual arts takes place: traditionally, i.e. in-person or virtually using digital methods. Literature analysis and empirical qualitative research in the form of interviews with visual arts creators did allow to answer the following research questions: 1) How do forced virtualisation and digitisation affect the quality of the creative process in an aesthetic situation regarding visual arts? 2) Which qualitative parameters of the aesthetic situation are losing and which are gaining quality in connection with the virtualisation of the creative process in an aesthetic situation regarding visual arts? The presented results of empirical research show which of the components of the aesthetic situation are subject to modifications due to the form of participation in visual arts.
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1. Introduction and literature background

One of the more universal and, at the same time, more widely unknown holistic theories in the field of aesthetics is the theory of the aesthetic situation (Gołaszewska, 1984b; Ingarden, 1981); this theory is successfully used in the field of management (Szostak, 2021, 2022; Szostak & Sułkowski, 2020). Its universality lies in the simplicity and inclusiveness of all phenomena occurring in the art creator and recipient areas. The components of the aesthetic situation are the creator, the work of art, the recipient (also a critic as a specific type of recipient), the world of universal values and the natural world. In addition to being aware of the components of this theory, one should be aware of the mutual relations between them: a work of art is a crucial component of the aesthetic situation; however, it needs a creator who will include universal values in the artwork in the form of items of the natural world, as well as a recipient who will read universal values in the elements of the natural world through the process of receiving the work. The features of the aesthetic situation vary depending on the optics of the visual arts creator and the visual arts recipient. Therefore, this paper focuses mainly on the creator’s perspective, considering the recipient of the visual arts perspective.

The mutual perception of the visual artist as a disordered personality functioning in a messy space is not confirmed in the identity of the artists (Szostak, 2022; Szostak & Sułkowski, 2021c). Moreover, it concerns only the shallow and easily-visible layer of reality without touching the essence of the organisational side of the creative process. The creative process is also commonly perceived as a phenomenon on the edge of madness and chance; however, analysing theories concerning aesthetic and managerial optics allows looking at the creative process as a phenomenon perfectly suited for investigation based on management theory.

Visual arts management may be considered on three levels: 1) self-management of the visual arts creator (Jones, 2009; Kostera, 2014; Marra, 2019; Sims, 2003; Szostak & Sułkowski, 2021b); 2) management of the aesthetic situation by the visual arts creator (Böhme, 2021; Szostak, 2021; Szostak & Sułkowski, 2020); 3) visual arts institution management by a visual arts creator (Morozova et al., 2016; Rius-Ulldemolins & Klein, 2021). Each of these levels is characterised by different complications; however, they also have common denominators based on considering the metaphysical nature of the essence of the aesthetic situation (Szostak, 2021). The last level is mainly described in the literature focusing on how to run an art gallery, a theatre, or organise an art event. Therefore, this article focuses on the first and second levels mentioned above.

Naturally, a large part of the processes developing in the 21st century is virtualised; part of reality adapts faster to the digital world, another part slower (Karki & Porras, 2021; Kröner et al., 2021). Visual arts is also an area that cannot resist the process of virtualisation, although each of the forms of the visual arts (painting, sculpting, graphics) has a different propensity for digitisation due to its characteristics (Mao & Jiang, 2021; Schwartz, 2020; Wagner, 2020). Since the turn of 2019/2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has been an essential catalyst for visualisation and digitisation in virtually all areas of human activity. It was the dominant external factor, from which there was no turning back, and its strength and a long period of influence were able to break even the most hardened traditionalists accustomed to traditional forms of participation in arts (Szostak & Sułkowski, 2021c, 2021a). In this case, too, visual arts had to surrender, and perhaps for the first time in the history of humankind, most visual artists and audiences were forced to participate in their art discipline in a virtualised way – in whole or to a large extent. Just as each visual arts form reacts differently to virtualisation, the creators and recipients of individual visual arts forms also react inversely to this process. The reasons for this different reaction are many factors: 1) the characteristics of the creative process among visual arts forms; 2) characteristics of the perception process among visual arts forms; 3) the personal preferences of a visual arts creator; 4) personal preferences of the recipient; 5) having an appropriate infrastructure to participate in visual arts in virtual forms.

