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ABSTRACT

The cultural economy of American cities emerged as an important topic in cultural policy at the end of the 21st Century, when cultural policy makers started to highlight the multifaceted dynamics of cultural activities and city officials started to pay attention to their great potentials for the growth and well-being of the city. This moved cultural policy from the national to the local level and two main problems emerged. First, it is not always agreed what constitutes cultural economy; the academic literature and reports are not consistent in the language, and their object of analysis is defined by different boundaries. Second, the connections between the cultural economy and urban policymaking are unclear due to the lack of standardized structure in city bureaucracy and the intricacy of metropolitan governance, in particular, for what concern suburbanization.

The purpose of my dissertation is to inform decision making for cultural planning by exploring the connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking. To this end, I develop a research strategy that entails two steps: (1) build a definition of cultural economy that can be operationalized, and (2) find an analytical approach that can link the data about the cultural economy to the complexity of urban policymaking. First, I review a broad range of literature, categorizing the different approaches and identifying three main domains: industries, institutions, and districts. They are characterized by three main
differences – foundational concepts, economic functions, and interaction mechanisms – but merge in an inclusive definition of the *cultural economy*.

Second, I use a geographical information system (GIS) as method of analysis. GIS is a powerful analytical tool; creating maps, it grasps the administrative, social, and economic aspects intertwined with culture.

My empirical analysis focuses on Columbus, Ohio, USA, and its suburbs. I locate their *cultural economy* identifying its breadth and articulation. Then, I explore the connections of *cultural economy* with urban policymaking: I analyze the Neighborhood Liaison Areas and their socioeconomic characteristics, I map the situation in the suburbs, and, finally, I overlay and compare the Neighborhood Liaisons Areas with the suburbs.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Scholars in the field of public policy have considered policies about cultural economy as part of a large set of policies broadly termed “cultural policies” (Kong, 2000, p. 386). Until recently, cultural policies involved governmental strategies and activities that promote the production, marketing, and consumption of the arts. Today, however, cultural policies encompass a broader array of activities than what was traditionally associated with arts policy (Mulcahy, 2006; Wyszomirski, 2004b). In order to understand how cultural economy became the focus of cultural policymaking, in this section I examine the development of cultural policies in the last twenty years.

As Kong (2000) observed, the development of cultural policies in Europe and Great Britain shows an interesting path. In the 1950s and 1960s cultural policies had little sense of the economic potential of culture, and in the 1970s and 1980s, they served social and political agendas. In other words, there was a reassertion of the city center as catalyst for civic identity, and the primary goal of cultural policy was to enhance
community building. However, especially in the mid-1980s, this emphasis on community development and participation and the revitalization of public social life was replaced by “a language highlighting cultural policy’s potential contribution to urban economic and physical regeneration” (Bianchini, 1993) with concerns about selling the places. As cities see out the 1990s and move into the 21st century, “reflection[s] on comprehensive holistic cultural planning that [are] truly regenerative have emerged” (Kong, 2000).

Looking at the United States, I argue that initially, cultural policy efforts mainly focused on the development of a national cultural policy (Wyszomirski, 2004b; Wyszomirski, 2006). Animated debates on the necessity of a federal agency, sustained by presidential reports (Biddle, 1953; Heckscher, 1963), peaked in the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in 1965. Since then, things never really settled down, and a constant controversy accompanied NEA’s existence.

Lately, however, the discussion moved from the national to the local level, paying attention to the cultural economy of “the city” (A. J. Scott, 2000), and its strength as a tool of economic and urban development (Grodach & Loukaitou-Sideris, 2007)—a change that is relevant not only for the shift in the geographic unit, but also in the policy model. The former model was based on the need to subsidize the arts for their intangible worth; the new paradigm highlights the hard dollars generated by the arts in the community (Americans For the Arts, 2002; Cohen, Schaffer, & Davidson, 2003; Florida, 2002a; Florida, 2002b; Markusen, 2006b) and shows how the arts can offer a variety of community assets that can be engines of local development (Bianchini, 1993; Bianchini,
The new paradigm can be described as “the creative city” (Landry, 2000) agenda, which promotes a vision of urban development, fostering interaction between culture, innovation, and community.

