

**Research Article**

## **ART PRICE INDEX EVALUATED FOR THE MOST OFTEN TRADED POLISH PAINTERS**

**\*Dorota Witkowska**

*Faculty of Management, University of Lodz, Poland*

*\*Author for Correspondence*

### **ABSTRACT**

Situation at financial markets tends investors to look for alternative investments to diversify their portfolio. Relatively new approach toward investing is to concern pieces of art as investment instrument or collateral. In order to decide whether art is a good investment, it is necessary to evaluate expected returns, which might be obtained from such investment thus an art price index should be developed. The aim of the paper is to discuss artworks as investment assets and evaluate price index of paintings produced by 11 Polish artists whose artworks were traded the most often on auctions that held in Poland in the years 2007-2010. In our research, employing data concerning 750 objects, we apply hedonic index methodology to estimate returns from the paintings market. The results of our investigation show that hedonic quality adjustment essentially influences evaluation of artworks' prices. Our results justify the opinion that art can be treated as safe asset class, especially in comparison to equity market

**Keywords:** *Investment, Art Market, Hedonic Price Index*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The global art market equaled 47.4 billion of euro (in total sales of art and antiques) in 2013, and it is close to its highest-ever recorded total in 2007. It means that the global art and antiques market is almost back to the extraordinary heights of the pre-recession boom years powered by buyers in America and by rising prices for major Post-War and Contemporary artists. In the year 2013, USA accounted for 38% of the global market by value, China – 24%, the UK – 20%, France – 6%, Switzerland – 2%, Italy, Germany, Austria and Sweden - for 1% each of them, and the rest of the world – 6%. Taking into account Europe as a whole, United Kingdom created 63% of the market value, France – 19%, Germany – 5%, Italy – 3%, Austria – 2%, Sweden – 2%, Spain – 1%, the Netherlands – 1% and the rest of European Union 4%. The European Union as a whole kept 32% of the world market (McAndrew 2014).

In 2012 the Polish art market value was estimated for 300-350 millions PLN (i.e. approximately about 75-90 millions euro), while auction sales was 60.5 million PLN, and it was the highest result from 1989 (Deloitte 2013). Thus it is easy to conclude that Polish art market is very small since it is about 0.2% of the world sales.

The art market in Poland practically did not exist under the communist regime. Although in that time several art galleries and artist associations were operating buying and selling art pieces, mostly currently produced by domestic artists or the one from other soviet bloc countries. Art market in Poland started to normalize and develop at the beginning of political and economic transformation in 1989. New art galleries and foundations together with auction market have been created. In years 1989-2012, number of art auctions increased from 8 to 122. It is worth mentioning that last two decades were characterized by changes in the income distribution and the structure of consumption that caused the increasing of the interest on art market in the Polish society.

Therefore, in the paper, the attempt to estimate returns from investment in Polish paintings market is made. Commonly used methods to construct art price indexes are repeat-sales regression and hedonic regression (Ginsburgh, et al., 2006, p. 947). Limited scale of the art market in Poland does not allow to apply the repeated sale approach for the price index construction, therefore the hedonic approach is employed. The aim of research is evaluation of the art price index on the basis of data concerning the selected sample of paintings sold at auctions held by auction houses and foundations in the years 2007-2010.

## **Research Article**

### **1. Art as investment asset**

Situation at financial markets tends investors to look for alternative investments to diversify their portfolio. Relatively new approach toward investing is to concern pieces of art as investment instrument or collateral. There is growing literature concerning artworks as investment opportunity for investors: Anderson (1974), Frey and Pommerehne (1988, 1989a), Pesando (1993), Mei, Moses (2002), Worthington and Higgs (2003, 2004), Campbell (2004, 2008), Adamowska (2008), Higgs (2012), Hsieh, et al. (2010), Kraeussl and Wiehenkamp (2012), Sokołowska (2012), and Frey, Cueni (2013), to mention some.

Artworks as investment assets are quite special. The current market value of art piece is difficult to evaluate since there is no “natural value”, which could be used as reference or fair value. The price of artwork is limited only by the amount of money that collectors are willing and able to pay for (Goetzmann, et al. 2011). Investment in art is undivided and illiquid in comparison to “classical” financial assets. Artworks are often expensive, also costs of purchase and sale may be high (from 10 to 25 percent of hammer price while costs on financial markets are about 1% of the price) and they seem to be long-lasting investments.

There are also several risks (regardless the risk of price variability of investment instruments) special for the art market (Frey, Cueni, 2013).

