



CREATIVE CITIES: A 10-YEAR RESEARCH AGENDA

ANN MARKUSEN
University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT: *Over the past decade, under the rubric of creative placemaking, policymakers, planners and practitioners have turned to arts and culture to enliven city life and stimulate urban economies. Good multidisciplinary research has kept pace, but challenges remain. What are the missions of urban arts and culture? How can offerings and engagement become more equitable and diverse? In fashioning good policy and making funding and planning decisions, what do city leaders and advocates need to know about the location preferences of artists, arts organizations and arts participants? I review what we know and don't know to date on these questions, and close with reflections on the potential of arts and cultural research to link to broader urban theories, capitalize on interdisciplinary research and mixed methods, and integrate international research and experience in the field.*

INTRODUCTION

For a century or more, the phrase “city culture” conjured up the specter of large, dedicated performing arts palaces and visual arts museums in Europe, North America, and industrialized Asia (Blau, 1989). Since World War II, flagship venues, institutions, and their offerings have won a large share of regional arts philanthropic funding and dominated the arts sections of daily urban newspapers. On the grounds that they promise economic development, they have also garnered large public capital grants. But over the past two decades, this approach has been challenged in academic, philanthropic and policy worlds (e.g. Whitt, 1987; Eisinger, 2000; Strom, 2002; Plaza, 2006; Grodach, 2008, 2010; Dean, Donnellan, & Pratt, 2010). A new focus on the intersection between arts/culture and cities has emerged. In her framing piece for this issue, Editor Laura Reese notes the recent increase in *Journal of Urban Affairs* papers submitted and published under the rubric “creative cities.”

Internationally and in the U.S., academics, urbanists and advocates have charted new agendas for the intersections of arts, culture, and place. The roles of artists and cultural organizations as urban change agents have come to the fore. New, diverse democratic forces are challenging the privileges of elites, academics, and the state to define arts and culture and to determine how it will be housed and presented. Definitions of “art” and “artist” are hotly debated, perhaps not for the first time, but more broadly. Ethnic, working class communities and outsider artists question the artistic canon and share their own cultures and aesthetics boldly and publicly, often reaching across national borders in their programming. Participants, long cast as audience members and attendees, are becoming restive, demanding to actively engage in art-making and to co-curate productions. They now care more about the venues in which they experience music, drama and visual art—whether they are pleasurable, enable interaction with art-makers, permit socializing (and with whom), and encourage conversation about cultural experience.

Researchers, cultural creators, and other publics now more prominently recognize place, including cities of all sizes and rural communities, as a crucible for cultural expression. Under the rubrics of creative cities and creative placemaking, artists and arts and cultural leaders are walking out of their

Direct correspondence to: Ann Markusen, University of Minnesota, Humphrey School of Public Affairs, Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, 1161 Villa Vista Circle, Wright MN 55798. E-mail: markusen@umn.edu.

doors, partnering with others, and bringing their talents to bear on community building. They are pairing up with agencies and advocacy groups on technology, transportation, and health care fronts, where art can serve supportive and creative roles. But many potential urban policymakers and other partners know very little about how the arts and cultural capacity is structured and funded, and how it intersects with place.

These developments open up yeasty new areas for research and policy practice for urban scholars. They call for research that is framed by new concepts, employs mixed methods, and is interdisciplinary and internationally and domestically comparative. They offer us opportunities to cross boundaries of specialization. For arts and cultural experts in and outside of academia: to connect to broader urbanization research and to contribute to fast-moving, though fragile, policy formation. For faculty: to fashion new interdisciplinary curricula in urban studies, arts management, social science, and planning and policy fields. For urbanists working on other fronts: to find out how arts and culture work in cities and how their missions intersect with those of other sectors.

Because published research on arts, culture, and cities is mostly of recent vintage and spotty, I structure this essay around four over-arching research questions that challenge us to move this agenda forward. (1) What are the urban missions of arts and culture? (2) How do ethnic, racial, immigrant, and working class arts and cultural groups and practices embed themselves in the urban environment, and how are they treated in mainstream arts ecologies, conventions, and current urban creative city policies? (3) How do arts participants/consumers behave with respect to place, not just in patronage patterns but also in decisions on where to live? (4) How do arts creators (artists and designers) and arts-provisioning organizations (private and nonprofit) decide where to locate? I explore behavioral theories in the final two inquiries, because much published academic and policy research lacks an adequate comprehension of how individual and organizational actors make choices in response to a complex and dynamic urban environment (Markusen, 2004).

In addressing each question, I pose conceptualization problems and inquire into the state of urban and other theories that bear on them. I explore what researchers have found to date. I set out a series of further questions begging for attention. In closing, I reflect on the potential of research on urban arts and culture's link to larger urban theories; to capitalize on interdisciplinary research and mixed methods; and to integrate international research and experience into the field. These research frontiers do not exhaust all possibilities, and I look forward to other scholars' and practitioners' views on research priorities.

THE URBAN MISSIONS OF ARTS AND CULTURE

Most people exposed to recent creative city and creative placemaking debates conclude that the urban contributions of arts and culture are to fuel economic and community development. They should not be faulted for this—most research and written work, as well as policy advocacy, underscores these functions. However, such an instrumental view of arts and culture is both weak and extremely narrow. In this section, I document the evolution of this view and contrast it to one based on the intrinsic values of arts and culture.

The Urban Economic Contributions of Art and Culture

What are the urban missions of arts and culture? One heavily researched mission is economic development, a result of adjustments to crisis in public arts funding. Following the wrenching “culture wars” of the early 1990s (Kreidler, 1996; Markusen, 2013b), Congress eliminated almost all federal funding for artists, and many state arts boards, as well as corporate and private philanthropies, followed suit (Rushton & Lewis, 2007). Advocates for the arts began to shift their lobbying and research toward underscoring the economic contributions of cultural industries and arts organizations. Pioneers in this effort include the Los Angeles study headed up by Harvey Perloff and the Urban Innovations Group (1979) and Perloff (1979) and the New York-New Jersey Port Authority study (1983). Americans for the Arts (2002), the national coalition of advocacy groups, has been doing

economic impact studies every year for more than a decade, producing them at city, metro, and state scales.

A newer body of work explores the economics of arts and cultural occupations, rather than industries, and addresses the economic contributions of artists: how artists export their work (writing, visual art) outside of the city or region, or travel to perform, bringing income into the local economy. How they provide human capital to creative industries like publishing, advertising, TV, radio and film, and technical services as well as other non-arts-related businesses, enabling profitability and added jobs. How some develop new services or products that result in new companies (Markusen & King, 2003; Markusen & Schrock, 2006a). How their collective presence adds to the quality of life, attracting other managers and skilled workers (Florida, 2002c; Lloyd, 2002, 2004; Lloyd & Clark, 2001).

Since the early 1990s, arts economic impact studies began to be commissioned and used in advocacy. Despite compelling academic criticism of such studies (Seaman, 2000), many users believe that they clinched budget allocations. The best of these studies go beyond chunking out jobs, payrolls, and taxes to offer visual frameworks for “seeing” the complex structures that mediate between artists and consumers (Beyers et al., 2008) and including artists as creative entrepreneurs (Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, 2010). Arts and culture’s urban economic impact is now widely understood.

Artists and arts activities do deliver economic impacts: job creation, tourism, and increasing productivity and sales in cultural and other industries, but this line of reasoning is quite weak (Markusen, 2013b). Spending money on almost anything at national, state, or local levels will result in additional jobs and incomes. Though there may be differential impacts, we don’t really have good enough data on, say, re-spending of artists’ incomes to really know whether their multiplier effects are superior to those of scientists or construction workers. Artists probably do spend more of their incomes locally (including on other artists’ work and services), but there is no way to prove it. Yet these are instrumental arguments for arts and culture. Scientists, engineers, doctors, and technologists don’t have to make such a case. They need only articulate the various missions that they serve—a cleaner environment, a cure for cancer, better telecommunications.

The Intrinsic Urban Contributions of Arts and Culture

Why do we love and need arts and culture? Its intrinsic missions and gifts are multiple: beauty, critique, innovation, emotional insights, cultural bridging and bonding among them. Interestingly, in the Minnesota 2008 Constitutional Amendment vote for a sales tax hike that now generates \$50 million annually for 25 years for arts and culture (with larger sums going to recreation and environment), advocates did not use the economic impact argument. People understood the values of arts and culture and voted for the measure, in margins larger than for then-presidential candidate, Barak Obama. Sociologists, consultants, and arts leaders are helping us articulate the case for these intrinsic missions: for instance, McCarthy et al.’s *Gifts of the Muse* (2004), Brown, Novak-Leonard, and Gilbride’s work on theatregoers’ experience (2011), and GIA’s Support for Individual Artists Group Steering Committee (Guay, 2012).

Why are the intrinsic missions of arts and culture often avoided in urban planning and policy? More than almost any other urban practice sphere, the arts are an arena in which cogent protest emerges. Actor, funder, and now theatre manager John Killacky shows how the 1990s culture wars were born out of outrage, expressed in visual and performance art, among those whose ranks were savaged by the AIDS crisis (Killacky, 2010). Art is also frequently used to express outrage and demands and to change consciousness. Singing, for instance, was central to the urban civil rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s.

What are the distinctly *urban* missions of arts and culture? Arts and culture contribute to quality of life; foster civic engagement; beautify and animate neighborhoods; and offer tools for problem-solving, protest, and community celebration (Stern & Seifert, 1998; Jackson, Kabwasa-Green, & Herranz, 2006). They may also increase understanding and collaboration among distinctive groups: immigrants and long-time residents; people by age, race, ethnicity, and gender; and subcultures.

How can we define and measure these benefits? Nowhere is this challenge more evident than in efforts to evaluate creative placemaking, the bundle of new initiatives (many built on prior, pioneering efforts) that have been funded under or inspired by the new national programs, Our Town at the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and ArtPlace, a consortium of major national funders, federal government agencies, and banks. Both have launched efforts to design indicators to gauge progress in hosting local communities (ArtPlace, 2012a, 2012b; National Endowment for the Arts, 2012). Both are stumbling over debates about desired outcomes: “vitality,” “vibrancy,” and “livability,” for instance, all great examples of fuzzy concepts that mean different things to different people, but flourish precisely because of their imprecision (Markusen, 2003). See, for instance, Thomas Frank’s (2013) recent pillorying of the notion of vibrancy, Gadwa Nicodemus’ (2013b) nuanced reflection on “fuzzy” vibrancy, and Markusen’s (2013c) detailed critique of ArtPlace and NEA outcome conceptions, proposed indicators, data inadequacy, and the dangers of using cross-sectional secondary data sets to gauge project success without acknowledging other forces at work in the same communities.