This paper aims to analyse changes in the creative process among the aesthetic situation depending on the form in which the aesthetic situation regarding visual arts takes place: 1) traditional in-person or 2) virtual with digital
techniques. In order to structure the considerations, the subsequent research questions were formulated: 1) How do forced virtualisation and digitisation affect the quality of the creative process in an aesthetic situation regarding visual arts? 2) Which qualitative parameters of the aesthetic situation are losing and which are gaining quality in connection with the virtualisation of the creative process in an aesthetic situation regarding visual arts?

The research methods used in this work are critical review and qualitative analysis of the literature and qualitative research in the form of interviews with visual arts creators. The methodological strategy is based on an interdisciplinary and multi-paradigm approach, taking into account the achievements in the field of aesthetics and management. The critical review of the literature concerned two areas of aesthetics and management. As a supplement to the cognitive gaps in key-importance themes, the literature in philosophy, psychology, sociology and pedagogy was also analysed to a limited extent. The primary languages of the analysed publications were English and Polish; critical German publications were also analysed. Qualitative analysis of the literature was based primarily on monographs with an established position in the field of aesthetics (Dahlhaus, 2007; Gołaszewska, 1967, 1984a, 1984b, 1986, 2001, 2005; Ingarden, 1981; Levinson, 2003; Ossowski, 1949; Wilkoszewska, 2007), management (Drucker, 2006b, 2006a, 2009; Griffin, 2005; Kotler & Keller, 2016; Kożmiński, 2005; Kożmiński & Piotrowski, 1999; Mintzberg, 2012; Porter, 1980) and aesthetics of management (Biehl-Missal, 2011; Guillet de Monthoux, 2004; Kostera, 2014, 2019; Kostera & Woźniak, 2022; Linstead & Höpfl, 2000; Minahan, 2020; Strati, 1999), as well as on the analysis of the results of research published in the form of scientific articles, which were made possible by scientific research EBSCO, Google Scholar, JSTOR, Mendeley, Scopus and Web of Science databases.

Considerations regarding managerial issues in the artist’s activity can be placed on self-organisation and self-management, where self-awareness and the ability to reflect are essential. This self-management, which from the title of M. Kostera’s monograph may be called “occupy management”, is a response, on the one hand, to the erosion of the role of the nation-state, and on the other hand, to the growing power of corporations that take over an increasing range of everyday spheres. Among all these, there is a modern man who is better and better equipped with the knowledge and skills to organise his own life without institutional support (Kostera, 2014). Nevertheless, on the other hand, we also see that the existing guarantees of the good of humanity – in the form of technological progress, democracy and science – are no longer valid. In each area mentioned above, we notice negative sides, e.g., heartlessness, populism or using progress results for selfish purposes. Referring to selected classic management functions, M. Kostera recognises the principal axes of self-management (Kostera, 2019): 1) as the keys to planning (3I: imagination, inspiration, intuition); 2) as the keys to organising (3S: structure, space, synchronicity); 3) as keys to motivate (3L: leadership, learning, love); 4) as keys to control (3E: ethos, ethics, ecology).