- Buyer can never be certain whether the purchased object is original (i.e. not a copy or forgery). And even if the artwork is an original piece, one never knows who was a painter: the master himself, the circle, the school or the painting is made only in style of a grand master (Frey and Pommerehne, 1989b).
- Quality of paintings, which have been repainted, damaged, not properly renovated or stored, may cause the declining of their values.
- Owners of art pieces can be afraid that the masterpieces (that they possess) might be stolen, destroyed (by fire, revolution, etc.) or seized by government as a part of “national heritage”.
- Possession of valuable art can cause the necessity to pay additional taxes (sale or property taxes) and government may impose new export restrictions.
- Tastes and fashions changes over a time and art market is characterized by extreme heterogeneity thus one never knows if the certain artist will not be “fallen from fashions” in the future. Renneboog and Spaenjers (2013) report 220 “fallen from fashions” artists who were included in the 1926, 1959 and 1980 edition of Gardner’s *Art through the Ages* (Gardner, 1926 and Gardner *et al.*, 2004), but not in the 1996 or 2004 edition.
- Art belongs to the group of luxury goods and its price is very sensitive on general economic situation and income changes. Goetzmann *et al.* (2011) present the evidence that personal income of the highest earners determines price of art - one percent fall in income of the earners in the top 0.1 percent income distribution in the UK triggers a decline in art prices of nearly 10 percent.
- Behavioral anomalies seem to play an important role in the art market since collectors are usually not willing to sell pieces of art from their collections and they tend to buy art produced by domestic artists.

In order to decide whether art is a good investment, it is necessary to evaluate expected returns which might be obtained from such investment thus an art price index should be developed. The major motivation behind construction of art price indexes is (Ashenfelter and Graddy, 2006; Ginsburgh *et al.*, 2006):

- (1) to measure financial performance of art, relative to other alternative forms of investment,
- (2) to check whether adding art to a diversified market portfolio can lower the overall risk and/or increase the rate of return, and
- (3) to outline general trends on the art market.

Construction of the art price index dedicated to the certain market requires several decisions concerning: selection of the index methodology and selection of the sample i.e. its size and the way of the object

## **Research Article**

selection. There are several methods and indexes which can be used to analyze changes of prices or returns from the art market, such as naive price index, repeat-sales, average price (geometric mean), composite price (basket) index, and hedonic index. Pesando (1993), Pesando and Shum (1999), Mei and Moses (2002) employ repeat sales, Mok et al. (1993), Landes (2000) – geometric repeat sales, Ginsburgh and Schwed (1992), Kraussl and van Elstrand (2008), Higgs, Warthington (2005) – hedonic index, Candela et al. (2004) – quality adjusted price, Renneboog, van Houtte (2002) – basket index.

The repeat sales methodology considers only those artworks that were sold at least twice in the investigated period, and their price were registered. Thus it requires transparent and liquid market. Ginsburgh et al. (2006) argue that repeat-sales regression should not be applied to periods shorter than 20 years, since the number of observations may be too small to obtain reliable results. The main advantage of hedonic index approach is that it may consider all traded objects.

According to the Deloitte (2013) report, average annual return from 800 repeat sales, that took place in Poland during last 20 years, was 25.7% while in the same time equity returns measured by Warsaw Stock Exchange Index WIG20 was only 8.7% (Gajewski and Potocki, 2013). Annual return from artworks hold longer than 15 years was 46.6% while investments with the horizon shorter than 5 years gave only 0.2% profit. Thus the time span of investments is crucial in obtained returns.

Naive art price indexes are constructed using average and median auction prices. In this method, a basket of representative paintings is created and tracked over time. This approach avoids the repeated sales restrictions but requires instead aggregation on some a priori criteria in order to construct so-called “average painting” (Candela et al. 1997).

The problem of the sample selection is crucial in construction the fixed basket of representative artworks that must be made by experts. However it appears also in application other methods and it is known from literature since many different criteria of the artwork selection are employed. Some selected in literature criteria are given below:

- mediums, for example Locatelli-Biey, Zanola (2002) consider sculptures, Pesando (1993) – prints, Candela et al. (2004) – paintings, Ginsburgh, Schwed (1992) – drawings;
- style of the piece of art or the period when the artwork came into being, for instant Pesando (1993) concerns modern prints and Picasso prints, Candela et al. (2004) – Modern and contemporary, 19-th century, Old Master paintings, Ginsburgh, Schwed (1992) - Flemish-Dutch, French, Italian Old Master drawings;
- authors selected by the experts, as an example is a paper by Pesando, Shum (1999) who analyze Picasso prints;
- nationality of artists or place where they created their artworks, for instance: Mok et al. (1993) consider Modern Chinese paintings, a Kraussl, van Elstrand (2008) – German paintings in general, Ginsburgh, Schwed (1992) - Flemish-Dutch, French and Italian drawings, Higgs, Warthington (2005) – Australian paintings;
- belonging to the certain collection as it is done by Landes (2000) who takes Ganz collection.