Finally, as scholars and policy makers have turned their attention to the local level, the new cultural policy discourse is committed to developing cultural plans for the cities. As Gibson (2004) stated, “‘Cultural planning’ has been hailed as essential to the formation of an economically successful city, especially one that expects to be competitive in a global network of ‘creative cities’” (p. 2), and it has become the way with which cultural policy makers try to reach the benefits of the cultural economy of American cities: cultural vitality, economic growth, and community development (Dowling, 1997; Evans, 2001; Stevenson, 2005).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As cultural policy moved to the local level, focusing on cultural economy, two main problems emerged. First, there is a theoretical confusion about what cultural economy is; the academic literature and policy reports are not consistent in the language utilized, and their object of analysis is defined by different boundaries. Second, the connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking are unclear due to the lack of a standard structure in the city bureaucracy and the intricacy of metropolitan governance, in particular in regards to suburbanization.
1.2.1 Theoretical Confusion

According to Kong (2000), the “relationship between culture and economy is dialectical, for while local cultures contribute to the nature of economic activity, economic activity is also part of the culture-generating and innovation in particular places” (Kong, 2000). Increasingly, local governments have sought to formulate policies that harness the linkage between culture and economy. However, it is not always agreed what constitutes a cultural economy. Markusen et al. (2006) stated:

The need for definitional clarity has become increasingly acute as applications of the creative economy concept have become more widespread. While these have opened up new understandings of the connections between commercial, non-profit, and individual creative enterprise, they have also created significant confusion by using inconsistent approaches and measures. Without a shared framework in which to examine economic processes and relationships, there is no way to comparatively evaluate the findings of individual assessments or to build an analysis in a way that can reliably inform the development of public policy. (p. 25).

One of the problems investigated in this dissertation is this need to clarify what cultural economy is. In Chapter 3, I provide a framework that articulates the cultural economy of an American city in three domains: cultural industries, cultural institutions, and cultural districts. This framework is the result of a wide literature review navigating the theoretical confusion and analyzing the implications of the specific choices of language and words. The expectation is to provide a shared framework that encompasses different cultural realities that can provide a foundation for future comparative evaluations and informative analysis for the development of public policy. The lens utilized is an organizational approach.
1.2.2 Unclear Connections with Urban Policymaking

Cultural planning has been focusing on cultural economy since the mid-1990s, when “the creative city” heralded urban and economic planners to turn to the arts and culture as a tool for urban revitalization. As Markusen (2006) stated, “[d]espite the fact that ‘the ‘creative city’ rubric has the potential to tie urban planning, economic development and arts and cultural policy efforts together, this has for the most part not happened in most American cities, though some smaller towns have been able to do so. Furthermore, the theoretical and institutional underpinnings for such a synthetic effort have not been well explored” (Markusen, 2006a).

In my dissertation, I explore the institutional underpinning of this synthetic effort to tie together urban planning, economic development, and arts policy, analyzing the structure of the city bureaucracy to discover how arts and culture are integrated in the overall city government structure and its planning process. Given the convolution of metropolitan governance, I look at both the large central city and its suburbs. In Chapter 5, I describe the city government structure of Columbus, Ohio, USA, and its suburbs, focusing on the planning divisions and the local arts agency; then I look at city plans and cultural reports. In Chapter 6, I map cultural economy on the metropolitan territory, so I can make connections with the socioeconomic characteristics of the community of a specific jurisdictional boundary and link cultural economy to the mechanisms of urban policymaking. Then, I also explore the connections between Columbus, OH and its suburbs from the perspective of cultural economy.
1.3 Purpose

The purpose of my dissertation is to inform decision making for cultural planning by exploring the connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking. To this end, I develop a research strategy that can support the formulation step of the policy process of cultural planning. I also proceed with an empirical investigation, developing an exploratory analysis of cultural economy and its connections with urban policymaking in Columbus.

In Chapter 2, I describe the policy process in five steps: issue definition, agenda building, policy formulation, policy implementation, and policy evaluation. The policy formulation step is the one where policy makers need to formulate concrete actions through planning. My idea of what should be the contribution of academic research at this stage of the policy process is based on Mintzberg’s claim that the best route for policymaking is a better knowledge of the reality policy makers are facing (Mintzberg, 1994). Accordingly, I provide a research strategy that practitioners can use to better understand their current situation and assess the need for future action.

Developing a research strategy entails two steps: (1) building a definition of cultural economy that can be operationalized, enabling the researcher to collect empirical data of a specific place; (2) finding an analytical approach that can link the data about cultural economy to the complexity of urban policymaking. In Chapter 3, I pull together the main literature from different disciplines and deductively frame the definition of cultural economy, emerging from the following question: What is the organizational structure of local cultural economy?
In order to conduct an empirical investigation, in Chapter 6 I apply this definition to the collection of data about Columbus, and analyze the data, mapping where things are and what their connection is with political, social, and economic factors. I use the geographic information system (GIS) to answer the following questions: How can I study the relationship of cultural economy to the territory and urban policymaking? How can I deal with the complex articulation of metropolitan governance?