To date, such indicator design and implementation has not been built on a careful reading of extant urban and arts research. Instead, the rush to indicators has turned to handy data sets rather than engaging the research, policy and practice communities in defining outcomes, understanding the behaviors and structures that shape these, and then searching for appropriate metrics and data. For example, the design and use of diversity indices has been powerfully critiqued by economist Michael Rushton (2008), who argues that percentage-of-minority measures are unacceptably indifferent to which races and ethnicities are prominent in the mix. An index reading of 70%, for instance, could mean 70% white and 30% black, or 70% black and 30% everybody else—you could not reasonably expect to understand much about urban phenomena, including the impact of a creative placemaking intervention, from such a crude measure. Those working from within arts and culture have much to learn from other social and urban sciences. Stern and Seifert’s (2013) careful documentation of the multi-dimensional impact of arts and cultural activity in Philadelphia using multiple data sources is pioneering in this regard.

Gentrification: An Urban Arts and Cultural Mission?

What about gentrification? Many lay people as well as academics believe that a key mission of arts and culture is gentrification. In some accounts, some artists and arts organizations are depicted as key agents in gentrification (Deutsche & Ryan, 1984). Misreadings of Sharon Zukin’s (1982) seminal study of Manhattan, *Loft Living*, are partly to blame. While some of those who moved into abandoned garment factory lofts in Soho were artists, many others were not. Lots of small-scale (as opposed to official urban renewal) investments in housing and workspace in post-World War II inner cities were initiated by urban homesteaders: young, two-income families wanting to move closer into the city center and people interested in growing community gardens. Eventually, as Zukin brilliantly describes, real estate developers took note and capitalized on the phenomenon, a perfect example of David Harvey’s “spatial fix” (2001). Andy Pratt describes this process powerfully in his examination of the Hoxton district of London (2009). In addition, profit-seeking, developer-led, district turnover only occurs in cities where there is high generalized demand in housing and land markets. New York City is a prime example: every rich person in the world can afford a condo in Manhattan. In other words, unequal wealth, a free market property rights system, and an active development industry in cities drive gentrification, not artists per se, even if some artists are caught in its fast-changing web. Contemporary cultural observers understand this and are questioning the pervasiveness of artist-led gentrification (Davis, 2013).

Yet the artist-led gentrification myth persists. For instance, one contemporary critique asserts that “If placemaking is project-led, development-led, design-led or artists-led, then it does likely lead to gentrification and a more limited set of community outcomes” (Project for Public Spaces, 2013), even though there is no adequate body of research that enables us to conclude that they are. Stern and Seifert’s (2007) work on city-wide “natural” cultural districts in Philadelphia, explored at greater depth below, found very little evidence of gentrification in districts where arts capacity

and artists have clustered. Gadwa and Muessig's (2010, 2011) studies of artist live-work buildings in Lowertown, Saint Paul, Minnesota, found little gentrification-led displacement, even after more than a decade. In a recent rebuttal of Project for Public Spaces' disparaging of artist-led development on equity grounds, Gadwa Nicodemus (2013a) offers powerful examples of how artists have lent their talents and energies to improving their lower income neighborhoods while successfully fighting gentrification. Maria Rosario Jackson, a leading researcher of artists and communities, advances both thinking and practice in her recent article, "Developing Artist-Driven Spaces in Marginalized Communities" (Jackson, 2012). Grodach's (2011) Dallas-area case study of small art spaces and their connections to neighborhoods, artists, and the cultural economy explores yet more positive contributions.

This is a promising frontier for researchers. Several urban planning researchers are developing sophisticated concepts of and measures for gentrification that can serve as models. Chapple and Jacobus (2009), in a study of retail revitalization, distinguish among several forms of gentrification, suggesting that some may be more salutary than others. For instance, revitalization might involve a neighborhood staying low-income but with improved access to services and opportunities. It might involve an influx of more affluent residents and/or improvements in the incomes of existing residents. Or, it might involve disinvestment followed by an influx of investments and households of higher socioeconomic status and educational attainment. Chapple and Jacobus find that empirical studies of gentrification show mixed results for lower-income people. An increase in middle-income residents and retail may improve the lives of lower-income residents, and they cite studies finding that this can occur without displacement. On the other hand, if both lower-income and middle-income residents depart, a neighborhood will be left with bi-polar residential and retail structures that may be unstable (and even dampen high-end gentrification).

Are there unique characteristics of artists (skills in renovation, relationships to other cultural spaces in the area) that might make them more likely to contribute to turnaround and gentrification? Studies could be done of mid-sized urban precincts to detect whether different types of artist households (by age, ethnicity, race, occupation, household composition) are more closely associated with land and housing unit deflation and/or inflation over time. Inspiration on this score can also be drawn from an excellent new paper on how arts organizations (commercial and nonprofit) contribute to gentrification and revitalization (Grodach, Foster, & Murdoch, 2013). Developing a model of the presence of various art forms on neighborhood change and using Census and Department of Commerce industry data to test it for 100 large metro areas at the ZIP Code level, they conclude:

Our findings reinforce claims that the arts are associated with urban revitalization, but also show that particular types of arts activities are connected to gentrification processes. Whereas fine arts activities (e.g. visual and performing arts companies, fine art schools) are more likely associated with indicators of revitalization, commercial arts industries (e.g. film, music, and design-based industries) are a strong predictor of neighborhood gentrification. Furthermore, while the fine arts are associated with stable, slow growth neighborhoods, commercial arts clusters are associated with rapidly changing areas. To effectively incorporate the arts into neighborhood planning efforts, planners should recognize that different types of arts activities have different relationships to the type and pace of neighborhood change and are associated with different neighborhood conditions. (Grodach et al., 2013, p. 3)

Similar empirical explorations could be addressed to the study of artists and gentrification.

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY IN URBAN ARTS AND CULTURE

Recently, concerns with equity and diversity have been forcefully injected into creative cities and arts funding debates. Susan Fainstein has, in her *The Just City*, made important distinctions and explored conflict among goals of equity, diversity, and democracy that will be useful to those grappling with these issues (2010, pp. 48–56). Fainstein shows that improving the distribution of wealth and income, and ensuring that urban policies do not leave less-well-positioned groups worse

off, differs from preserving diversity, which would ensure that distinctive groups (based on race, ethnicity, immigrant status, gender, sexuality, and other affinities) retain the right to practice their cultures and live safely, even if in large non-diverse enclaves. With these tensions in mind, what are the equity and diversity agendas for urban arts and culture?

Much long-in-coming articulation of the need for greater equity and diversity has recently come from within the arts community. Forceful critiques of the class-bound, fine art, and Euro-American centric character of nonprofit and publicly-supported arts in the U.S. are emerging. A study of the mal-distribution of U.S. arts philanthropic funding overall, based on research by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, deserves quoting:

Every year, approximately 11 percent of foundation giving—about \$2.3 billion in 2009—is awarded to nonprofit arts and cultural institutions. The distribution of these funds is demonstrably out of balance with our evolving cultural landscape and with the changing demographics of our communities. . . . The majority of arts funding supports large organizations with budgets greater than \$5 million. Such organizations, which comprise less than 2 percent of the universe of arts and cultural nonprofits, receive more than half of the sector’s total revenue. These institutions focus primarily on Western European art forms, and their programs serve audiences that are predominantly white and upper income. Only 10 percent of grant dollars made with a primary or secondary purpose of supporting the arts explicitly benefit underserved communities, including lower-income populations, communities of color and other disadvantaged groups. And less than 4 percent focus on advancing social justice goals. (Sidford, 2011, p. 4)

Robert Bedoya, a funder in southern Arizona, recently called for a revamping in how creative placemaking is conceptualized. Involved in dialogues and debate about the NEA’s Our Town and ArtPlace initiatives, he argues that:

. . . they are tethered to a meaning of “place” manifest in the built environment, for example, artists’ live-work spaces, cultural districts, spatial landscapesnot the complete picturebefore you have *places of belonging*, you must feel you *belong*. A troubling tenor of Creative Placemaking discourse is the avoidance of addressing social and racial injustices at work in society and how they intersect with Creative Placemaking projects If Creative Placemaking activities support the politics of dis-belonging through acts of gentrification, racism, real estate speculation, all in the name of neighborhood revitalization, then it betrays the democratic ideal of having an equitable and just civil society. (Bedoya, 2013)

What are the conceptual challenges to transforming urban arts and making them more inclusive? One is the use of tag words that discriminate between arts that are “fine” versus “craft,” “professional” versus “amateur,” “formal” versus “informal,” and so on, that place many worthy cultural activities on the margins. Anthropologist Maribel Alvarez (2007) offers important responses to characterizations that underlie disparagement and neglect of smaller, community-based and ethnic/racial and immigrant cultures. She articulates features of “informal” arts that urban arts and cultural researchers should address, arguing that informal art practices are highly visible materially but paradoxically invisible socially (as art) as well as officially disavowed. Participants often meet and create in non-art spaces such as neighborhood centers, public libraries, park and recreation facilities, YMCAs, church basements, strip malls, and coffeehouses, where people are engaged more as direct producers rather than as audiences of arts programs. The activities are hands-on, shared in groups, casually organized, financed with personal resources, and involve culturally relative aesthetics.

Alvarez contrasts these to the nonprofit art model: publicly-labeled art spaces, artists with formal training, paid administrators and gatekeepers, formalized financing systems, governance by rule and an administrative culture, and conceptions of the public as ticket-buyers, audiences, or targets for outreach. In contrast, the informal arts are dispersed, idiosyncratic, and entrepreneurial. She calls for an ethic of participation, where arts creators ask: “Whom do we make art for, with, among?” She recommends that researchers codify participatory artistic practices and sites, showcase exemplary models, and research cultural vitality, not only arts settings, products and agencies. Alvarez’s (2005)

series of case studies of Silicon Valley participatory arts venues is a role model for practice and research.

An additional challenge is that the offerings of small, ethnic and immigrant arts organizations are often particular to traditions and places of origin. Different races and ethnicities, immigrant groups, and working class constituencies face distinctive forms of oppression and discrimination, and these color their resources and forms of expression. Case studies, especially when based on extensive interviews, offer one way of exploring these in different contexts. In a detailed study of Minnesota contemporary Native American artists and the gatekeepers who control access to resources (including educational institutions, galleries, music venues, theatres, funders, casinos, powwows, and tribal spaces), we found that Native-specific artist practices such as placing community above self, use of sacred rituals not open to larger publics, need for traditional materials whose harvesting is prescribed by public agencies or banned by tribal practices from sharing with outsiders, and distinctive prejudices held by non-Native gatekeepers often denied Native artists support (Rendon & Markusen, 2009).