Such arbitrary choice may be criticized because selected artworks may not be representative for the whole market. The size of the sample depends on the investigated period i.e. time span when artworks are sold.

## **2. Hedonic art price index**

Art price index can be evaluated employing hedonic regression, which is a method for estimating an approximate value of a piece of art adjusting the average price of the artist's works for the qualitative characteristics which are incorporated into the hedonic model. Hedonic price functions are used to predict prices of new goods, adjust for quality change in price indexes and to measure consumer and producer valuations of different products. They describe the relationship between characteristic of a product and its price. The analytic function is determined by distributions of buyers and sellers and their preferences as well as the structure of competition in the market (Neiheim 2006).

### Research Article

Artworks are heterogeneous assets, with a variety of physical and non-physical characteristics that make them unique, including artist reputation, materials used, the period of production and subjective traits like quality. Therefore the price of an artwork depends on these characteristics. In hedonic approach (Nesheim, 2006; Triplett, 2006; Candela, et al., 2004; Kraeussl and Elsland, 2008; Kraeussl and Wiehenkamp, 2012; Kraeuss and Logher, 2008), the value attached to each one of the attributes, that are deemed to be significant in the determination of the price, is estimated and the price index is evaluated employing so called hedonic quality adjustment (HQA). The basic formula for hedonic index (HI) is as following:

$$HI_{t+1} = \frac{NI_{t+1}}{HQA_{t+1}} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n (P_{i,t+1})^{1/n}}{\prod_{i=1}^m (P_{i,t})^{1/m}} \quad (1)$$

where at time  $t$ :  $NI_t$  – naive price index,  $P_{it}$  – the price of the  $i$ -th artwork,  $HQA_t$  – hedonic quality adjustment.

The naive price index (NI) describes “average painting” from the aggregation of all artworks that create the sample representing the art market or its segment. The hedonic index allows the tracking of short-term price movements and returns in this market. It let us a better understanding of how this market performed over the investigated period. The performance of this market can then be compared to investments in traditional financial assets.

Changes in quality, style and type of the artworks is described by the hedonic quality adjustment which is defined as following:

$$HQA_{t+1} = \exp \left[ \sum_{j=1}^k \hat{\alpha}_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_{ij,t+1}}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{X_{ij,t}}{m} \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

where  $X_{ij,t}$  – observations of the  $j$ -the feature characterizing the  $i$ -th artwork at time  $t$ ,  $m$  and  $n$  are numbers of lots sold in the period  $t$  and  $t+1$  respectively,  $\hat{\alpha}_j$  – parameter estimates of hedonic regression (pooled regression) that usually takes the following form:

$$\ln P_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j X_{ij,t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \beta_t Z_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha_j, \beta_t$  – the coefficient values of the characteristic  $X_j$  and  $Z_t, Z_{i,t}$  – time dummy variable, which takes the value 1 if the painting  $i$  is sold in the period  $t$  and takes the value 0 otherwise, and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  – the disturbance term.

One of the underlying assumptions is that the price of an artwork depends essentially on its quality, which is to a great extent quantifiable. The explanatory variables represent characteristics of the objects, such as the artist, size, format, technique, materials, period, subject of the artwork, signature and artist’s living status or related to the sale, including auctioneer, location and date of sale. These attributes are usually qualitative so they are represented by dummy variables in (3). The dependent variable in hedonic models is usually the natural logarithm of the sales price. All auctions relating to an artist are included in the calculation in order to avoid selection bias. The time dummy variables can be annual, semi-annual, quarterly or even monthly depending on the frequency of trading. The hedonic approach essentially entails running an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression.

The hedonic regression method therefore controls for quality changes by attributing implicit prices to a set of value-adding characteristics. In other words, hedonic regressions strip the observable characteristics from the artworks to obtain an index reflecting the price of a “standard artwork” (Renneboog, Van Houtte 2002).

Hedonic models require knowledge of the artworks’ characteristics and mechanisms driving art prices. The main weakness of this methodology is limitation of attributes used as explanatory variables and arbitrariness of their selection. Therefore application of hedonic index methodology requires decision about:

**Research Article**

- (a) the form of the price index (Widlak 2010), for example Kraeussl, van Elsland (2008) use formula (1) while Higgs (2012) defines hedonic price index in different way;
- (b) the selection of explanatory variables in the regression model (3) that is connected with the information describing artworks being subject of transaction,
- (c) the selection of the artwork sample that will be used for art price index evaluation in formulas (1)-(2).