1.4 Significance of the Study

My research provides a conceptual framework to capture the cultural economy of an American city and suggests an analytical approach – mapping – to link it to the complexity of urban policymaking. The significance of this study is found in several aspects of the contemporary cultural policy debate: “the creative city” agenda, the flourishing of mapping reports in arts communities, and the current cultural debate in Columbus.

1.4.1 “The Creative City” Agenda

The designation of “the creative city” has been the leading model of cultural policies around the world. It addresses the question of how urban development can promote the interaction between cultural industries and technical innovation, fostering an environment characterized by innovation.

Charles Landry’s book, The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators, was a seminal work that provided a toolkit, showing policy makers how to run urban life with

---

1 Charles Landry is the founder of Comedia, a cultural planning consultancy.
imaginative action and how to plan cities creatively, while addressing urban issues. Written from a European perspective, Landry’s idea spread the debate at the conference for policy makers in Helsinki, entitled “Creative Cities” (Verwijnen, Lehtovuori, & Taideteollinen, 1999).

In Canada, the vision of “the creative city” has been pursued since the mid-1990s. It was started by The Metropolitan Toronto Council that published the Metro’s Culture Plan: Redefining our Cultural Framework in 1994. Afterwards, both Vancouver and Toronto produced cultural documents expressing this holistic view of “the creative city” (Duxbury, 2004). Also, the organization Creative City Network of Canada (Creative City Network of Canada, 2008) was founded to support people employed by municipalities across Canada, who plan the development and support of the arts, culture, and heritage.

Recently, this vision was also pursued in the United States. Partners for Livable Communities (Partners for Livable Communities, 2008) founded a networking program to promote the relationship of amenities, creativity, technology, and e-commerce to “the globally competitive region.” In 2006, the conference Cultivating Creative Communities, whose purpose was to share this vision, brought together more than 400 civic leaders in Charlotte, SC. Those who attended the conference included mayors and other elected officials, urban researchers, business executives, city managers, community and grassroots leaders, city planners, non-profit organizations, cultural advocates, entrepreneurs, and representatives of arts organizations and trade associations. This was
an important gathering that showed how the idea of “the creative city” is a vision that can bring together several actors of urban life.

In the United States, Richard Florida’s approach, focusing on the importance of attracting a creative class in order to promote a creative city,\(^2\) has been leading the debate. However, this approach lacks a thorough connection between creative capital and urban infrastructures. Therefore, as Stern and Seifer remarked, “[…] We anticipate that it will be Jane Jacobs – not Richard Florida – who will prove inspirational in guiding the creative economy of the post-industrial urban neighborhood, breathing new life into the great American city” (Stern & Seifer, 2007, p. 76). Jacobs (1961) criticized the urban planning of the 1950s and 1960s, calling for reconsidering the single-use housing projects, large car-dependent areas, and segregated commercial centers. From her critique, urban planners paid more attention to the variety of actors they needed to attract in planning vital neighborhood.

In “the creative city agenda”, what is not settled is how cultural programming and urban spaces can be connected. There is a need to develop achievable policy recommendations and move away from policy rhetoric that does not provide actual outcomes. As Gibson stated, “It is not simply a matter of ‘add culture and stir’”(L. Gibson & Stevenson, 2004, p. 3). Thus, my dissertation provides policy makers with a research strategy that allows them to gather information about socioeconomic aspects, which characterize a place and need to be understood in concert with cultural assets and amenities.

\(^2\) See (Florida, 2002b; Florida, 2005a; Florida, 2005b)
1.4.2 Mapping and Local Cultural Policy

The need to map cultural economy is shown by the flourishing of mapping reports all over the world. My dissertation investigates this research trend and moves forward (1) redefining the meaning of mapping and (2) picking a different unit of analysis.

The purpose of the mapping reports is to create visibility of the sector, understand its boundaries within the general economy, and identify its potentials. In Chapter 4, I provide a list of these reports, pointing out how they have been focusing on the measurement of the industries and of the occupations. The main objective of the reports is the analysis of economic trends and impacts, while the objective of my study is different. By “mapping” I do not mean “measurement,” but “the creation of a cartography that draws cultural economy on the territory of the city.” The purpose of mapping is still to create a visibility of the sector, but with a slightly different focus: it is not about quantifying cultural economy, but about tracking it on the territory in order to create connections with political, social, and overall economic aspects.

Mostly, mapping studies have been done at a national or regional level. However, Americans for the Arts (Americans for the Arts, 2005a) understood the importance of focusing attention on smaller geographic units. Therefore, they disaggregated the data collected and expanded their analysis to include different geographic levels: state, districts, and city.