Working class cultural participants, although often intersecting with racial and ethnic cultures, have distanced themselves from the fine arts tradition, refusing to participate in events that are often riddled with pretension and requirements for having had arts training. Often the cultural expressions chosen by white working class people involve formats that make educated people uncomfortable: country music, tattooing, NASCAR racing, mud bogs (in rural areas), and more. Most efforts by cultural organizations to attract white working people into their theatres and museums have been disappointing, but this may be a function of narrow programming rather than the venues and their usual fare. Two anomalies suggest this. The New York Guggenheim's *The Art of the Motorcycle*, a 1998 exhibit of more than 100 beautifully designed motorcycles, attracted more visitors to the museum than any other exhibit before or after. People in leather jackets lined Fifth Avenue for many blocks to see it, day after day. In Minneapolis, a 2003 Guthrie Lab Theatre adaption of Barbara Ehrenreich's non-fiction *Nickel and Dime* portrayed the author's experience working as a minimum wage worker stocking shelves at a Walmart, cleaning a motel, and waiting tables in a diner. The play was held over for many weeks, and people with union jackets packed the seating (Markusen & Brown, 2013).

What are the questions researchers might tackle regarding the relationships between urban space and informal, participatory, ethnic/racial/immigrant and class arts and cultural practices? They include the following: Are there class, age, or other cultural (e.g. religious) divisions within ethnic, racial, and immigrant groups that dampen cultural expression or result in the fragmentation of cultural offerings, and if so, is this a good or bad phenomenon? Do hierarchies develop inside participatory or informal cultural groups that discourage participation? Is there cooperation among different cultural groups serving the same spatial community, or do they compete, and what are the consequences? How do low-income cultural groups find, manage, and/or own their own spaces for cultural programming? How common is ongoing arts and cultural programming in low-income communities, or are one-off festivals, parades, and art fairs more common? Are large, non-diverse ethnic communities that you might find in Los Angeles, Orange County, or Miami well-served by the homogeneity and density of their precincts? Are small immigrant and ethnic arts groups able to maintain connections with their home country via cultural exchanges and trade in regalia and instruments? As ethnic groups, over time, disperse throughout a metro, and as dilution of formerly ethnic neighborhoods by other newcomers makes neighborhoods less distinctive, how do ethnic and immigrant groups hold on to their cultures and art forms? Do more established mainstream arts organizations nurture small ethnic, immigrant, and working class groups, or do they compete with them? How do funders view and support diverse and low-income arts organizations? In each case, what role does urban space and its features play: transit, residential density, residential/commercial mix, the attitudes of dominant built environment interests, the politics of local governments?

Research on working class, immigrant and ethnic, and racial arts organizations, venues, programming, and participation, whether urban or rural, is hampered by a lack of good data. Even descriptive data are inadequate, as those who have worked on other urban informal sectors well know. The Cultural Data Project (CDP) surveys nonprofit arts organizations but poorly covers smaller

organizations, particularly those specializing in ethnic, folk and multi-disciplinary arts and culture. Large, mainstream arts organizations are more likely to respond to CDP surveys because funders require it of grant applicants; thus the CDP data do not comprise a random sample. Use of these data can spread misconceptions that belittle small and diverse organizations. For instance, an arts advocacy group, using CDP data, published a report showing (in fancy graphics) that Philadelphia hosts more mid-sized arts organizations than smaller ones (Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance, 2008), very unlikely (Isserman & Markusen, 2013). It is possible to benchmark the CDP data against National Center for Charitable Statistics (IRS) data to correct for this distortion (Markusen et al., 2011b, pp. 2–3).

Cultural vitality as a community feature has been the object of extensive research by Maria Rosario Jackson and her team at the Urban Institute (Jackson et al., 2006; Jackson & Herranz, 2002). Based on extensive field research, they define cultural vitality as evidence of creating, disseminating, validating, and supporting arts and culture as a dimension of everyday life in communities. Their work is an effort to move beyond the narrow SPPA framework that confines arts participation as attendance, and from it, they have developed broader indicators based on what people value and how they participate. While their work yields us indicators that can be operationalized with existing data and compared across places, they do not offer causal theories of cultural vitality in place or test such theories with their indicators.

Research on racial, ethnic, traditional, immigrant, and working class art practices and their relationship to place will likely be inductive for the present. Preliminary insights can be found in many case studies, published and unpublished. For example, in an effort to map all of California's nonprofit arts and cultural organizations and analyze locational patterns and links to arts participation, one study team undertook three-dozen case studies of small, mostly ethnic and immigrant arts organizations throughout the state (Markusen et al., 2011a). Several important insights emerged. For one, these organizations' size and impact turned out to be much larger than official data captured because they rely very heavily on volunteers. The interviewers asked organizations how large their budgets would be if they paid these volunteers—they would be many times their reported sums. Turning back to the CDP data, the study team found volunteer-to-paid staff ratios of seven-to-one for California arts nonprofits between \$25,000 and \$250,000, compared to two-to-one for those above \$250,000 and only one-to-five for those over \$10 million (Markusen et al., 2011a, p. 23). Sometimes stumbling across a phenomenon enables researchers to formulate a hypothesis and test it with data in this way. And it matters: researchers can now re-estimate the size of small arts organizations by adding an imputed value-of-volunteer element to budget totals and adding FTE volunteers to staff totals.

Other insights from the same case studies: Small (including informal or not officially nonprofit) organizations are often the structures in which culturally-specific or local community arts offerings begin, grow, and develop. As direct representatives of a community, workers in these organizations often possess deep knowledge of community issues and a personal affinity with those they serve. Because of this grounding, activities by small organizations working in culturally-specific areas often challenge the dominant concepts and definitions of art, artistic quality, and value. At the same time many of these groups work cross-culturally, using their artistic practices to bridge among ethnicities, races, immigrant, age and class groups, and arts disciplines. Besides volunteers, small organizations often build and use non-financial assets such as social capital and in-kind donations that don't show up on their balance sheets but are an essential part of arts and cultural delivery. Small, low-income arts groups are more likely to lack dedicated space to create, present, and organize their work than are larger ones, a source of some anxiety and disruption. Sometimes, organizational boundaries are fuzzy: they are more likely to share insights, resources, space, and staff, and mentorship with others, including outside of the arts. Smaller arts and cultural organizations are more likely to be embedded in geographic and/or affinity (ethnic, immigrant, age, sexual preference, specialized art form) communities than are large organizations. They are often asked to solve problems outside of their arts and cultural expertise, such as dealing with neighborhood violence, immigration issues, or health challenges of participants, and they often pitch in (Kitchener & Markusen, 2012).

Several younger researchers are taking up this challenge. Urban Planning Ph.D. student Carolina Sarmiento, in a study of Mexicano immigrant arts and cultural groups in Santa Ana, California, and

African-American groups in Oakland, California, shows the complex relationships between these groups and urban real estate interests, built environment and planning schemes, city councils and mayors, and urban bureaucracies. One key Mexicano organization, El Centro Cultural, has been displaced six times from its rental space, in a city with an all-Latino city council that is pre-occupied with gentrifying the city center via arts and culture. The council's first large success is a Cal State Fullerton student artists' residence, an urban renewal project near the city's center. Sarmiento's account shows, too, how cultural groups use their skills as artists and musicians to protest and participate in democratic forums, including city council meetings, to try to stop gentrification and enable sustainable space and activity for working class immigrants (Sarmiento, 2014).

UNDERSTANDING URBAN ARTS PARTICIPANTS

The urban arts and cultural literature is short on how arts participants, artists, arts organizations, and relevant policy agencies make decisions about where to locate vis-à-vis arts ambitions, and on how evolved locations affect the quality, success, and inclusiveness of arts offerings. For instance, currently the designation of arts districts is in vogue in some cities and states, but do they actually increase participation, and by whom? Do they undermine participation in other neighborhoods that are not designated? We badly need the kind of insights that urban land use and transportation planners have been generating for some time on how people choose neighborhoods and workplaces in which to live and work. Arts participants care about both the location of arts offerings vis-à-vis where they live and the emotional experiences and social encounters available in spaces where they experience music, drama, and performing arts. These behavioral patterns deserve much more scrutiny than they have received in urban research to date.

Proximity and Arts and Cultural Participation

How does the urban location of arts venues and events influence participation with its associated benefits? We know from analyses of the national Survey of Public Participation in the Arts and from surveys done by other researchers that participation rates of adults vary by income, wealth status, age, and educational attainment. From urban scholarship, we also know that households over the decades have sorted themselves, given the choices or absence thereof (e.g. Native American reservations, Chinese Exclusion Act, Japanese interment camps, FHA and bank redlining) into spatially distinct enclaves. From other areas of urban studies, we have the tools for exploring how relationships among residence, the location of arts offerings, and participation work. For instance, Krizek's (2003) article, using panel data for a single metro area, explores how changing urban form affects transportation behavior.

Pioneering research at both regional and within-metro scales has cast some light on participants' behavior given existing arts locations. A 2003 Indiana household survey using Acorn dominant neighborhood types found that arts participation rates are highest among urban professional couples (97%) and lowest among rural industrial workers (51%). In the same survey, 35% of respondents stated that the availability of arts and cultural events is a problem in their community, with much higher rates among low-income urban dwellers and factory and farm communities (Sapp, 2005). These studies suggest spatial opportunities for arts producers and presenters in both lower-income urban neighborhoods and in rural areas. Some have proposed a hierarchy of arts offerings and participation strictly associated with metro population size and density. However, a study of the per capita presence of nonprofit arts and cultural organizations in California regions, using the Cultural Data Project and NCCS IRS data, found the per capita organizations (and per capita budgets) to be below average in the Los Angeles metro, high in the San Francisco Bay Area, but highest in the thinly populated Sierra, North Coast, and North State regions (Markusen et al., 2011a, p. 26). The study demonstrates that neither population size/densities nor geography dictate the viability of arts and cultural capacity.

One caveat on research findings to date: reliance on the SPPA restricts participation to a relatively narrow set of "high arts" forms in more traditional venues. The SPPA has traditionally limited

its coverage to attendance at events and at museums, ignoring religious venues (singing, music, dance, visual art) and community-organized activities, often free and more participatory, such as festivals in the parks and street dances, especially common in ethnic and immigrant communities. A growing literature by anthropologists, sociologists, urban planners, and arts consultants documents the vibrancy of these activities and calls for greater formal accounting for them (Wali et al., 2002; Alvarez, 2005; Jackson et al., 2006; Brown, Novak, & Kitchener, 2008). To its credit, the National Endowment for the Arts, whose SPPA survey is attached to the Current Population Survey (and is thus regrettably a small sample), has been broadening its definition of participation. For instance, in 2008, the NEA included attendance at salsa concerts in its SPPA survey, and in California participation rates rose three percentage points (Markusen et al., 2011a). We are more or less stuck with the SPPA as the only reliable secondary data source. Efforts to survey arts organizations directly about who participates have been frustrating. For instance, in the Chicago Policy Center's *Mapping Cultural Participation in Chicago* (LaLonde et al., 2006), only 49 small and medium-size arts organizations responded to a request for participation data. Good data on how distance and location affect participation would help arts organizations, artists, funders, and governments to better reach under-served populations.