**3. EMPIRICAL RESULTS**

Structure of the art market in Poland in 2012 is presented in Table 1. Paintings are the most popular medium of the Polish art market both in number of lots (56%) and value of transaction (72%). Therefore paintings may be use as representative segment of the Polish art market. “Ultra-contemporary art”, which describes young artists (under 40 years old) is distinguished since it creates the majority (44%) of artworks sold but they characterize by low prices, and creates only 8% of total value.


Hedonic models are estimated employing data (Lucińska 2012) from auctions of paintings that took place in Poland in the years 2007-2010. The whole sample contains 10,400 objects produced by nearly 3,000 artists who represent different periods and styles, as well as a great variety of techniques. Taking into account number of lots sold, one should notice that situation is stable i.e. every year these numbers are similar (Figure 1). However the highest value of transaction was observed in 2008, and in 2010 it equaled less than 50% of the sales in 2007 (Figure 2).

**Table 1. Structure of Polish art market in the first half of 2012 by mediums and segments**

Mediums	Lots [%]	Value [%]	Segments	Lots [%]	Value [%]
Sculpture	2	1	Post-war and contemporary	30	31
Photography	1	0	Ultra-contemporary	44	8
Arts & Crafts	10	5	Art before 1945	26	61
Graphic	14	2			
Drawing	17	20			
Painting	56	72			


**Source: Own elaboration on the basis of data from Gajewski and Potocki (2013, pp. 18-19).**

The range of prices is huge from 20 PLN for a piece produced by J. Jakóbowska (born in 1984) to 1.1 million PLN for an artwork by W. Czachórski (1850-1911), with average price for a single lot 8,691 PLN and standard deviation 33,698 PLN. Therefore here a question arises which traded objects should be taken into account and what is the minimal price for a work to treat it as a piece of art.



**Figure 1. Number of lots sold in years 2007-2010.**

Source: Own elaboration



**Figure 2. Value of transactions in years 2007-2010.**

Source: Own elaboration

**Research Article**

**3.1. Description of data and variables**

We decided to consider only artworks, painted by the Polish artists who are selected according to the biggest number of lots sold in the investigated period (Kompa and Witkowska 2013), and we assume that minimal average price for an artist should be 2,000 PLN. Employing these criteria the sample of paintings is constructed. It consists of 750 paintings created by 11 artists (see Table 2).

**Table 2. List of Polish painters whose artworks created the sample**

No.	Author	Count	Value [PLN]	Average value [PLN]	Year of	
					of artworks sold in 2007 - 2010	birth
1	ChmielińskiStachowiczWł.	55	648 200	11 786	1911	1979
2	DominikTadeusz	46	608 000	13 217	1928	-
3	Dwurnik Edward	63	431 300	6 846	1943	-
4	ErbErno	58	816 500	14 078	1890	1943
5	KossakWojciech	60	2 027 500	33 792	1856	1942
6	Wyczółkowski Leon	61	3 848 300	63 086	1852	1936
7	HofmanWlastimil	85	1 817 050	21 377	1881	1970
8	Kossak Jerzy	91	1 261 000	13 857	1886	1955
9	MalczewskiJacek	71	9 401 300	132 413	1854	1929
10	NikiforKrynicky	79	196 400	2 486	1895	1968
11	Nowosielski Jerzy	81	5 706 700	70 453	1923	2011
	Sum	750	26 762 250			

**Source: Own elaboration**

The biggest number of lots sold in analyzed period were produced by Jerzy Kossak (91) while the highest value of transactions concerns artworks by Malczewski (more than 1 million PLN). In our sample, the lowest average value for the single artwork obtained paintings by Nikifor (2,486 PLN). The selected sample covers 7.2% of all lots and 16.2% of the turnover registered in the database. Table 2 contains basic information about “the most liquid” painters whose artworks are used in our research.

In our investigation we select several explanatory variables, which are usually applied in hedonic models constructed for the art price. They describe artist’s and exhibitor’s reputation, type and quality of the artwork as well as conditions of the transaction. *Auction house* describes the reputation of auctioneer and this variable is specified as a number of dummies defined the name of auctioneer. In our models there are 9 variants of this variable, and the reference variant is: “other auctioneers”. Artist reputation is defined by the name of a painter that is represented by the variable *artist* (see Table 2), and “Wyczółkowski” is the reference painter, among 11 artists. Artist’s living status is often incorporated to hedonic models since when an artist dies the production stops and prices may rise. We assume that variable *living status* equals zero if artist is still living when and the auction takes place.

Type and quality of the art piece is described by several variables such as: *signature*, *technique* and *surface* of the painting. Technique and materials characterize type of work and this variable is specified as a number of dummies that indicate whether the art piece represents certain type of work. We distinguished 9 variants of the variable and the reference variant is: “other techniques”. *Signature* is one of the artworks attributes, it equals 1 if signature is visible. *Surface* [cm<sup>2</sup>] of the artwork is the most commonly used variable that describes the physical characteristics of painting. In general the parameters estimates for this variable should be positive however larger works may be difficult to display thus in some models squared surface is applied. In the model we use natural logarithms of surface area or of squared surface.