The optimal explanation of the visual artist’s organisational optics will be analysing the aesthetic situation with its components and their relations (Gołaszewska, 1984b; Szostak, 2020; Szostak & Sulkowski, 2020). According to the theory of the aesthetic situation, the artist’s organisational activities take place on three levels: 1) the world of values (artistry), 2) works of art (creativity), 3) the natural world (virtuosity) (Szostak, 2022). Managing by a visual artist at the level of the world of values (managing artistry) can be compared to strategic management. It is responsible for defining the organisation's vision, mission and strategic goal(s). Decisions at this level determine the further direction of the processes. Artists tend to be focused on specific values exploring them over long periods of creativity, or they change the subject of their creative interests depending on various internal and external factors. The chosen strategies for achieving the goals may be permanent or changeable – adapted to the circumstances. Managing at the level of a work of art, i.e. managing creativity, can be compared to tactical management. The defined goals and strategies are translated into directional decisions regarding the creative process, ending with the creation of the work, taking into account the process of receiving the work by the recipient. It should be remembered that the artist’s intention is not to create the work itself but to use the created work to influence the recipient in a planned manner through the values to which the work relates. This fact is not without significance for the process of reception of the work, which depends on many factors discussed earlier. Natural-world management, i.e. virtuosity management, is an analogy for managing operational activities. Decisions regarding the
choice of the content and form of the work, the use of a specific material (sculptural, colours, structures, musical scales, gestures, language) and its processing techniques. The vast majority of the literature about every field of art and most of the didactic process concern this management level. It is understandable because this level is the most tangible, visible and modelable, and the effects of this modelling are measurable.

In this context, the creator plays the role of a manager of the aesthetic situation because of the content of the message (the choice of values and their location in the elements of the natural world) and its form (applied schemes, styles or formal solutions) will depend on him. For this purpose, the creator has three streams of influence at his disposal: virtuosity, artistry and creativity. A conscious creator manages these streams in a controlled manner – both at the stage of building his competencies in this area and, above all, at the stage of using them in the creative process. Not every work requires highly virtuosic solutions: the creators often refer to brutalist solutions (e.g. rough sculptural material) to draw the recipient’s attention to specific issues in this way. Not every work requires many sophisticated references to the world of values – often, the simplicity of the message is sometimes more powerful. In the same way, creativity does not have to be characteristic of every work – not always an innovative form will be more understandable than traditional solutions.

The visual arts creator, as the manager of the aesthetic situation – through designing the work – also determines the process of its reception. Nevertheless, of course, in each form of visual arts, the creator has a different influence on the reception process. After completing the work, the creator within the visual arts separates himself from it and cannot influence the reception process: the recipient can shape the circumstances of contemplation (time, length of exposure, contexts) at his own discretion. Based on that, the visual arts creator does not fully influence the reception process because the reception process depends on many factors independent of the creator, including, first of all, the level of the recipient’s activity.

In addition to the analysis of the results of secondary research published in the literature on the subject, primary qualitative research was carried out from the perspective of the visual arts creator (as understood by the manager of the aesthetic situation) in terms of the aesthetic situation taking place in a traditional and virtual form. The research was carried out in structured face-to-face interviews with the creators of the visual arts. What constitutes the essence of art, i.e. the creator’s contact with the work and the work with the recipient, was taken by the deadly SARS-CoV-2 virus into the brackets of threats to health and life (Demianczuk, 2022). This ubiquitous and irreversible change served as the primary context for showing the specificity and mechanisms of managing an aesthetic situation from the creator’s perspective.

2. Materials and methods

To explain the changes in the nature of the creative process depending on the form of presentation of the work (traditional/in-person or digital/virtual) from the visual arts creator’s perspective, the method of exploratory research was used in the study. The qualitative research was conducted in the form of structured in-depth formal interviews with key informants engaged in visual arts actively. The choice of such a methodology seems to be the most appropriate for the pilot nature of the study. Furthermore, the research sample selection was justified by the availability of people engaged in creative activity in visual arts from different countries and cultures and their openness to participation in such research. The study examined representatives of all visual arts forms: painting, drawing, photography, sculpture, ceramics, architecture, comics, design, and fashion.

Twelve visual artists were asked to participate in the study. Respondents came from the following countries: Poland, Turkey, Ukraine, and Vietnam. The interviews were conducted in a personal or virtual form over five months, from April to August 2022. Most of the research sample came from Poland (75.0%), one person from Turkey, Ukraine and Vietnam (8.3% each). Most of the respondents were men (75.0%). Due to the pilot nature of this study, no efforts were made to achieve a balance in terms of gender, age, or the length of the artistic experi-
ence of the participants. Therefore, the influence of these elements on the research results was fully realised, but the results were analysed to obtain at least a general picture of the examined problems. Content analysis was performed using NVivo software.