Do arts offerings and participation reflect simply socio-economic characteristics of the resident population? Even given the limitations of the SPPA, research findings tentatively suggest not. Stern (2011) found that neither age nor birth cohort are strongly related to arts participation. In a regression analysis of California regions, arts participation rates (varying from highs of 66% in the Bay Area and 60% in the Mid-Coast and Northern and Sierra regions, to 42% in the San Joaquin Valley and Inland Empire) could not be fully explained by resident socioeconomic characteristics, local economy features, and the presence of for-profit cultural industries (Markusen, Gadwa, & Barbour, 2013; Markusen et al., 2011a, 2011b). The authors speculate that evolutionary capacity building by individuals and organizations in some regions has created a robust and diversified local-serving nonprofits arts and cultural sector, enhanced where area residents are active participants, not passive consumers.

But urban planners, arts organization managers, and artists need to know more. Where do people go to patronize the arts? Many arts organizations collect data on the ZIP Codes of attendees, and most see a distance-decay function at work. Do most people participate locally in the arts? Or do they travel to do so? Many cities' tourism strategies are based on the belief that high-end arts venues attract visitors, and the best of economic impact studies show considerable patronage by out-of-towners (e.g. Beyers & GMS, 2011). But we don't know much about this from the household's point of view. Do people travel to see arts offerings, or is it that they come to visit family or on business primarily? How do arts participants choose across locations in making arts consumption choices? Many people now participate online, a confounding factor (Brown, Novak-Leonard, & Gilbride, 2011). How far will rural and suburban arts aficionados travel to participate? Within cities, do people increase their participation if arts activities are clustered within walking distance, or do they cherry-pick their preferred offerings regardless of location. Is accessibility by transit important? How much does good arts press and arts marketing affect participation choices? Do people choose to live near arts and cultural offerings, and which kinds? Answers to these questions will inform decisions by arts organizations, arts funders, and city policymakers in ways that could greatly enhance both equity and efficiency in arts and cultural programming and affect the character of towns and city neighborhoods.

How Cultural Participants Experience Arts Venues

Arts participants also make patronage decisions based on the features of venues. Theatre professor Lynne Conner (2008) argues that contemporary performing arts enthusiasts desire to be more engaged and interactive with artists and performers, and consultant Alan Brown (2012) suggests that participants care more about their aesthetic, emotional, and social experience with the venue hosting the performance than in the past. This shift challenges class-based Euro-American urban arts infrastructure that maximizes the distance between creators and audiences. Yet we know very little about the complex ways that people are demanding more out of their venues. If we had more

evidence about the direction and intensity of these changes, urban policymakers and planners and arts leaders could make better decisions about the design, placement, and programming of arts and cultural capacity.

Both Conner and Brown detect growing restiveness and selectivity on the part of arts audiences. “Consumers increasingly expect, and more often than not are given, a high degree of interactivity and engagement in their leisure pursuits, . . . aspiring to co-author meaning,” writes Brown (2012). Connor (2007) uses the term “sovereignty” to connote the authority that audiences increasingly assert in their arts experiences. Brown, Leonard-Novak, and Gilbride (2011) offer a five-part typology of ways that people participate in the arts, from least engaged to more engaged: spectating, educational enrichment, crowd sourcing, co-creation, and audience-as-artist. Both in this study, and their earlier look at many, mostly small arts organizations in an under-served region of California (Brown, Leonard, & Kitchener, 2008), the authors offer readers in-depth case studies of pioneering efforts at active participant engagement.

Official city cultural infrastructure since the late 19th century has been dominated by large institutions, and these dominate what city tourism agencies market to tourists and residents alike. Large art museums, concert halls, opera houses, and, to some extent, high-end theatres maximize the distance between creators and audiences. In the performing arts, the roles of performers and viewers are strictly delineated and segregated by the structuring of spaces in which the action takes place. In televised or filmed performances, audiences are completely detached from the performers, so that the latter never even hear the roar of the crowd, their laughter or boos and bravos. In live performance, interaction between the two is possible, but, for several reasons, has been severely limited by artistic conventions and technological developments like lighting. In arts museums, the artist is almost never present, unless it is an opening for a contemporary exhibit (Markusen & Brown, 2013).

More assertive and interactive behavior could radically change patronage patterns, with important implications for public and nonprofit funding and maintenance of arts and cultural facilities. What do we know about what experiences people seek in arts venues? Do people increasingly prefer arts activities in the parks and on the streets to those indoors? Will festivals and other one-off events in different locales be increasingly preferred over performance seasons in existing structures? How are arts spaces and activities and the organizations that run them responding? Will existing and future investments in showcase arts palaces by cities and funders become increasingly obsolete? We have little research to build on, other than cases invoked by Brown, Conner, and others. Surveys of arts participants and arts organizations could provide evidence, but to date have not. Research evidence on these matters is important to ongoing policy debate about flagship arts versus small-scale arts facilities and over cultural districts, covered below.

UNDERSTANDING WHERE ARTISTS LIVE AND WORK

Just as we know little about how people include arts and cultural locations as part of their decisions on where to live and to patronize the arts, we also don’t know much about behavior of artists vis-à-vis cities and towns. New interest in where and why artists choose to live and work reflects a shift in economic development research away from a singular focus on physical capital and employment by industry toward a co-equal emphasis on human capital and occupations (Feser, 2003; Mather, 1999; Markusen, 2004, 2008; Renski, Koo, & Feser, 2007). Work on how workers migrate by occupational group is thin, but emerging. For instance, multi-variate analyses tested competing hypotheses on how scientists and engineers migrated among regions during the Cold War (Ellis, Barff, & Markusen, 1993; Campbell, 1993). For both artists and arts organizations, researchers are now tracking spatial outcomes and changes over time, but generally inferring behavior from cross-sectional and longitudinal studies, rather than studying it directly. How do we theorize the complexity of artist location, and how can we test our hypotheses?

Artists choose among competing locations, both among cities and within them, with some sophistication. They tend to cross state lines more often than people in most other occupations, and they appear to move among metros and between cities and smaller towns at particular periods in their life cycles. What theories do we have on artists’ locational choices, including staying in place, and how

can we document their relative influence? Intelligence on such behavioral patterns can be important for policymakers, arts advocates and arts leaders who are choosing whether or not, and where, to fund and build (and sometimes manage) artist live/work space, artist studios, and artists' centers.

Differential artist distributions and densities among and within urban areas are the result of two factors: net migration (in-migration minus out-migration, including immigration and emigration) and the formation of artists in place. Migration flows do not tell the whole story. The whole state of Minnesota, for instance, experienced slight net out-migration rates of artists for the period 1995 to 2000, yet posted growth rates in the numbers of working artists exceeded many other metros, including those with high net in-migration rates (Markusen & Schrock, 2006a). High increments of "home-grown" artists reflect the state's excellent arts educational institutions and its concentration of artist centers that offer ongoing training, space and equipment to work, opportunities to vet, exhibit and sell work, and above all, occupational networking, especially among beginning, emerging, and seasoned artists (Markusen & Johnson, 2006).

What about the migration component? Geographers, economists, and demographers have long tied workers' inter-regional (i.e. beyond labor market areas) migration patterns to the search for work. Richard Muth's seminal "chicken-or-egg" article (1971) asked whether workers follow firms or firms follow workers. Many aggregate analyses of migration assume that workers follow jobs (Greenwood & Hunt, 1984; Kleiner, 1977) or concentrations of employers in particular industries (Saxenian, 1994). Others hypothesize that worker location decisions are made semi-independently of specific job opportunities and that factors such as culture, amenities, and diversity draw skilled workers to particular locales (Florida, 2002b; Greenwood & Hunt, 1989; Mueser & Graves, 1995). Others have explored push factors: low wages, poor working conditions, and unemployment in the region of origin (Herzog & Schlottmann, 1984).

While the search for work and career-building surely figures into artist migration patterns, high self-employment rates of artists mean that many artists are relatively footloose and can favor amenity or other factors over the search for a job. Some 48% of artists reported being self-employed in the 2000 Census long form and Current Population Survey, which includes those who work at music, writing, and visual and performing art as a second occupation (Markusen & Schrock, 2006a). In 2011, artist self-employment rates estimated from the American Community Survey (and not including second occupations) ran 34%, 3.5 times the national workforce average (Nichols, 2011). Artist migration rates are much higher than for all other occupational groups excepting scientists and engineers (Markusen & Schrock, 2006b), occupations with lower than average self-employment. Thus while we can infer that science and engineering professionals are quite likely to follow jobs, it's much less likely that artists do.

Why might artists prefer large metros and central cities? They may be responding to the presence of large central city-centric industries like advertising and media, major visual and performing arts institutions, and more educational and internship options. In some industries, there are well-known increasing returns to scale—the cost of production per consumer falls in complex art forms like symphonic music. Also, there may be synergies among art forms, such as set-making and performance in opera and film, that are easier to achieve in cities. The preference for arts consumption may be higher in large cities where wealthier people live and/or visit frequently. The asset share of income may be higher in the largest metros, fueling both nonprofit philanthropy and patronage of visual and performance artists. Downstream outlets for one's work, such as galleries and publishing houses, may be more concentrated in large central cities. Networking and learning opportunities are likely to be more accessible there. Urban amenities, from restaurants to opportunities to consume creative goods and services, may also be a big city advantage (Markusen, 2013a).

Where do artists live within metro areas? Because of ties to institutions of higher education and arts venues (both of which tend to be central city-centric) and urban amenities in general, artists are likely to prefer living in the inner precincts of metropolitan areas. This varies by artistic discipline, so that those practicing in more individualistic art forms—visual art and writing—may be found living farther from the center than those more likely to be creating art with others: musicians and performing artists. Artists may also be drawn to neighborhoods that are more tolerant of their idiosyncracies and gender identities (Florida, 2002).

Why might artists favor medium-sized metros and smaller towns? They may be drawn by amenities not available in big cities. Affordability, cheaper and more expansive space for creating artwork, and favorable conditions for raising a family. Vintage architecture, farmhouses, or older industrial buildings are poised for artist-friendly occupancy. Isolation may be more attractive to some solitary creators, like visual artists and writers, who can resort to travel and the Internet for professional and social interaction. Community connectedness and K–12 schools might be superior in smaller cities and towns. Leaders in some smaller cities and small towns might hang out the welcome mat for artists in ways that big cities don't. Recreation and environmental amenities might trump what big cities offer. And, it's where they live. Many artists receive training far from where they grew up, but return home to build a career and life.