Conditions of the transaction is represented by two variables: *year* and *price relation*. Year of sale is a set of binary variables defined the year of transaction. In our research we consider 4 years, and the reference

**Research Article**

variant of this variable is “Year\_2010”. *Price relation* between reserve and hammer price, this variable equals 1 if the former is bigger than the latter since in such a case sale might not take place (so-called conditional sale).

**3.2. Hedonic regression**

In this paper we present four selected models that are estimated employing OLS method on the basis of described above sample. The models’ specification is presented in Table 3, where symbol ● denotes variables present in the certain model, numbers in parenthesis inform about number of variants that are statistically significant for the significance level  $\alpha=0.05$ , + informs that qualitative or dichotomous variables are significant with positive sign of the parameter estimates.

**Table 3. Comparison of models’ specification**

Models	M1	M2	M3	M4
<i>const</i>	● +	● +	● +	
<i>year</i>	● (1)	● (1)	●	●
<i>auction house</i>	● (4)	● (4)	● (8)	● (7)
<i>artist</i>	● (9)	● (9)	● (9)	● (9)
<i>signature</i>	●	●	●	●
<i>technique</i>	● (5)	● (5)	● (2)	● (2)
<i>price relation</i>	●			●
<i>surface area</i>	● +	● +		
<i>surface area<sup>2</sup></i>			● +	● +
<i>living status</i>				● +
$R^2$ adjusted	0.8114	0.8115	0.9953	0.9953
<i>F</i>	101.68	105.07	5071.98	4910.11
Akaike	1269.1	1267.3	-1494.4	-1492.9

**Source: Own elaboration**

Models M3 and M4 are characterized by the highest adjusted  $R^2$  and negative value of Akaike’s information criterion, which make them the best models from the point of view their statistical characteristics. The specification of the models M1 and M2 is nearly the same, except presence of the variable: *price relation* thus their characteristics are similar. One may notice that the models M2 and M3 differs one from another only by representation of the painting’s size (logarithm *surface area* or logarithm *surface area<sup>2</sup>*) but their statistical properties are completely different that is especially visible comparing Akaike’s criterion. While the models M3 and M4 differ by two variables and the constant term but their characteristics are nearly the same.

Table 4 contains parameter estimates of selected models, stars denote significance level: \*  $\alpha=0.10$ , \*\*  $\alpha=0.05$  and \*\*\*  $\alpha=0.01$ . Artist’s *living status* is significant variable with positive sign in model M4. In all models variable *signature* is not significant, as well as nearly all variants of the variable: *year*. Parameter estimates standing by names of all painters, except Malczewski, are negative that is correct since only Malczewski’s artworks obtained higher prices than Wyczółkowski. Positive parameters standing by names of auctioneers is also proper because selected auction houses are well-known and seem to be trustworthy thus they organize auction which are chosen more often by the art seller when valuable artworks are subjects of transactions. Taking into consideration sign and significance of selected techniques we notice that oil paintings are usually more expensive than the ones prepared using other techniques.