Interviews with Polish respondents were conducted in Polish, and interviews with non-Polish respondents were conducted in English, recording their responses. Then they were written to standardise the analysis and inference process, and the answers obtained from the English-language interviews were translated into Polish. Description of the research sample – in terms of: 1) gender, 2) year of birth, 3) year of commencement of artistic activity (number of years of artistic activity), 4) determining whether the artistic activity is performed as primary, additional or one of many forms of professional activity, 5) artistic education, 6) non-artistic education and 7) declared nationality – is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Birth year</th>
<th>Years of art experience</th>
<th>Artistic activity as primary, additional or one of many forms of professional activities</th>
<th>Artistic education</th>
<th>Beyond-artistic education</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIA01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts, painting, MA in Art History</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA02</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>one of many</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts, painting</td>
<td>MA in Polish Language Studies</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts, painting</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA04</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>MA in Visual Arts, painting</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA05</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>Bachelor in Management (in progress)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA07</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>one of many</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>one of many</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts</td>
<td>postgraduate studies in Blockchain</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA09</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>MSc in Cybersecurity</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>one of many</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>Doctor of Visual Arts</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>MA in Physical Education</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own elaboration

Inference regarding the results of the secondary and primary research was mainly based on the synthesis of the results and was carried out with awareness, rigour, systematics, pluralism and methodological triangulation. The methods used in the qualitative research were reproducible according to the canon and can be repeated to verify or expand the conclusions.
3. Results and discussion

The analysis of the impact of the limitations resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic on the creative process from the perspective of the visual arts creator is as follows (questions from part A). The following aspects had a negative impact rather: no public live performances of one’s work (question 9, rating: -0.25); limitation of in-person contact with own team/group members (12, -0.42); limiting in-person contact with other creators of visual arts (13, -0.42); limiting in-person contacts with creators of other art disciplines (14, -0.33); limitation of in-person contact with people in general (15, -0.42). The pandemic limitations slightly impacted visual arts creators' moods (20, -0.08) and mental states (21, -0.08). Note that “restrictions have been replaced by very intense, even excessive, online contact” [VIA02], which may indicate that in traditional circumstances, the creator had more opportunities to regulate contact’s qualities; when switching to virtual mode, the freedom of communication was so facilitated that their excessive number simply interfered with the implementation of basic classes. The visual arts creators found the following positive effects of limitations: transferring their artistic activities to virtual reality (10, 0.33); the possibility for recipients to participate in visual arts following their personal preferences as to the time of participation, duration of participation or regulating the parameters of the artwork (11, 0.25); more time to relax (16, 0.75); development of the artistic knowledge (17, 0.83), development of the artistic skills (18, 1.00), as well as the level of their creativity (19, 0.92). As for the issues related to goals and their implementation, the assessment is moderately positive: the impact of pandemic restrictions on setting one’s own life goals (22, 0.33) and their implementation (23, 0.25), own artistic goals (24, 0.42) and their implementation (25, 0.25). Understanding human nature as manifested by acting under constrained conditions has also been assessed moderately positively under pandemic constraints (26, 0.50). In summary, the creative process determined by the limitations resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic was assessed by the creators of visual arts on the border of neutrality and moderate positivity (0.21); details are presented in Figure 1.

Assessment by visual artists of the impact of restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic on visual arts in general (i.e., with creators, audiences, institutions, and sponsors) is on the verge of moderately negative and neutral (responses to questions from part B, general rate: -0.18). The limitations had a moderately negative impact on the following issues: limiting the in-person contact with members of one’s creative group (30, -0.50), limiting the in-person contact with other creators of visual arts (31, -0.50) and creators of other art disciplines (32, -0.33). On the other hand, the lack of public performances of own work in-person (27, -0.08) and the possibility of the audience participating in visual arts following their personal preferences as to the time of participation, duration of participation or regulation of the parameters of the work were considered neutral (29, 0.00). Only the transfer of artistic creativity to virtual reality was rated moderately positively (28, 0.33). The results are presented in Figure 2.