Migration is also highly sensitive to the life cycle, with younger people in general much more on the move, but also adults between the ages of 55 and 70, who have been leaving metropolitan areas for more pristine, recreation-friendly small town environments (Plane & Jurjevich, 2009). We might expect that artists in particular would be more likely to seek training and initial career experiences in large arts-rich metros, while more established artists, especially in often solitary art-making (visual art, writing), would be freer to relocate elsewhere.

These are hypotheses. To date, most attempts to support or refute them rely on descriptive comparative data on outcomes: both the relative distributions of artists and their migration patterns. Regrettably, the latter have become much more difficult to study because the American Community Survey has dropped the migration question that previously asked respondents to identify their location five years ago as well as present. No major surveys have been done on why artists might prefer one place rather than others, and popular accounts are often full of annoying anecdotes that reflect only those who have arrived or stayed and not those who have left.

We are left to infer location preferences from distributions of artists and the revealed preference of their migration patterns. Artist concentration ratios—their share of regional or metro employment divided by artist shares of national employment show considerable variation. In 2000, the Los Angeles metro's artist job share was three times the nation's (3.0), although it is important to keep in mind that the implosion of aerospace and defense-related jobs in Los Angeles in the 1990s influenced the ratio through the composition effect. New York (2.5) and San Francisco (1.8) also hosted relatively large contingents of artists, and another set of second tier metros (Washington, DC; Seattle; Boston; Orange County, California; Minneapolis/Saint Paul; and Miami) all exceeded the national share by 15% (Markusen & Schrock, 2006a).

In a study of the Great Recession years, 2006–2009, Grodach and Seman (2013) update this analysis using the American Community Survey. They found that artist employment was highly vulnerable in the three artist-rich metros (Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco), while some of the mid-sized cities added artist employment during these years: Boston, Minneapolis/Saint Paul, Seattle, Baltimore, Atlanta, and Las Vegas among them. Metros where artists were initially under-represented did even more poorly during the recession. Overall, they found quite selective responses to the recession, underscoring that artist employment (including self-employment) is relatively volatile and can shift across metros over time.

Artists are moving among metros, too. While in the latter half of the 1990s, Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco metros posted the highest net migration rates for artists, patterns were quite varied otherwise, with some second tier metros attracting artists, including older industrial metros, and others losing them, including some fast-growing Sunbelt metros (Markusen & Schrock, 2006a). Artists' propensity to move and destinations also vary by age cohort. A study of artist net migration rates for the Twin Cities metro (about 70% of the state's population) and the rest of Minnesota found striking differentials. The Twin Cities attracted, through net in-migration, disproportionate shares of young artists aged 16 to 34, while the rest of Minnesota experienced substantial net outmigration (Markusen & Johnson, 2006). But in the age group 35 to 44, the Twin Cities lost artists to places elsewhere, while greater Minnesota gained substantially, a pattern that also held for working artists over age 65 (many self-employed artists do not retire).

Are artists' location explained by the presence of for-profit cultural industries? If so, evidence of artists following jobs might be inferred, though the direction of causality can be questioned. Some

geographers and planners have argued this to be the case (e.g. Currid, 2007). But in a comparison of California metro areas, total artist employment did not correlate closely with artists working for private sector employers (Markusen, Gadwa, & Barbour, 2013).

Where do artists locate within metro regions? In larger metros, the shares of resident artists in suburban areas are much lower than in central cities (and in some cases, inner ring suburbs like Santa Monica, Hollywood, and Pasadena in Los Angeles). In a study of artists' share of employment in Minnesota, suburban areas of the Twin Cities hosted even fewer artists among their employed residents than did the rest of the state (Markusen & Johnson, 2006). Nowhere is this lopsidedness greater than in the Los Angeles region, where residential densities of artists are more than nine times the national average in the areas around Hollywood and below the national average in some predominantly minority areas of Los Angeles County (Markusen, 2006). In general, visual artists and writers are more apt to live outside of major metro areas and more likely to live in suburbs than musicians and performing artists. Musicians are more ubiquitously distributed than any other groups of artists, in part due to high employment rates (33%) in religious organizations. GIS mapping techniques are enabling visual displays of complex data sets like these that enhance presentation of research findings (Markusen et al., 2006).

How can we test for the significance of various location factors for artists? Multivariate models could be built, though encompassing all possible factors would be difficult. Conceptualizing and operationalizing amenities is particularly challenging, and it would be difficult to model wage differentials, since so many artists do not occupy "jobs." Even if we do succeed in building models, we have little good data for testing them. Studying the historically evolved distribution of artists in a cross-sectional analysis would not be satisfactory, as the Grodach and Seman (2013) findings confirm. Charting how artists actually move over time and choose among places is the appropriate test, but with the disappearance of the Census' five-year location question, we can no longer link artists' moves with characteristics of place past and present and with other socioeconomic characteristics—age, gender, artistic discipline, income, sector working in (self-employed, private, nonprofit, public) and more. The relatively new Strategic National Arts Alumni Project survey data provide some opportunity to replicate the location data available in NSF's ongoing surveys of science and engineering graduates, because it asks respondents to identify where they moved to after graduating (and the location of graduation is known).

In the absence of definitive research, how do policymakers and urban arts investors anticipate artist location so that they can design and implement successful artist attraction strategies and plans for artist housing? Surveys and expert opinion are the chief options. Artspace Projects, a nonprofit developer and ongoing manager of artist live-work and studio buildings that works with cities around the U.S., large and small, seeks out artist organizations in initial stages of planning, asking them whether they can offer evidence that artists will want to live in newly provided space as well as directly surveying area artists. The city of San Jose, California, perceiving artist deficits and outmigration, launched a Creative Entrepreneur Project in 2008 to attract and retain artists. As part of their efforts, they conducted a survey of artists in the region to explore what kinds of support would be welcome. Among other useful intelligence, artists responded that they did not particularly need artist housing, but severely lacked adequate workspace (Markusen, Gadwa, & Shifferd, 2008). Surveys could be mounted to explore inter-regional and within-metro artist location preferences. Design would be relatively easy, but reaching a representative sample more difficult. In artist surveys that do not sample randomly, results can be benchmarked against Census data as a way of testing for bias in response rates on various socio-economic and spatial characteristics (see the data appendix for Markusen et al., 2006).

UNDERSTANDING HOW ARTS ORGANIZATIONS LOCATE AMONG AND OPERATE IN CITIES

Politicians, policy leaders, and staffers hoping that creative capacity will help improve their cities will do a better job of targeting resources when they know where this capacity is located and how organizations choose sites. To date, many cities have left the lead role in arts-related development to

their economic development agencies (Grodach & Loukaitou-Sideris, 2007). Such agencies operate in an opportunistic “deal-making” fashion, responding to initiatives by private sector developers and nonprofits arts and cultural organizations, disproportionately large ones. Both commercial and nonprofit organizations hold their location preferences close to their chests, making it more difficult for cities to know what is really possible and whether, and how much, they must subsidize particular projects to make them work (Weber, 2007). Cities often lose money subsidizing large flagship arts venues, which they may partly own in complicated arrangements, and infrastructure for arts and cultural facilities that do not earn the expected returns.

Mayors and city councils trying a more strategic approach need better intelligence on how the arts and cultural sectors works. For instance, politicians, urban scholars, real estate interests, arts community members, and policymakers have engaged in vigorous debates about whether to designate cultural districts, what kinds of resources should be devoted to them, and what kinds of success to anticipate if created (Whitt, 1987; Frost-Krumpf, 1998; Brooks & Kushner, 2001; Galligan, 2008; Markusen & Gadwa, 2010). Many research questions are embedded in just this issue. Are arts and cultural venues dispersed throughout the city? If not, should they be? If so, do they chiefly serve adjacent precincts, or do they attract or otherwise serve people throughout the region and beyond? Do smaller arts organizations emerge and stay in immigrant, ethnic or otherwise distinctive neighborhoods, and do city policies nurture them? Does clustered arts capacity enable artistic and other forms of innovation (Rushton, 2013)? Do other considerations—reinforcing downtown commercial complexes, the desire to turn over city-owned land—trump the preferences of arts organizations? Should cities encourage and devote resources to designated cultural districts? These questions call for analysis of how arts organizations value and choose among alternative locations.

Location theory, a contribution of regional science, has long theorized and tested hypotheses about how firms choose to locate in various industries, particularly manufacturing but also in services and retail (Isard, 1956; Beyers, 1989). These theories assume that firms profit-maximize and that they balance supply factors (the differential costs of inputs at various locations, including shipping these to the point of production) with demand factors (how much effective demand there is at various locations and how much it costs to take product/service to market). Arts and cultural organizations, be they firms or nonprofits, face similar sets of determinants in choosing locations. Geographers and planners have studied location choices in for-profit cultural industries such as filmmaking, but with greater emphasis on supply side factors such as changing technology and industry structure rather than suppliers’ relationship with their end markets (Christopherson & Storper, 1986; Scott, 2005). While there is little U.S. public policy directed toward influencing the location of cultural production, subsidies offered to filmmakers to locate production in a state or city are an outstanding exception, despite their dubious payoffs (Christopherson & Rightor, 2010).

In commercial arts retail (think galleries, live music clubs, art fairs), we might expect location to be heavily oriented toward concentrations of consumers. A case study of New York, for instance, shows that high-end art galleries choose to locate in high-income neighborhoods, despite higher commercial space rental rates, and that they do not cause but rather follow gentrification (Schuetz, 2013). But New York is an exceptional art market. In medium-sized metros, galleries do not necessarily cluster, perhaps because visual art buyers are not residentially concentrated. In Minneapolis, for instance, a gallery row that was displaced by sports bars following the city’s erection of an all-events center (basketball, high-end Hollywood acts) never re-clustered in any part of the city. Live music venues are often much more oriented toward particular neighborhoods within cities. A study of Chicago music venues found significant dispersion throughout the city, with somewhat higher concentrations in higher density inner city districts with younger residents (Rothfield et al., 2007).

How can elements of location theory be used in theorizing the siting calculus of nonprofit arts organizations? On the supply side, organizations that rely on pools of actors, dancers, musicians, and support people (e.g. lighting designers) will be more likely to favor central city locations because, as we have seen, artists tend to be residentially clustered there. In some sectors, such as theatre, there is also likely a “buzz,” a premium on producing in an area thick with innovators (Storper & Venables, 2004). Organizations may also choose sites based on the supply side features such as cheapness of rent or purchase price, the appropriateness of buildings for kilns or large printing equipment, the

safety of the neighborhood, and the availability of transit and parking for their employees. These latter two features affect their ability to recruit and retain valued workers. The locational calculus for any one arts nonprofit will be very sensitive to distinctive features of its service or production process. Some arts nonprofits are becoming more deliberately spatial and entrepreneurial in their location decisions, even consciously taking on the function of economic developer. Amanda Johnson documents how the Seattle Art Museum strategically chose to partner with Washington Mutual to expand its presence to downtown Seattle, a risky but ultimately successful initiative (Johnson, 2013).