I focus on the “city” for several reasons: (1) in a definition of cultural economy it is important to pay attention to the dimension of place, defined as a specific unit of
space,\(^3\) because place seems to be a privileged locus of culture (A. J. Scott, 1997; A. J. Scott, 2001); (2) my definition of *cultural economy* is place-specific, tracing its object of inquiry along spatial lines; (3) the policy discourse in America shifted attention to the local level; and (4) the city functions as an ecology of commodified symbolic production and consumption, creating intertwined relations between the urban landscape and the goods and services produced there.\(^4\)

1.4.3 Setting of the Study: Columbus, OH

This study explores the connection between *cultural economy* and urban policymaking in Columbus, thus fitting the needs of the contemporary situation in the city. In other words, my dissertation engages in the current public debate, fulfills a need raised by the latest cultural reports, and contributes to an overall regional economic perspective.

At the beginning of 2008, interest in tracking the breadth and depth of Columbus’s cultural offerings was a source of debate in the local newspaper. The *Columbus Dispatch* published the article *Grim reality: Perception is that City Lacks in Arts* (Sheban, 2008), reporting the findings of a report about economic development, *Benchmarking Central Ohio* (The Columbus Partnership & Community Research Partners, 2008), that ranked Columbus sixteenth in terms of arts per capita. Several letters to the editor followed the article; noteworthy was the one written by Bryan

---

\(^3\) See Chapter 4 for a thorough discussion about two important concept underlying the action of mapping: spatiality and scalar identities.

\(^4\) “In an ecology like this, moreover, there will tend to be powerful and recursively intertwined relations between the meanings that adhere to the urban landscape and the symbologies of the goods and services produced in the local area” (A. J. Scott, 2001).
Knicely, President of Greater Columbus Arts Council (Knicely, 2008), who asked for a greater perspective and criticized the methodology adopted in the report. In the last few years, several reports about arts and culture have been released in Columbus. In Chapter 5, I analyze these reports. What emerges is the need of a consensus about what is at stake in cultural planning because several conceptions of arts and culture are perceived in the community. The latest report commissioned by the City Council, *The Creative Economy. Leveraging the Arts, Culture and Creative Community for a Stronger Columbus* (2007), observes that there is a need to estimate “the full depth and range of arts and culture assets in Columbus” (Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee, 2007, p. 15). My dissertation (1) designs an inclusive definition of *cultural economy* and (2) provides a way to operationalize it and collect empirical data: an operation that answers the call of the above mentioned City Council report.

In 2001, the Mayor of Columbus, the President of The Ohio State University, and the Chair of the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce commissioned a study about the *Regional Economic Strategy for Greater Columbus*. The study suggests to advance the life sciences, transportation, and creative services (Collaborative Economics, 2001, p. 10). In particular, it claims that the increasing the importance of creativity as a driver of economic innovation has implications for place-based strategies, particularly for vibrant, livable downtowns. Downtown is envisioned as a hub of creativity, information, arts, and entertainment, where creative services stimulate the economy. The report sketches a list of creative services, and mentions the need to connect with the plan drawn for downtown Columbus.
My dissertation helps to articulate these creative services as a *cultural economy* and provides a tool to connect it to political, administrative, and socioeconomic factors. These two steps facilitate the realization of a place-based strategy envisioned by the plans mentioned above in order to pursue a regional economic development.
CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

The background for my research implies to understand the change in the cultural policy paradigm occurred in the last twenty years, the context of urban policymaking and the logics and types of planning. At first, I will explore how cultural policy has been framing its discourse in the United States, moving from national to local level. Then, I will examine the several aspects of urban policymaking pointing out its complexity. Finally, I will study planning with particular attention to urban and cultural planning.

2.2 Change in the Cultural Policy Paradigm

Cultural policies involve governmental strategies and activities that promote the production, marketing, and consumption of the arts. Today, cultural policies encompass a broader array of activities that was traditionally associated with arts policy (Mulcahy, 2006; Wyszomirski, 2004b). Often, especially in the United States, it is not clearly understood how deeply the government is involved in arts and culture (Strom & Wyszomirski, 2004), therefore little attention is paid to cultural policy paradigms. In this
section, I will illustrate the evolution of the cultural policy paradigm trying to understand how culture became an issue undertaken by the cities as *cultural economy*.

The development of cultural policies in Great Britain and continental Europe reveals an interesting path. In the 1950s and 1960s cultural policies had little sense of the economic potential of culture. In the 1970s and 1980s cultural policies generally served social and political agenda. As part of this social agenda, there was a reassertion of the city center as catalyst for civic identity and the primary goal of cultural policy was to enhance community-building. Since the mid-1980s, the emphasis on community development and participation as well as the revitalization of public social life was replaced by “a language highlighting cultural policy’s potential contribution to urban economic and physical regeneration” (Bianchini, 1993) with concerns about selling the places. As cities enter the 21st century, “reflection on comprehensive holistic cultural planning that is truly regenerative have emerged” (Kong, 2000).