Changes in the creative attitude of visual artists following the transition from traditional to digital methods of artistic activities (questions from part C) were assessed negatively. Overall, it can be said that with the transition from traditional to digital methods of artistic activities, the creators of visual arts lose only 5% of their creative potential. After the transition from traditional to digital methods of artistic activity, all the analysed parameters of the creative attitude lose their quality, and the loss varies between individual parameters. By ranking the aspects from the most losing quality, we get the following list: contact with the audience (46, -15%), inspiration to create (44, -7%), external motivation to start creative activity (38, -5%), external motivation to continuation and termination of creative activity (40, -5%), opportunities to delve into topics bothering society (48, -5%), creativity (42, -4%), internal motivation to start creative activity (34, -2%). Only the intrinsic motivation to continue and

---

1 Five-point Likert scale: -2 = very negative influence, -1 = rather a negative influence, 0 = neutral influence, +1 = rather a positive influence, +2 = very positive influence.
end creative activity does not change with the transition from traditional to digital methods of artistic activities in the field of visual arts. The results are presented in Figure 3.

![Figure 1. Assessment of the COVID-19 pandemic impact on visual artists](source)

**Source:** own elaboration

![Figure 2. The impact of restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic on the discipline of visual arts in the opinion of creators](source)

**Source:** own elaboration
The creators of visual arts referred to their predictions of the situation in the field of visual arts after lifting the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic (questions from part D). They concluded with moderate certainty that public events in person would be simultaneously broadcast virtually (50, 0.50), literary arts will fall into two subcategories: those specialising in traditional live activities and those operating virtually (51, 0.33), and that sooner or later everything will return to the pre-pandemic state (49, 0.25). A graphic presentation of the results is shown in Figure 4.

The assessment of the reception process in visual arts in the context of traditional and virtual forms of participation in the eyes of the creators of the visual art (questions from part E) looks negative concerning digital and virtual forms and, thus, definitely unambiguously positive concerning traditional live forms. The strength of differences in all aspects was assessed as moderate to the disadvantage of virtual forms, i.e. in terms of: customer satisfaction (53, -0.75), customer satisfaction (54, -0.67), customer involvement (55, -0.67), the possibility of experiencing the state of catharsis by recipients (56, -1.08), contact of recipients with the work itself (57, -0.75), contact of recipients with the creator/performer of art (58, -1.00). Only the possibility of attracting more recipients was assessed moderately in favour of virtual forms (52, 0.25). A valuable commentary on this group of questions will be the following statement: “Although direct contact is the most important thing for a creator, the visual arts recipients have a good opinion of virtual forms of presentation that allow for a wider reach. According to the creator, the work itself is lost in this perception, but I do not know if it disturbs the recipient” [VIA02]. The synthetic results of this group of questions are presented in Figure 5.
Two (17%) of the creators of visual arts stated that they did not see any differences in their creative process from the traditional and virtual forms of the aesthetic situation [VIA02, VIA08] (question 59): “Creating a painting requires solitude – there is no difference between later virtual or in-person presentation” [VIA02]. However, the vast majority of respondents (83%) emphasised the differences between both forms concerning:

- a contact with the artwork, experiencing the creative process: “A work that will be presented virtually requires a different rent conceptualisation than that presented in-person. I try to add extra possibilities to work being presented virtually that cannot be used in a traditional presentation” [VIA07];
- experiencing aesthetic experiences, creative fulfilment: virtual forms are treated as “a compromise, a transitional state, [method of obtaining] financial support and scholarships” [VIA01];
- contact with creative matter [VIA03];
- contact of the recipient with the work: “The mood and contact of the recipient with the work in-person are most important” [VIA11];
- the possibilities of conveying emotions: “More emotions can be conveyed in-person” [VIA12];
- treating activities in traditional forms as fundamental, which is reinforced by virtual activities, e.g. as a form of promotion [VIA10];
- virtual activity is more convenient [VIA05].