Many arts nonprofits will be highly sensitive to how their locations affect demand for their offerings. Large, destination flagships that draw from a huge catchment area will be concerned about street access, transit, and parking. Smaller arts organizations serving constituents who are spread throughout a metro—artists' serving centers for instance—will have similar concerns, and will tend to locate centrally (Markusen & Johnson, 2006). Smaller theaters and music venues will care whether they can expect patrons from surrounding neighborhoods, because patronage tends to be heaviest among people living in surrounding districts (Willis et al., 2012). If their neighborhood changes, with some residents leaving and others moving in, will their previous patrons continue to commute in to participate, and can they draw new participants from new residents? In *The Heart of the Beast Puppet and Mask Theatre Company*, in Minneapolis, in its sixth location in three decades, found itself suddenly surrounded by new Latino residents. Having struggled successfully to make its once-porn theater space work, the company worked hard to change its programming to include Latino themes and music. In other cases, arts organizations have moved to the suburbs with their clientele.

How have the metropolitan locations of arts and cultural nonprofits shifted over time, and can we infer elements of location behavior from these patterns? Sheppard (2011) provides a wonderful window into nonprofit arts and cultural organizations' modest dispersion from metropolitan cores, comparing it to nonprofits in general. Using NCCS IRS nonprofit data annually from 1990 to 2008 for the Providence, Rhode Island metro, he shows that arts nonprofits are most concentrated at a distance of around five kilometers from the city center throughout the period but that they decentralized substantially, first to within five to 10 kilometers between 1990 and 2000, and then beyond 10 kilometers between 2000 and 2008. Health and religious nonprofits, in contrast, were relatively more decentralized over the entire period, sited in proximity to residential populations, but religions nonprofits became over time more clustered within a 10- to 20-mile radius. Sheppard crafts several hypotheses around these descriptive findings. One, fee-for-service funding models (e.g. health care) encourage location close to customers. Second, nonprofit sectors where subjective evaluation offerings are more common tend to cluster closer to metro centers. Third, public policies may encourage clustering of some sectors (e.g. cultural district funding and incentives from city governments). Providence, for instance, has a long history of mayor-led arts revitalization efforts (Gadwa Nicodemus, 2012).

Despite Sheppard's finding of centrifugal shifts in nonprofit arts capacity over time, the suburbs by and large host relatively few arts organizations per capita, comparable to their low rates of resident artists and relatively low rates of arts participation. In Minnesota in the 1990s, controversy followed the publication of a study that demonstrated the lopsided location of arts and cultural facilities in the two central cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, with thin coverage in the suburbs (Bye, 2002; McKnight Foundation, 2005). Urban arts organizations worried that funders like the McKnight Foundation would redistribute their considerable operating and project support to redress this balance, at their expense. But others argued that adding capacity in the suburbs had the potential to increase patronage of all metro arts organizations, because their outposts would familiarize broader publics with what arts and culture have to offer. Not long before that, the City Council of Hopkins, an inner ring, aging post-World War II suburb, had decided to build and publicly operate a new Hopkins Center for the Arts. It was a bold bid to turn around a declining city center commercial strip that hosted pawn shops and lacked a decent restaurant. It was immediately successful, spawning cafés and restaurants, senior medium-rise housing across the street, and a third-run art film theatre that complemented visits to the center. We don't know whether it deflected or encouraged patronage of central city venues. Following this pilot, and with both modest region-wide philanthropic and public

sector funding, new performing/visual arts centers sprang up in several suburbs, the fruit of citizen organizing. Predictably, these tend to be located in wealthier suburbs.

How do these hypotheses and trends inform urban arts and cultural policy debates? Take the cultural districts phenomenon. Several alternative hypotheses are embedded in the arguments for and against designated cultural districts. One suggests that co-siting major cultural venues (e.g. Seattle Center, a re-use of 1962 Seattle World's Fair structures; Lincoln Center in New York, a 1950s urban renewal project; Civic Center in San Francisco, a City Beautiful-era project) will showcase a city's arts prowess, help attract tourists, and revitalize depopulated inner city areas. Critics of concentrated cultural districts argue that they suppress capacity in more decentralized areas of larger cities and lower arts patronage overall because of distances many patrons must travel. An alternative approach envisions a mosaic of decentralized cultural capacity, cultivated or not, that would engage more participants overall, serve people in their neighborhoods, celebrating their distinctive cultures and using art to address specific community challenges, and spread the benefits of city and state public subsidies more broadly.

Some researchers have documented the success of spontaneous and decentralized cultural districts that thrive without public largess, are sustainable, and have salutary benefits for the surrounding communities. Singular among such studies for its careful empirical work is sociologist Mark Stern and urban planner Susan Siefert's (1998, 2007) studies of "natural" (their quotation marks) cultural districts in Philadelphia. They studied 94 Census blocks that were revitalized (defined as poverty decline and population gain) in the 1980s. They found that neighborhoods with more arts organizations and higher arts participation were more likely to experience revitalization, and without racial or ethnic displacement, than neighborhoods without such activity. They also found that cultural investments, compared with other neighborhood revitalization tools, excelled at nurturing both bonding and bridging social capital.

The wisdom of investing in flagship cultural facilities is also hotly debated, but with little systematic research on outcomes. Several researchers have made the general case against trusting in the draw and diverse benefit streams of large new arts facilities (Eisinger, 2000; Evans, 2005; Hammett & Shoal, 2003; Strom, 2002), and others have conducted excellent case studies of specific completed projects, including the Bilbao Guggenheim (Plaza, 2006); California flagships (Grodach, 2008); and Newark's New Jersey Performing Arts Center (Strom, 1999). Minneapolis' extravagant Guthrie Theatre is the subject of a curt review (Markusen and Brown, 2013) as both a money loser for the city (a publicly-built parking garage that failed within the first couple of years) and as problematic in terms of audiences and vis-à-vis existing smaller theatre venues (wooing small companies away from for-profit small theaters on an intermittent basis). The field and city leaders need more comparative research, as in Markusen, Evans, and Radcliffe's (2012) investigation of cultural flagships in de-industrialized U.K. cities: two failed outright (Manchester's Urbis and Sheffield's National Center for Popular Music) while others found ways of reaching new audiences (Newcastle-Gateshead's Sage Gateshead Music Centre, Glasgow's Concert Hall). Such comparative studies help us understand what works, how location and site access affect success, and whether new flagships lift all cultural boats or cast shadows on other, smaller venues.

Case studies still dominate this field of inquiry. It would not be that difficult for policymakers to survey commercial and nonprofit arts and cultural establishments about their relationship to existing space and locations as well as their preferences and views on how the area's arts and cultural ecology works as a whole. Urban transportation planners survey employers on where they operate, what kinds of commercial shipping access they need, who they employ and how their employees get to work. Arts and culture planners could design counterparts, the results of which would be useful to the sector as a whole.

CONCLUSION

In this research agenda for arts, culture, and cities, I have underscored the diverse urban missions of arts and culture; how urban offerings and policies meet equity norms; and the roles of various arts protagonists (arts participants, artists, arts organizations) and their spatial behavior. I have not framed

the research agenda in terms of major policy issues, such as cultural districts versus dispersed cultural capacity, or flagships versus smaller, more dispersed arts venues, both of which have been debated elsewhere (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010a; Markusen et al., 2012), but rather posed the meta-research questions I believe to be important for fruitful and relevant research going forward.

I have not been able to cover all scrutiny-worthy intersections of arts and culture with urban life and policy. For instance, new comparative work on urban arts and cultural policy is helping us understand how politics and institutional structure mediate city arts and cultural outcomes (e.g. Grodach & Silver, 2012; Rushton, 2002). I have not explored the durability and ongoing research implications of precocious work in urban physical planning around creativity, led by European scholars working comparatively (e.g. Landry et al., 1996; Kunzman, 2004). Except where it bears on the issues and research questions posed, I have given rather short shrift to urban economic development work around arts and culture, in part because this research area is well-launched and vibrant. I have addressed only three facets of creative placemaking—evaluation, equity, and locational dimensions, but there are also many questions around how to do it well (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010b; McCarthy et al., 2007), which the research questions and methods posed here only partially answer.

The urban functions and meanings of arts and culture offer a challenging and important research frontier for urban affairs researchers and practitioners. All of the social sciences—anthropology, economics, geography, political science, sociology—already host relevant bodies of work and research controversies that spill over disciplinary boundaries, a process encouraged by the active engagement of urban planners and policymakers. In addition, a growing number of arts researchers and cultural policymakers are studying the urban dimensions of arts and using the research to make funding decisions and shape strategies. They are newly interested in cities, place and space.

Introductions to and sharing of new research questions and methodologies are generating powerful feedback effects on the disciplines themselves. New web-based forums for sharing research and issue concerns (e.g. Cultural Research Network, *Createequity*) and relatively speedy and free dissemination of research results (e.g. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, *Artivate*) are strengthening the quality of research, facilitating research partnerships, and reaching practitioners, advocates and constituencies faster than before. Major activist urban arts and community development organizations' publications and websites (e.g. *Arts and Democracy Project*, *Arts in a Changing America*) provide ongoing insights into current urban creative cities debates and why we shouldn't ignore them. Yet compared to many established urban specializations (e.g. housing, community development, land use, transportation, economic development), urban arts and culture must rely on relatively few researchers spread across disciplines. The field is attracting younger people, many of whom already cross arts/humanities and social science boundaries. But we could use more seasoned researchers with depth in various disciplines to work on this rich sphere that aspires, in former NEA Chair Bill Ivey's words, to ensure that citizens are well-served in their "right to an expressive life" (Ivey, 2008).