**Research Article**

**Table 4. Parameter estimates**

Name of variable	Variable variants	Model M1		Model M2		Model M3		Model M4	
		Parameter estimates							
	<i>const.</i>	2.7877	***	2.7934	***	5.0400	***		
<i>year</i>	YEAR_2007	0.0934		0.0971		0.0075		0.0067	
	YEAR_2008	0.0758	**	0.0768	**	0.0010		0.0007	
	YEAR_2009	0.0145		0.0154		0.0021		0.0019	
<i>auction house</i>	AGRAART	0.2945	**	0.2989	**	0.0843	***	0.0834	**
	Desa	0.1990		0.2013		0.0848	***	0.0844	
	DesaUnicum	0.4084	***	0.4026	***	0.0536	**	0.0550	***
	OknaSztuki	0.4798	***	0.4816	***	0.0707	**	0.0701	**
	Ostoya	0.0998		0.1032		0.0649	***	0.0642	***
	Polswiss Art	0.8052	***	0.7968	***	0.0697	***	0.0717	***
	Rempex	0.0895		0.0807		0.0584	***	0.0606	***
	RynekSztuki	0.0172		0.0080		0.0481	**	0.0504	**
	<i>signature</i>	-0.0435		-0.0457		-0.0043		-0.0038	
	<i>price relation</i>	-0.0273						-0.0065	
	<i>surface area</i>	0.5646	***	0.5636	***	0.0484	***	0.0484	***
	<i>surface area<sup>2</sup></i>					0.5636	***		
	<i>artist's living status</i>							5.0405	***
<i>artist</i>	Kossak_J	-1.5906	***	-1.4183	***	-0.0565	***	-0.0566	***
	Kossak_W	-0.8769	***	-0.6864	***	-0.0321	*	-0.0318	
	Chmieliski	-1.2274	***	-1.0203	***	-0.0600	***	-0.0601	***
	Dwurnik	-2.2824	***	-2.1742	***	-0.1413	***	-0.1413	***
	Erb	-1.0908	***	-0.8124	***	-0.0409	**	-0.0420	**
	Hofman	-1.0883	***	-0.8475	***	-0.0479	**	-0.0484	**
	Malczewski	0.3115	***	0.5349	***	-0.1003	***	-0.1007	***
	Nikifor	-1.3326	***	-0.8743	***	-0.2553	***	-0.2556	***
	Nowosielski	-0.1185		0.0723		-0.0471	***	-0.0471	***
	Dominik	-1.9053	***	-1.8535	***	-0.0596	***	-0.0594	***
<i>technique</i>	watercolour	0.1968		0.5533		-0.0149		-0.0155	
	acrylic	0.6975	***	0.8912	***	0.0452		0.0448	
	gouache	0.2849		0.6414		-0.0021		-0.0038	
	oil	0.8856	***	1.0433	***	0.0563	**	0.0561	**
	pencil	-0.2460		0.2354		-0.0701	**	-0.0704	**
	pastel	0.4502	**	0.7456	**	0.0341		0.0336	
	tempera	0.6350	***	0.9969	***	0.0303		0.0296	
	drawing ink	-0.5984	**	-0.2753	**	-0.0172		-0.0171	

Source: Own elaboration

**3.3. Hedonic art price indexes**

In our research we evaluate naive and hedonic price indexes. Parameter estimates of the models (3), presented in Table 4, are used to evaluate hedonic quality adjustment (2), and, finally, price index (1). In Table 5 we present obtained results. Naïve price index is a nominator in the relation (1), and describes “average” changes of prices regarding selected artworks in every investigated year. Hedonic quality adjustments (HQA) is evaluated separately for the estimated models therefore also hedonic price indexes depends on the parameter estimates.



**Research Article**

**Table 5. Hedonic art price indexes**

Year	Model	HQA	Art price Hedonic Index	Art price Naïve Index	Equity market WIG index	Equity market WIG 20index
2008	M1	1.4137	1.0599	1.4984	27 228.64	1 789.73
2009		0.6867	0.8975	0.6163	39 985.99	2 388.72
2010		0.9860	0.9575	0.9441	47 489.91	2 744.17
2008	M2	1.4160	1.0582	1.4984	27 228.64	1 789.73
2009		0.6862	0.8981	0.6163	39 985.99	2 388.72
2010		0.9887	0.9549	0.9441	47 489.91	2 744.17
2008	M4	1.3256	1.1303	1.4984	27 228.64	1 789.73
2009		0.8552	0.7206	0.6163	39 985.99	2 388.72
2010		0.9088	1.0389	0.9441	47 489.91	2 744.17

Source: Own elaboration and \* [http://www.gpw.pl/indeksy\\_gieldowe](http://www.gpw.pl/indeksy_gieldowe)

Last two columns in Table 5 contain quotations of the market indexes from the Warsaw Stock Exchange (WIG is the total return index while WIG20 is blue chip index). Having quotations of stock indexes we may calculate returns that could be obtained investing on equity market and compare it to the investment on art market.

Therefore we calculate percentage returns for each year (Table 6) as:

- annual return i.e. in comparison to the pervious year (t-1),
- total return i.e. in comparison to the year 2007, and
- average annual return as geometric mean from the total return obtained in the year 2010.

It is visible that both equity indexes generated losses in every year of investigation while negative returns on the art market appear in 2009 and 2010. It worth mentioning that naïve price index and hedonic indexes evaluated on the basis of the models M1 and M2 show smaller average annual losses than stock index WIG. While all of them have generate smaller losses than index WIG20.