Three (25%) visual artists see no differences in their creative process, knowing that the work will (or is) presented traditionally or virtually [VIA01, VIA07, VIA08] (question 60). Most visual arts creators, however, notice differences in their creative process: “I shape the visual message a bit differently – but it is not fully conscious – I know that stronger and simpler messages work better on the Internet, so I choose intuitive ones for presentation there” [VIA02]. “If I have to do a job on the Internet, I must have a separate idea for it” [VIA11]. Certain doubts are also raised by the fact that there is no influence on the fate of one’s work presented virtually: “Live transmissions are worse compared to traditional activities – they are unpredictable compared to in-person performances, and yet they are archived, for example, on YouTube forever; no one seems to be removing YouTube live streaming services” [VIA10]. All visual artists unanimously confirmed that the COVID-19 pandemic had intensified their art discipline’s digitisation and virtualisation process, but the beginning of that process started earlier (question 61).

Conclusions

The cited research results show how, in practice, the visual arts creator manages the creative process within an aesthetic situation. He has to consider many factors that together shape the quality of the aesthetic situation. As apparently ephemeral and seemingly impossible to grasp by scientific models, the creative process can be – with the help of an appropriate conceptual apparatus taken from aesthetics – broken down into many analytical components, the single definition of which is not so difficult. Of course, it is essential how the parameters of the aesthetic situation’s quality are determined to be able to conclude based on the obtained results. The methodology presented and used in the above study can be successfully replicated in further research on the analysed problem.
The context of the limitations resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, which firmly determined the aesthetic situation, served only as a pretext for the dynamisation of phenomena in the studied area. Even without factors as vital as the pandemic, the visual arts creator in the creative process must consider the same parameters that synthetically allow him to manage an aesthetic situation from his perspective in a conscious manner. The management factor is essential in fruitful artistic activity due to the achievements in organisational methods that can be successfully used to manage the natural world and the aesthetic situation. By applying management models, of course, along with the necessary adjustments to the metaphysical world, we can expect an improvement in the effectiveness of the creative process through its deeper understanding and analytical approach.

The omnipresent changes also affect the visual arts world, the essence of which seems to be unchanged. Forced virtualisation and digitisation – such as the recent COVID-19 pandemic – significantly affect the quality of the creative process within the aesthetic situation, depending on the form of participation in visual arts. Managing the creative process within the aesthetic situation, the visual arts creator must consider the factors mentioned above because otherwise, his creativity will be incomprehensible. The presented research results show the components of the aesthetic situation being subject to modifications due to the form of participation in art. Therefore, visual arts creators – consciously managing the creative process within the aesthetic situation – should appropriately modify the scale of virtuosity, artistry and creativity so that their message is consistent with their assumption, taking into account the form of participation in art.

Forced virtualisation and digitisation significantly affect the quality of the reception process because each visual arts form, using a different scope of senses, reacts differently to digitisation and virtualisation. Therefore, knowledge about this phenomenon should accompany the creators of visual arts. As a conscious manager of the aesthetic situation, the visual arts creator will be able to manage the parameters of virtuosity, artistry and creativity more effectively as part of own work, depending on the manner of participation (in-person or virtually).

The following groups should be interested in the research results: 1) visual arts creators to develop or structure their perception of the creative process; 2) visual arts managers to develop or structure their perception of the complex nature of the creative process; 3) visual arts institutions’ managers to develop or structure their perception of the complex nature of the creative process of visual artists involved in the institutions they manage. The limitations of the research may be the following: 1) the relatively small size of the research sample and randomness of research participants do not allow for profound generalisation of results; 2) the research took place in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic when the conclusions could be affected by day-to-day struggling. Among perspectives of the research can be mentioned: 1) large-scale research could be undertaken based on the methodology prepared for this study; 2) more focused research could be undertaken based on the methodology prepared for this study (visual arts creators from different countries, regions, cultures, divided by age, gender or the length of experience).
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