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, M. (2005). *There's nothing informal about it: Participatory arts within the cultural ecology of Silicon Valley*. San Jose, CA: Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley. http://www.ci-sv.org/pdf/MAlvarez_PA_study.pdf
- Alvarez, M. (2007). *Fostering cultural citizenship: How can and should we support the informal arts?* Presentation at the annual Americans for the Arts Meetings, Las Vegas, NV, June 1.
- ArtPlace. (2012a). Vibrancy indicators. <http://www.artplaceamerica.org/articles/vibrancy-indicators/>
- ArtPlace. (2012b). Vibrancy definitions. <http://www.artplaceamerica.org/loi/>
- Bedoya, R. (2013). Placemaking and the politics of belonging and dis-belonging. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 24, 20–21, 32. <http://www.giarts.org/article/placemaking-and-politics-belonging-and-dis-belonging>
- Beyers, W. (1989). The producer services and economic development in the United States: The last decade. Final report. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, April.
- Beyers, W., Fowler, C., and Andreoli, D. (2008). *The economic impact of music in Seattle and King County*. Seattle, WA: Mayor's Office of Film and Music. <http://www.seattle.gov/music/impactstudy.htm>
- Beyers, W., & GMS Research Corporation. (2011). *An economic impact study of arts, cultural, and scientific organizations in the Central Puget Sound region*. Seattle, WA: Arts Fund. <http://www.artsfund.org>
- Blau, J. (1989). *The shape of culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Brooks, A., & Kushner, R. (2001). Cultural districts and urban development. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 3, 4–14.
- Brown, A. (2012). All the world's a stage: Venues and settings, and the role they play in shaping patterns of arts participation. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 23/2, Summer. <http://www.giarts.org/article/all-worlds-stage>
- Brown, A., & Novak, J. (2007). Assessing the intrinsic benefits of a live performance. WolfBrown, January. <http://wolfbrown.com/images/books/ImpactStudyFinalVersionFullReport.pdf>
- Brown, A., Novak-Leonard, J., & Kitchener, A. (2008). *Cultural engagement in California's Inland Regions*. San Francisco: WolfBrown.
- Brown, A., Novak-Leonard, J., & Gilbride, S. (2011). *Getting in on the act: How arts groups are creating opportunities for active participation*. San Francisco: The James Irvine Foundation. <http://irvine.org/images/stories/pdf/grantmaking/Getting-in-on-the-act-2011OCT19.pdf>
- Bye, C. (2002). *A new angle: Arts development in the suburbs*. Minneapolis, MN: The McKnight Foundation. <http://www.mcknight.org/arts/angle.aspx>
- Campbell, S. (1993). Interregional migration of defense scientists and engineers to the gunbelt during the 1980s. *Economic Geography*, 69, 204–223.
- Chapple, K., & Jacobus, R. (2009). Retail trade as a route to neighborhood revitalization. *Urban and regional policy and its effects*, Volume II. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution-Urban Institute.
- Christopherson, S., & Rightor, N. (2010). The creative economy as 'big business': Evaluating state strategies to lure film makers. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29, 336–352.
- Christopherson, S., & Storper, M. (1986). The city as studio, the world as back lot: The impact of vertical disintegration on the location of the motion picture industry. *Environment and Planning (D), Society and Space*, 4, 305–320.
- Conner, L. (2008). In and out of the dark: A theory of audience behavior from Sophocles to spoken word. In W. Ivey & S. Tepper, (Eds.), (*Engaging art: The next great transformation of America's cultural life* (pp. 103–124). New York: Routledge.
- Currid, E. (2007). *The Warhol economy: How fashion, art and music drive New York City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Davis, B. (2013). Are artists to blame for gentrification? Or would SoHo, Chelsea, and Williamsburg have gentrified without them? *Slate*, October 15. http://www.slate.com/articles/life/culturebox/2013/10/are_artists_to_blame_for_gentrification_or_would_soho_chelsea_and_bushwick.html
- Dean, C., Donnellan, C., & Pratt, A. (2010). Tate Modern: Pushing the limits of regeneration. *City, Culture and Society*, 1, 79–87.
- Deutsche, R., & Ryan, C. G. (1984). The fine art of gentrification. *October*, 31, 91–111.
- Eisinger, P. (2000). The politics of bread and circuses. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(3), 316–333.
- Ellis, M., Barff, R., & Markusen, A. (1993). Defense spending and interregional labor migration. *Economic Geography*, 69, 182–203.
- Evans, G. (2005). Measure for measure: Evaluating the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 4, 959–983.
- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Feser, E. (2003). What regions do rather than make: A proposed set of knowledge-based occupation clusters. *Urban Studies*, 40, 1937–1958.
- Florida, R. (2002a). Bohemia and economic geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 2, 55–71.
- Florida, R. (2002b). The economic geography of talent. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 92, 743–755.
- Florida, R. (2002c). *The rise of the creative class*. New York, Basic Books.
- Frank, T. (2013). Dead end on shakin' street. *The Baffler*, 22. http://www.thebaffler.com/past/dead_end_on_shakin_street
- Gadwa, A. (2010). *How Artist Spaces Matter: Impacts and Insights from Artspace Project's Developments*. Minneapolis, MN: Metris Arts Consulting, January. <http://metrisarts.com/2012/07/13/how-artist-spaces-matters/>
- Gadwa Nicodemus, A. (2012). Cultural plan backs up creative capital branding: A creative city initiative case study on Providence, RI. Paper presented at the Hong Kong Institute of Contemporary Culture, Chinese Creative Industries Forum. <http://metrisarts.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/ProvidenceFullCaseStudy.pdf>
- Gadwa Nicodemus, A. (2013a). Artists and gentrification: Sticky myths, slippery realities. *Createquity*, April 5. <http://createquity.com/2013/04/artists-and-gentrification-sticky-myths-slippery-realities.html>
- Gadwa Nicodemus, A. (2013b). Fuzzy vibrancy: Creative placemaking as ascendant U. S. cultural policy. *Cultural Trends*, 22(3–4), 213–222. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09548963.2013.817653#>

- Gadwa, A., & Muessig, A. (2011). *How Artist Spaces Matter II: The Riverside, Tashiro Kaplan and Insights from Five Artspace Case Studies and Four Cities*. Minneapolis: Artspace Projects and Metris Arts Consulting, July. <http://metrisarts.com/2012/07/13/how-art-spaces-matter-ii/>
- Galligan, A. (2008). The evolution of arts and cultural districts, In Cherbo, J., Stewart, R. A., and Wyszomirski, M. J., (Eds), *Understanding the arts and creative sector in the United States*, (pp. 129–142). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance. (2008). *2008 Portfolio*. Philadelphia, PA: Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance. <http://www.philaculture.org/research/reports/2008-portfolio>
- Greenwood, M., & Hunt, G. L. (1984). Migration and interregional employment redistribution in the United States. *American Economic Review*, 74, 957–969.
- Greenwood, M., & Hunt, G. L. (1989). Jobs versus amenities in the analysis of metropolitan migration. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 25, 1–16.
- Grodach, C. (2008). Looking beyond image and tourism: The role of flagship cultural projects in local arts development. *Planning Practice and Research*, 4, 495–516.
- Grodach, C. (2010). Beyond Bilbao: Rethinking flagship cultural development and planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29, 353–366.
- Grodach, C. (2011). “Art spaces in community and economic development: Connections to neighborhoods, artists, and the cultural economy.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31, 74–85.
- Grodach, C., Foster, N., & Murdoch III, J. (2013). Gentrification and the artistic dividend: The role of the arts in neighborhood change. Working paper, School of Urban and Public Affairs, Arlington, TX: University of Texas as Arlington.
- Grodach, C., & Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2007). Cultural development strategies and urban revitalization: A survey of U.S. cities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13, 349–370.
- Grodach C., & Seman, M. (2013). The cultural economy in recession: Examining the U.S. experience, *Cities*, 33, 15–28.
- Grodach, C., & Silver, D. (Eds.) (2012). *The politics of urban cultural policy: Global perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Guay, A. (2012). In support of individual artists. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 23(1). <http://www.giarts.org/article/support-individual-artists>
- Hall, P. (2000). Creative cities and economic development. *Urban Studies*, 37, 639–649.
- Hammett, C., & Shoval, N. (2003). Museums as flagships of urban development. In L. Hoffman, S. Fainstein, and D. Judd (Eds.), *Cities and visitors: Regulating people, markets and city space* (pp. 217–236). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of capital: Towards a critical geography*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.
- Isard, W. (1956). *Location and space-economy*. Cambridge, MA and New York, NY: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology & John Wiley & Sons.
- Isserman, N., & Markusen, A. (2013). Shaping the future through narrative: The third sector, arts and culture. *International Regional Science Review*, 36, 115–136.
- Ivey, B. (2008). *Arts, Inc: How greed and neglect have destroyed our cultural rights*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Jackson, M. R. (2012). Developing artist-driven spaces in marginalized communities: Reflections and implications for the field. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. <http://www.giarts.org/sites/default/files/Developing-Artist-Driven-Spaces-Marginalized-Communities.pdf>
- Jackson, M. R., & Herranz, J. (2002). *Culture counts in communities: A framework for measurement*. Washington, DC: the Urban Institute.
- Jackson, M. R., Kabwasa-Green, F., & Herranz, J. (2006). *Cultural vitality in communities: Interpretation and indicators*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, December. <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311392>
- Johnson, A. (2013). The resiliency of property-led arts economic development: Exploring the innovative but untimely partnership between the Seattle Art Museum and Washington Mutual, *Cities*, forthcoming. http://works.bepress.com/amanda_johnson1/
- Killacky, J. (2010). Called to serve. In National Alliance of Media Arts and Culture, *Leading creatively: A closer look 2010*. http://namac.org/sites/default/files/images_upload/NAMAC-Leading_Creatively.pdf
- Kitchener, A., & Markusen, A. (2012). How small arts organizations differ. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 23(2), 5–12. <http://www.giarts.org/article/working-small-arts-organizations>
- Kleiner, M. (1977). The interstate migration of professional and technical workers: A cross-sectional analysis. *Review of Business and Economic Research*, 12(3), 27–34.
- Kreidler, J. (1996). Leverage lost: The nonprofit arts in the post-Ford era. www.inmotionmagazine.com/lost.html