**Table 6. Percentage returns from different investment assets.**

Investment in art			Returns			Returns			
Year	Index type	Model	comparison to the		average annual	comparison to the		average annual	
			(t-1)	2007		(t-1)	2007		
2008	Naïve		49.8	49.8	-4.5	Warsaw Stock Exchange Index WIG			
2009			-38.4	-7.7					
2010			-5.6	<b>-12.8</b>					
2008	Hedonic	M1	6.0	6.0	-3.1	-51.1	-51.1	-5.1	
2009				-10.3		-4.9	46.9		-28.1
2010				-4.3		<b>-8.9</b>	18.8		<b>-14.7</b>
2008		M2	5.8	5.8	-3.2	Warsaw Stock Exchange Blue Chip Index WIG20			
2009				-10.2					-5.0
2010				-4.5					<b>-9.2</b>
2008		M4	13.0	13.0	-5.4	-48.2	-48.2	-7.4	
2009				-27.9		-18.6	33.5		-30.9
2010				3.9		<b>-15.4</b>	14.9		<b>-20.6</b>

Source: Own elaboration

## **Research Article**

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Presented results justify the opinion that art can be treated as safe asset class although in investigated period returns from treasury bonds was annually from 4% to 5.75% (it depends on mature of the bonds that is from 2 to 10 years). Comparing returns from art, represented by hedonic or naive indexes, to returns from WIG and WIG20 we notice that losses from investment in artworks are smaller. We also notice that financial crisis is visible in equity market in 2008 while in art market a year later. Our investigation shows that specification of the hedonic model is crucial in the price index evaluation.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adamowska, W., 2008.** Is Art such a good investment? Investing in fine art. on the international and Polish action market. Master thesis written under the supervision of F. Vermeylen, Erasmus University, Rotterdam
- Anderson, R. C., 1974.** Paintings as an Investment, *Economic Inquiry* 12(1), 13-26.
- Ashenfelter, O. and Graddy, K. 2006. Art Auctions. In: Ginsburgh, V. and Throsby, D. (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, Elsevier, North Holland, Amsterdam: 909-945.
- Campbell, R.A.J., 2004.** The Art of Portfolio Diversification. LIFE / Maastricht University Working Paper, <http://www.fdewb.unimaas.nl/finance/faculty/Campbell/images/Art%20Investment.pdf> (viewed 1 July 2008).
- Campbell, R.A.J., 2008.** Art as a Financial Investment. *The Journal of Alternative Investments* 10(4), 64-81.
- Candela, G., Figini, P. and Scorcu, A. E., 1997.** A Price index for Art Market Auctions. An Application to the Italian Market of Modern and Contemporary Oil Paintings. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 21, 175-196.
- Candela, G., Figini, P. and Scorcu, A. E., 2004.** Price indices for artists - A proposal. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 28(4), 285-302.
- Culture in 2012. 2013. Wydawnictwo GUS, Warsaw.
- Deloitte, 2013.** The art market. Art of the market. (in Polish), [http://www.deloitte.com/assets/DcomPoland/Local%20Assets/Documents/Raporty,%20badania,%20rankingi/pl\\_Art&Banking\\_PL.pdf](http://www.deloitte.com/assets/DcomPoland/Local%20Assets/Documents/Raporty,%20badania,%20rankingi/pl_Art&Banking_PL.pdf), (last accessed 12.11.2013).
- Frey, B.S. and Cueni, R., 2013.** Why invest in art? *The Economist's Voice* 2013, 1-6.
- Frey, B.S., and Pommerehne, W.W., 1988.** Is Art Such a Good Investment? *The Public Interest* 91, 79-86.
- Frey, B.S. and Pommerehne, W.W., 1989a.** Art Investment: An Empirical Inquiry. *Southern Economic Journal* 56(2), 396-409.
- Frey, B.S. and Pommerehne, W.W., 1989b.** *Muses and Markets. Explorations in the Economics of the Arts.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Gajewski, M., Potocki, T., 2013.** Skate's Focus: Poland's Art Market The Rising Star of Central Europe. Report created by Skate's Art Market Research Art & Business Magazine S.A., Skate's, LLC, New York, NY, USA, [skatesart.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/skates-focus-polands-art-market.pdf](http://skatesart.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/skates-focus-polands-art-market.pdf), last accessed 29.01.2014.
- Ginsburgh, V., Mei, J. and Moses, M., 2006.** The Computation of Prices Indices. *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, chap. 27 (947-979).
- Ginsburgh, V. and Schwed, N., 1992.** Price Trends for Old Masters' Drawings: 1980-1991. *The Art Newspaper*.
- Goetzmann, W. N., Renneboog, L. and Spaenjers, C., 2011.** Art and money. *American Economic Review* 101, p. 222-226
- Higgs, H., 2012.** Australian Art Market Prices during the Global Financial Crisis and two earlier decades. *Australian Economic Papers* 51(4), 189-209.
- Higgs, H. and Worthington, A., 2005.** Financial Returns and Price Determinants in the Australian Art Market, 1973–2003. *Economic Record*, Vol. 81(253), pp. 113-123.