Looking at the US, cultural policy efforts initially focused mainly on the development of a national cultural policy (Perone, 2004; Wyszomirski, 2004b; Wyszomirski, 2006). Animated debates about the necessity of a Federal agency, sustained by presidential reports (Biddle, 1953; Heckscher, 1963), peaked with the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in 1965.

Lately, however, the discussion moved to the local level focusing on the *cultural economy* of the city (A. J. Scott, 2000), and its strength as a tool of economic and urban development (Grodach & Loukaitou-Sideris, 2007). The 1980s were characterized by a general policy of decentralization, devolution, and reinventing government. “This
general policy tide effected arts and cultural policy both directly and indirectly. The historic budgetary growth trajectory of the NEA stopped, went into decline, and then was dramatically reduced. Meanwhile, the combined total of state arts appropriations continued to grow. The intersection of these two trends slowly shifted the balance of power and initiative within the intergovernmental cultural policy system away from the federal level and to the state and local levels” (Wyszomirski, forthcoming, p. 11).

At first, the shift was from the Federal Government to the states (DiMaggio, 1991b; Lowell & Heneghan Ondaatje, 2006); afterwards, it moved to the local level. The interest in the arts as a tool of economic and urban development responded to a crisis in American cities. The downtown areas of many US cities became empty and crime surged the inner city (Knox & McCarthy, 2005). City officials looked for strategies to revitalize their towns, while new arts advocacy research pointed out the economic impact of the arts (Americans For the Arts, 2002; National Endowment for the Arts, 1981; Radich & Schwoch, 1987).

The change towards local cultural policy is relevant not only for the shift in the geographic unit, but also in the policy model (Strom & Cook, 2004). The former model was based on the need to subsidize the arts for their intangible worth; the new paradigm highlights the hard dollars generated by the arts in their communities (Cohen et al., 2003; Florida, 2002a; Florida, 2002b; Markusen, 2006b) and shows how the arts can offer a variety of local assets that can be engines of economic and community development (Belfiore & Bennett, 2007; Bianchini, 1993; Bianchini, 2006; C. Gray, 2007; Strom, 2002; Strom, 2003; Whitt, 1987).
As scholars and policy makers have turned their attention to the local level, the new cultural policy discourse is committed to developing cultural plans for the cities. Cultural planning (Dowling, 1997; Evans, 2001; Stevenson, 2005) has become a recognized devise that cultural policy makers use to reach the benefits of cultural economy: cultural vitality, economic growth, and community development.

While in the next chapter I will tackle the definition of cultural economy, in the following sections, I will review the urban policymaking process in order to understand the context and policy mechanisms where cultural planning is taking place. Afterwards, I will analyze cultural planning and its actual situation in the United States.

2.3 Urban Policymaking

Policies are developed following a process, give direction for actions to any type of governance, become operative through a political structure, and involve planning. In the United States, urban policymaking exhibits major differences from one state to the other. Cities have no explicit place in the Constitution and they are wards of state governments. “Under the Tenth Amendment, authority over local government is implicitly reserved to state governments” (Rusk, 2003, p. 94) which are free to determine the characteristics of their political subdivisions. Nowadays, however, cities depend both on state government, from which their power is derived, and the federal government, from which they receive substantial money. Additionally, not only state and federal governments, but also other local governments can limit the actions city officials can take (Burns, 1994; Morgan et al., 2007; Rich, 2003).
To better understand all the aspects intertwined in urban policymaking, in the following sections, I will (1) describe the policy process; I will (2) focus on the metropolitan governance; I will (3) study the political structure of the cities; and finally, I will (4) look into urban planning to learn about its mechanisms and objectives. As explanatory examples of these steps of urban policymaking, I will look into the current situation of Columbus.

2.3.1 Policy Process

Urban policymaking follows a process that faces several inherent challenges, from fragmentation of political power (Yates, 1978) to concern with redistributive issues (Peterson, 1981). Lindblom (1980) suggests that policymaking in the public sector is not always highly rational because it tends to emphasize participation, in terms of responsiveness and accountability, over efficiency. The policymaking process can be described as a relatively stable course of action (Anderson, 2003) and the main literature agrees in identifying five main stages: issue definition, agenda building, policy formulation (or issue resolution), policy implementation, and policy evaluation (see Figure 1).