- Krizek, K. (2003). Residential relocation and changes in urban travel: Does neighborhood-scale urban form matter? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69, 265–281.
- Kunzmann, K. (2004). *Culture, creativity and spatial planning*. Abercrombie Lecture. Liverpool, UK: Department of Civic Design.
- LaLonde, R., O’Muirheartaigh, C., Perkins, J., Grams, D., English, N., & Joynes, D. C. (2006). *Mapping cultural participation in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, Cultural Policy Center. <http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/publications/MappingCPICweb.pdf>
- Landry, C., Bianchini, F., Ebert, R., Gnad, F., & Kunzman, K. (1996). *The creative city in Britain and Germany*. London: Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society.
- Lloyd, R. (2002). Neo-Bohemia: Art and neighborhood redevelopment in Chicago. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24, 517–532.
- Lloyd, R. (2004). The neighborhood in cultural production: Material and symbolic resources in the New Bohemia. *City and Community*, 3, 343–371.
- Lloyd, R., & Clark, T. N. (2001). The city as an entertainment machine. In Gotham, K. F. (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on urban redevelopment, Research in Urban Sociology*, 6, 357–378. Oxford, UK: JAI Press/Elsevier.
- Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation. (2010). *Report on the creative economy of the Los Angeles Region*. Los Angeles: Otis College of Art and Design.
- Markusen, A. (2003). Fuzzy concepts, scanty evidence, policy distance: The case for rigor and policy relevance in critical regional studies. *Regional Studies*, 37, 701–717.
- Markusen, A. (2004). Targeting occupations in regional and community economic development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70, 253–268.
- Markusen, A. (2006). Urban development and the politics of a creative class: Evidence from the study of artists. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 1921–1940.
- Markusen, A. (2008). Human versus physical capital: Government’s role in regional development. In J. Martinez-Vazquez & F. Vaillancourt (Eds.), *Public Policy for Regional Development* (pp. 47–65). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Markusen, A. (2013a). Artists work everywhere. In S. Tepper & E. Longo (Eds.), Special Issue on Careers in the Creative Industries, *Work and Occupations*, 40(4), 481–495.
- Markusen, A. (2013b). Diversifying support for artists, *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 24(3), 46–51. <http://www.giarts.org/article/diversifying-support-artists>
- Markusen, A. (2013c). Fuzzy concepts, proxy data: Why indicators won’t track creative placemaking success. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, Published on-line, September: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/12265934.2013.836291>
- Markusen, A., & Brown, A. (2013). From audience to participants: New thinking for the performing arts. In V. Borges & P. Costa, (Eds.), *(Desvendando o Teatro: Criatividade, Públicos e Território*, Special issue of *Análise Social*). Lisbon, Portugal: CES, Fall, forthcoming.
- Markusen, A., Evans, B., & Radcliffe, J. (2012). Responding to deindustrialization with arts and culture: Comparing four UK cities. Paper for presentation at the American Collegiate Schools of Planning Meetings, November 1–4. <http://www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/PRIE--publications.html>
- Markusen, A., & Gadwa, A. (2010a). Arts and culture in urban/regional planning: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29, 379–391. http://jpe.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/29/3/379?ijkey=G50IWuhbSeFSA&keytype=ref&siteid=spjpe&utm_source=eNewsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=1J22
- Markusen, A., & Gadwa, A. (2010b). *Creative placemaking*, Washington, DC: Mayors’ Institute on City Design and the National Endowment for the Arts, October, 2010. www.nea.gov/pub/CreativePlacemaking-Paper.pdf
- Markusen, A., Gadwa Nicodemus, A., & Barbour, E. (2013). The arts, consumption, and innovation in regional development. In M. Rushton (Ed.), *Creative communities: Art works in economic development* (pp. 36–59). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Markusen, A., Gadwa, A., Barbour, E., & Beyers, W. (2011a). *California’s Arts and Cultural Ecology*. San Francisco: The James Irvine Foundation, September. <http://irvine.org/news-insights/publications/arts/arts-ecology-reports>
- Markusen, A., Gadwa, A., Barbour, E., & Beyers, W. (2011b). *California’s Arts and Cultural Ecology: Technical Appendix*. San Francisco: The James Irvine Foundation, September. <http://irvine.org/news-insights/publications/arts/arts-ecology-reports>
- Markusen, A., Gadwa, A., & Shifferd, P. (2008). *San José Creative Entrepreneur Project: Artists’ Space and Resource Study*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Cultural Innovation, September. <http://www.cciarts.org/Publications.html>
- Markusen, A., Gilmore, S., Johnson, A., Levi, T., & Martinez, A. (2006). *Crossover: How artists build careers across commercial, nonprofit and community work*. Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, University of Minnesota. <http://irvine.org/news-insights/publications/arts>

- Markusen, A., & Johnson, A. (2006). *Artists' centers: Evolution and impact on careers, neighborhoods and economies*. Minneapolis: Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, February. <http://www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/PRIE--publications.html>
- Markusen, A., & King, D. (2003). *The artistic dividend: The arts' hidden contributions to regional development*. Minneapolis: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota. <http://www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/PRIE--publications.html>
- Markusen, A., & Schrock, G. (2006a). The artistic dividend: Urban artistic specialization and economic development implications. *Urban Studies*, 43, 1661–1686.
- Markusen, A., & Schrock, G. (2006b). The distinctive city: Divergent patterns in American urban growth, hierarchy and specialization. *Urban Studies*, 43, 1301–1323.
- Mather, V. (1999). Human capital-based strategy for regional economic development. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 13, 203–216.
- McCarthy, K. F., Heneghan Ondaatje, E., & Novak, J. L. (2007). *Arts and culture in the metropolis: Strategies for sustainability*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG477.html>
- McCarthy, K. F., Heneghan Ondaatje, E., Zakaras, L., & Brooks, A. (2004). *Gifts of the muse: Reframing the debate about the benefits of the arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG218>
- McKnight Foundation (Ed.). (2005). *You are here: Exploring art in the suburbs*. Minneapolis: The McKnight Foundation. <http://www.mcknight.org/youarehere/>
- Mueser, P., & Graves, P. (1995). Examining the role of economic opportunity and amenities in explaining population redistribution. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 37, 176–200.
- Muth, R. (1971). Migration: Chicken or egg? *Southern Economic Journal*, 37, 295–306.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (2012). Validating arts and livability indicators in selected communities and developing a user's guide with case examples and local data sources, Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, August 23. <https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=39f0ca2bec49a35d83076660a0b76992&tab=core&cview=1>
- New York-New Jersey Port Authority & the Cultural Assistance Center. (1983). *The arts as an industry: Their economic importance to the New York-New Jersey metropolitan region*. New York: New York-New Jersey Port Authority.
- Nichols, B. (2011). Artists and art workers in the United States. *National Endowment for the Arts, Research Note #105*, October.
- Perloff, H. (1979). Using the arts to improve life in the city. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 3, 1–21.
- Perloff, H., & The Urban Innovation Group. (1979). *The arts in the economic life of a city*. New York: American Council for the Arts.
- Plane, D., & Jurjevich, J. (2009). Ties that no longer bind: The patterns and repercussions of age-articulated migration up and down the U. S. urban hierarchy. *The Professional Geographer*, 61, 4–20.
- Plaza, B. (2006). The return on investment of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30, 452–467.
- Pratt, A. (2009). Urban regeneration: From the arts 'feel good' factor to the cultural economy: a case study of Hoxton, London. *Urban Studies*, 46, 1041–1061.
- Project for Public Spaces. (2013). All placemaking is creative: how a shared focus on place builds vibrant destinations, March 4. <http://www.pps.org/blog/placemaking-as-community-creativity-how-a-shared-focus-on-place-builds-vibrant-destinations/>
- Rendon, M., & Markusen, A. (2009). *Native artists: Livelihoods, resources, space, gifts*. Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, University of Minnesota, December. <http://www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/PRIE--publications.html>
- Renski, H., Koo, J., & Feser, E. (2007). Differences in labor versus value chain industry clusters: An empirical investigation. *Growth and Change*, 38, 364–395.
- Rothfield, L., Coursey, D., Lee, S., Silver, D., & Norris, W. (2007). *Chicago, Music City: Summary report on the music industry in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago. culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/publications/CMCFullReport.pdf
- Rushton, M. (2002). Political oversight of arts councils: A comparison of Canada and the United States. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8, 153–165.
- Rushton, M. (2008). A note on the use & misuse of the racial diversity index. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26, 445–459.
- Rushton, M. (2013). Introduction. In M. Rushton (Ed.), *Creative communities: Art works in economic development*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1–11.
- Rushton, M., & Lewis, G. (2007). Understanding state spending on the arts, 1976–1999. *State and Local Government Review*, 39, 107–114.

- Sapp, D. (2005). *Education, income, location affect Indiana arts participation*. Indianapolis: Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, Indiana University—Purdue University, May. http://www.urbancenter.iupui.edu/PubResources/pdf/100_05-C06_Arts.pdf1, accessed July 23, 2013.
- Sarmiento, C. (2014). *Strategies of fire and ICE: Immigration, cultural planning and resistance*. Santa Ana, CA: University of California Irvine doctoral dissertation, forthcoming.
- Saxenian, A. (1994). *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schuetz, J. (2013). Causal agents or canaries in the coal mine? Art galleries and neighborhood change. In M. Rushton (Ed.), *Creative communities: Art works in economic development* (pp. 12–35). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Scott, A. (2005). *On Hollywood: The place, the industry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Seaman, B. (2000). Arts impact studies: A fashionable excess. In by G. Bradford, M. Gary, and G. Wallach (Eds.), *The politics of culture: Policy perspectives for individuals, institutions and communities* (pp. 266–288). New York, NY: New Press.
- Sheppard, S. (2011). Localization of nonprofit enterprises in the US. Paper presented, North American Regional Science Association Meetings, Miami, Florida, November 11.
- Sidford, H. (2011). *Fusing arts, culture and social change: High impact strategies for philanthropy*. Washington DC: National Center for Responsible Philanthropy, October. <http://www.ncrp.org/paib/arts-culture-philanthropy>
- Stern, M. (2011). Age and arts participation: A case against demographic destiny, 2009–2010. http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/completed_projects/age_and_arts_participation.html
- Stern, M., & Seifert, S. (1998). *Community revitalization and the arts in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Social Impact of the Arts Project. <http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/>
- Stern, M., & Seifert, S. (2007). *Cultivating natural cultural districts*. Philadelphia, PA: The Reinvestment Fund. <http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/>
- Stern, M., & Seifert, S. (2013). *Natural cultural districts: A three-city study, 2010–2012*. Philadelphia, PA: Social Impact of the Arts Project, University of Pennsylvania, February. http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/siap/completed_projects/natural_cultural_districts.html
- Storper, M., & Venables, A. (2004). Buzz: Face-to-face contact and the urban economy. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 4, 351–370.
- Strom, E. (1999). Let's put on a show: Performing arts and urban revitalization in Newark, New Jersey. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 21, 423–436.
- Strom, E. (2002). Converting pork into porcelain: Cultural institutions and downtown development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38, 3–21.
- Wali, A., Severson, R., & Longoni, M. (2002). *Informal arts: Finding cohesion, capacity and other cultural benefits in unexpected places*. Chicago: Chicago Center for Arts Policy at Columbia College, June.
- Whitt, J. A. (1987). Mozart in the metropolis: The arts coalition and the urban growth machine. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 23, 15–36.
- Willis, K. G., Snowball, J. D., Wymer, C., & Grisolia, J. (2012). A count data travel cost model of theatre demand using aggregate theatre booking data. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 36, 91–112.
- Zukin, S. (1982). *Loft living: Culture and capital in urban change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Ann Markusen is the director of the Humphrey Institute's Project on Regional and Industrial Economics at the University of Minnesota. Currently, her research focuses on occupational approaches to regional development, and on artists, arts organizations, cultural industries, and cultural activity as regional economic and quality-of-life stimulants. Markusen has been an economic policy fellow with the Brookings Institution and a research economist with the office of the Michigan Speaker of the House. She was a Fulbright Lecturer in regional development economics in Brazil and has written on European, Korean, and Japanese regional economies as well as on North American cities and regions.