### **Research Article**

- Hsieh, S., Lee, J. and Tzeng L. Y., 2010.** Art as an Investment: Empirical Study of Asian Contemporary and Chinese 20th Century Modern Art. International Conference on Finance Department of Finance, National Taiwan University, December 10 -11, 2010, discussionpaper, [http://www.fin.ntu.edu.tw/~conference/conference2010/proceedings/proceeding/11/11-1\(A40\).pdf](http://www.fin.ntu.edu.tw/~conference/conference2010/proceedings/proceeding/11/11-1(A40).pdf) (viewed 7.11.2013)
- Kompa, K. and Witkowska, D., 2013.** Art Price Index. Preliminary Investigation for Selected Polish Painters. Prace i Materiały Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk.
- Kraeussl, R. and van Elsland, N., 2008.** Constructing the True Art Market Index - A Novel 2-Step Hedonic Approach and its Application to the German Art Market. CFS working paper, Center for Financial Studies Frankfurt University, No. 2008/11.
- Kraeussl, R. and Logher, R., 2010.** Emerging Art Markets. *Emerging Markets Review*, 11(4), 301-318.
- Kraeussl, R. and Wiehenkamp, Ch., 2012.** A call on Art investments. *Review of Derivatives Research* 15(1), 1-23.
- Landes, W.M., 2000.** Winning the Art Lottery: The Economic Returns to the Ganz Collection. John M. Olin Law and Economics Working Paper No. 76, Second series, The Law School, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Locatelli-Biey, M. and Zanola, R., 2002.** The Sculpture Market: An Adjacent Year Regression Index. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, vol. 26 (1), s. 65-78.
- Lucińska, A., 2012.** The Careers of Artists And Prices of Paintings on Polish Art Market. In: Zarzecki D. (ed.), *Finanse, Rynki Finansowe, Ubezpieczenia 51, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego*, 715-725.
- Mc Andrew, C., 2013.** TEFAF Art market report 2013. The global art market, with a focus on China and Brazil. The European Fine Art Foundation, TEFAF Maastricht.
- Mc Andrew, C., 2014.** TEFAF Art market report 2014. The European Fine Art Foundation, TEFAF Maastricht.
- Mei, J. and Moses, M., 2002.** Art as an Investment and the Underperformance of Masterpieces. *American Economic Review* 92 (5), 1656-1668.
- Mok, H.M.K., Ko, V.W.K., Woo, S.S.M. and Kwok, K.Y.S., 1993.** Modern Chinese Paintings: An Investment Alternative. *Southern Economic Journal*, vol. 59(4), s. 808-816.
- Nesheim, L., 2006.** Hedonic Price Functions. CEMMAP, London.
- Pesando, J.E., 1993.** Art as an Investment: The Market for Modern Prints. *American Economic Review* 83, 1075-1089.
- Pesando, J.E. and Shum, P.M. 1999.** The Returns to Picasso's Prints and to Traditional Financial Assets, 1977 to 1996. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23(3): 183-192.
- Renneboog, L. & Van Houtte, T., 2002.** The monetary appreciation of paintings: From realism to Magritte. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, No. 26, pp. 331-357.
- Renneboog, L. and Spaenjers, C., 2013.** Buying Beauty on Prices and Returns in the Art Market. *Management Science* 59(1), 36 – 53.
- Sokolowska, E., 2012.** Evolution and Perspectives of Art Investment as an Alternative Form of Investment (in Polish). In: Piłatowska M. (red.) „*Ekonometria dla praktyki*”, *Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne Oddział w Toruniu, Toruń*, s. 159-175.
- Triplett, J., 2006.** Handbook On Hedonic Indexes And Quality Adjustments In Price Indexes: Special Application To Information Technology Products. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Widlak, M., 2010.** Methods of Hedonic Price Index Evaluation as a Way of the Goods' Quality Control (in Polish). *Wiadomości Statystyczne*, Nr 9(592), s. 1-25.
- World Wealth Report. 2012.** from Capgemini and RBC Wealth Management, [www.capgemini.com/thought-leadership/world-wealth-report-2013-from-capgemini-and-rbc-wealth-management](http://www.capgemini.com/thought-leadership/world-wealth-report-2013-from-capgemini-and-rbc-wealth-management) (last accessed 12.11.2013).
- Worthington, A. C. and Higgs, H., 2003.** Art as an Investment: Short and Long-Term Comovements in Major Paintings Markets, *Empirical Economics* 28, 649-668.

**Research Article**

**Worthington, A. C. and Higgs, H., 2004.** Art as an Investment: Risk, Return and Portfolio Diversification in Major Painting Markets. *Accounting and Finance* 44, 257-271.

**Helen Gardner, F. S. Kleiner and Ch. J. Mamiya (2004).** *Gardner's Art Through the Ages*, First written by Helen Gardner and published in 1926.