![Policy Process Diagram](image)

**Figure 1: Policy Process**

---

5 for references about the main works see (Morgan, England, & Pelissero, 2007, p. 116, note 9)
Issue definition, or how an issue gets defined as a public matter, is the very first step of the policy process. Several mechanisms can bring attention to a problem and promote government intervention. Agenda building is the step at which the issue reaches public decision makers. Not every issue is considered of public interest and the agenda-building process selects which issues will be addressed. Issue resolution is the political decision of public officials about how to solve the problem defined in the issue definition step. It consists of an intense negotiating process that formulates the policy and gives criteria for action. The policy decided in the issue resolution step must be implemented and carried out by the administrative organizations. Finally, the evaluation phase will assess to what extent the policy reached its goals or needs to be changed.

My research can provide information for two steps: agenda building and policy formulation. Mapping identifies the types of cultural organizations present on the territory and makes them visible on the map, creating connections with other elements of the territory, such as jurisdictional boundaries, demographics of neighborhood, etc. Therefore, in cities where culture is not already on the public agenda, mapping cultural economy can help arts advocates to point to the gap that the urban government should address. In cities where culture is an issue on the agenda, the information collected with mapping can help policy makers and public officials to move to the following step and formulate a policy for action.
2.3.2 Metropolitan Governance

2.3.2.1 Local Fragmentation

The US Census Bureau recognizes five basic types of local governments: counties, municipalities, townships, school districts, and special districts. Therefore, metropolitan governance of the United States is characterized by a power structure that is highly fragmented and overlapping. For example, school districts and municipalities are two separate entities and their jurisdictions, sometimes, have different boundaries. In 1980, 40 percent of the land of the City of Columbus was in suburban school districts (Cox & Jonas, 1993).

In Ohio, municipalities with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants are called villages, while bigger ones are called cities. Cities and villages may exist within township areas. Township governments are governed by boards of township trustees.

The local fragmentation of power creates several problems: (1) unclear political accountability on account of the fact that many citizens are confused as to which government is responsible for which activities; (2) frequent lack of a coordinated approach the problem; (3) fiscal disparities between central city and suburbs; (4) great variations in service levels. Local reform groups have urged the creation of some form of governments that would encompass an entire metropolitan area, for example through city-county consolidation.

---

6 Ohio Revised Code, Section 703.01 (A), http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/703.01, retrieved September, 07
7 "Since the early 1900s only four consolidation of a large city (250,000 or more people) and a county have been approved: Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, in 1962; Jacksonville-Duval County, Florida, in 1967; Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana (imposed by the state legislature), in 1969; and Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky, in 2003" (Morgan et al., 2007, p. 52).
The literature in economic geography and the current administrative rhetoric is enhancing the need of a regional development (Hadjimichalis & Hudson, 2006; Ward & Jonas, 2004). Regionalist approaches emerge from the reorganization of territories in capitalism and claim that the region is the most appropriate scale to govern (Jones, 2001). Orfield’s (2002; 2004) work is an important scholarly and advocacy research in favor of regionalism and metropolitan politics. He also has been actively involved in building the necessary coalition to transform the Minneapolis-St.Paul metropolitan region.

In any case, there is little agreement on the topic because not everyone favors increased centralization in metro areas (Brenner, 2002). One major argument in favor of decentralization is drawn from the public-choice tradition that encourages competition in public services. “Public choice theorists speculate that citizens will seek to maximize the returns on their tax expenditures by choosing locales with a combination of the lowest tax rate and the highest level of services. In other words, citizens basically act as consumers of public services” (Oliver, 2003, p. 322). Another reason why there is not a strong move towards metropolitan government is that citizens do not want it, as it is showed in a survey conducted in St. Louis and Its suburbs (Jones & Hays, 2004). Finally, as Simpsons (2004) pointed out, several journalists and urban scholars argue that sprawl is not that bad: people fled the city because they wanted more yard, lower crime, and better amenities.

---

8 Public choice theory is based on the assumption that individuals are rational actors, seeking to maximize the utility of their actions for their own personal gains. As first it was articulated by the economist Tiebout (1956).

9 For an overview of several different perspectives on sprawl, with an examination of theories that support and refuse the spread of sprawl see Suburban Sprawl: Culture, Theory, and Politics (2003).
Aside from a few instances of metropolitan reorganization, the other means of creating governmental centralization in metropolitan areas has been some form of voluntary cooperation, particularly in the form of councils of government (COGs) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). In the Columbus area, for instance, the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC) is a volunteer association that assists 42 local governments with the objective of becoming a catalyst for change at regional level.

The census divides localities between those in metropolitan areas and those in rural areas and takes into consideration a metropolitan unit that is not a political entity: the metropolitan statistical area (MSA). An MSA is defined as a central city of at least 50,000 residents and the surrounding counties that have a high degree of social and economic integration with that nucleus. Within metropolitan areas, the census categorizes places as being either the central or the noncentral city (suburbs). Many scholars consider the MSA as the best unit of study for an understanding of places (Orfield, 2002; Rusk, 2003) because social and economic problems tend to be area-wide rather than jurisdiction-wide. “Any attack on urban social and economic problems must treat suburb and city as indivisible parts of a whole” (Rusk, 2003, p. 7).

Considering the political fragmentation (counties, municipalities, townships, school districts, and special districts), a city territory is characterized by the overlay of several different jurisdictional boundaries. Also, a city represents an economic unit (the MSA) that is different from a political entity. Two aspects that already make emerge the complexity of urban policymaking.
2.3.2.2 Suburbanization and Urban Morphology

The proliferation of local governments is especially a phenomenon of the Twentieth century related to suburbanization. America has become a nation of suburbs over the past fifty years and the city has been redefined (Lewis, 1996; Oliver, 2003; Rusk, 2003). “Despite the enormity of this change, we know very little about how suburbanization is shaping American political life, particularly at the local level” (Oliver, 2003, p. 312). Although social and economic implications have been largely investigated (Morgan & Mareschal, 1999), the political implications of this fragmentation are not well understood. There are few theories that explain the dynamics of suburban politics and there has been little empirical research in this area.

“The rapid growth of suburbs over the past fifty years has created a tremendous variety of localities within the metropolis. We now have exurbs, postsuburbs, edge cities, inner-and outer-ring suburbs, working-class suburbs, elderly suburbs, African American suburbs, and so forth” (Oliver, 2003, p. 315). Such a variety of labels create a challenge to anyone trying to understand metropolitan governance and to determine what is meant by suburb. Originally, a suburb was an area subordinated to a major urban area, an area situated on the edge of the main city. In reality the situation is much more complex. The city of Columbus, for instance, has several suburbs (see Figure 2): some of them are located around the edge of the city (Westerville, New Albany, Gahanna, Reynoldsburg, Pickerington, Canal Winchester, Groveport, Obetz, Grove City, Hilliard, Dublin, and Powell) and some of them are included within its territory but they have their own
political governance (Worthington, Whitehall, Bexley, Grandview Heights, Upper Arlington). Additionally, there is New Rome which is an unincorporated area.

Figure 2: Columbus and its Suburbs

At the end of the previous section, I noted that local fragmentation implied the co-presence of several jurisdictional boundaries and the existence of an economic unit that is not a political entity. Studying suburbanization, I discovered that jurisdictional boundaries are shaped in a very complex way, giving to the urban morphology a tangled form: another aspect that has to be taken in consideration in order to articulate the complexity of urban policymaking.
2.3.3 City Government Structure

“The choice of political structure has certainly been the key decision for municipalities throughout the past century” (Morgan et al., 2007, p. 61). Cities are creatures of the States, however municipal home rule provided by state law gives cities the right to make decisions on local matters and choose their own forms of government.

The urban political structure starts with citizens and takes shape through bureaucrats and chief executives. Citizens can make their voice heard by voting, joining political parties and interest groups, and contacting city officials. Local bureaucrats are organized in departments that usually take care of issues such as police, fire, streets, parks, and planning. City chief executives (mayors and city managers), city council members, local bureaucrats, and city voters can interact in different ways, mainly following two basic forms of municipal government: mayor-council government and council-manager government\(^\text{10}\).

Mayor-Council Government has two variations (see Figure 3):

- the weak mayor-council form
  the council possesses legislative and executive authority, exercises primary control on the budget and appoints several administrative officials; the mayor presides over the city council and sometimes works with boards and city commissions

- the strong mayor-council form
  the mayor has almost total administrative authority, prepares the budget, appoints all the departments heads, and works with the council on policymaking. Columbus and

\(^\text{10}\) This information is mainly drawn from Pelissero(2003).
has this kind of city government. Their mayor is the dominant force in city government (City of Columbus).

Figure 3: Mayor-Council Government Variations

Arts and culture are managed at local level by arts agency that can have different structures and different ways of being integrated in the city government. The local arts agencies in Columbus and Minneapolis, for instance, have two different relationships with the city government political structure and different missions. The Greater Columbus Arts Council (GCAC) is an independent private agency that administrates funds received from the City as established by contract. In 1970, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce charged its Cultural Affairs Committee to form a community arts agency to serve Columbus. In 1973, GCAC was incorporated as a nonprofit organization and City Council set aside funds to be administrated by the GCAC and distributed to nonprofit arts and arts related organizations serving the citizens of Columbus. In 1977, City Council allocated part of the revenue from the hotel/motel taxes that in 1981 was
fixed to a percentage of 20% of 4% tax. Today, GCAC receives over $2,000,000 of the funds from the city and distributes them to more than 70 organizations.

Each city has different political structures and organizes the management of the several issues in different ways. This explains why local arts agency can have different ways of being integrated in the city government. It is interesting to find out how the city decided to tackle culture, because it will give me the primary constituency interested in my research. Additionally, it suggests that for mapping the cultural economy of a city I need to study its political structure in order to identify my primary constituency and understand its position in the overall political structure.

2.4 Planning

Bryson (1995) claims how leaders of nonprofit and public organizations need to develop a coherent basis for their decisions. Strategic planning is a set of concepts, procedures, and tools that can assist leaders with this task. “Indeed, strategic planning may be defined as a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is, what it does, and why it does it” (p. x).

On the other hand, Mintzberg (1994), in his book The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning, develops a discussion about the shortcomings of strategic planning. For instance, he points out that beyond planning, an important task for planners is to understand their context. “We have also learned about our need to solidify our descriptive understanding of complex phenomena-and to face up to our ignorance of
them—before we leap into prescription” (p. 416). In fact, the best prescription comes from
the application of conceptual knowledge about a phenomenon in a specific context. “I
am firmly convinced that the best route to more effective policy making is better
knowledge in the mind of the practitioner of the world he or she actually faces” (p. vi).

Mintzberg’s ideas about planning are the base of my research. I consider my
research important for policymaking because it gathers information about a specific
context, Columbus, and provides a better knowledge to practitioners, enabling them to
develop better policies.

2.4.1 Urban Planning

“City planning is a particular kind of urban management that focuses on the
physical use of land” (Morgan et al., 2007). At different times, planning has meant
different activities: the design of comprehensive plans or discrete urban spaces, or the
creation of legislation, or the conduct of social research11. Over time, the emphasis
moved from shaping the use of land to addressing social issues and economic needs.
Even though planning is involved in many aspects of the community, whatever the focus
of the plan, most city planning still affects the use of land.

11 Planning history emerged as a recognized field only quite recently, but since the 1960s it has
produced layers of knowledge. Scott’s American City Planning since 1890, published in 1969, is the first
systematic study of institutionalized planning. Two Centuries of American Planning, edited by Daniel
Shaffer in 1988, is the product of the extension of planning history to urban history. Schultz offered an
interdisciplinary perspective in 1989 with his book Constructing Urban Culture: American Cities and City
Planning, 1800–1920. Nowadays, scholars want to expand the geographic breadth of planning history,
challenging the tradition that draws national trends from too few metropolitan areas.

Two main references for a clear perspective on urban planning history and theories are: Hall (2002)
Planning is the core part of the policy process and helps public officials to move from agenda setting to policy formulation and implementation. It encompasses two main operations, comprehensive and area-wide planning and zoning, while economic development is its main focus. Within the city government, a special division is dedicated to planning.

Land use, transportation and community facilities are the basic components of a comprehensive plan that offers long-range goals for the development of the community. The *Columbus Comprehensive Plan* was released in 1993, but arts and culture were not part of the plan\(^{12}\). It prescribes development policies for the city and a surrounding area that can become part of the city in the next 20 years.

Zoning regulations are a major tool for implementing plans, by requiring that similar uses of land be grouped together. Zoning ordinances are the most common form of land regulation and assign to delimited parcel of land a specific use. The three general land uses are residential, business commercial, and industrial.

Nowadays, economic development has become almost synonymous of planning in many cities. The main objectives are: to create better jobs, revitalize downtowns, redevelop older neighborhoods, and establish stronger tax bases. In Columbus, for instance, the Planning Division is an office of the Department of Development. “The Planning Division is organized to guide and shape growth and change in Columbus with the aim of balancing the social, aesthetic, cultural, political and economic requirements of life” (City of Columbus, 2007b).

---

\(^{12}\) See Chapter 5 for a closer analysis.
In the early 1980s, the Planning Division divided the city of Columbus into 30 planning areas. These planning areas served as a geographical guideline for research. Data was collected for all planning areas and compiled into separate area information profiles. The profiles acted as a guide for a great number of planning programs and policies throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s. As of today, the Planning Division has prepared 45 plans and overlays\(^{13}\) (City of Columbus, 2008b).

Beside a Planning Division, in many cities a planning commission has been created to give recommendations to the elected governing board. It is a group of respected community members appointed for a long period of overlapping terms to ensure their independence from the political administration. The commission evaluates plans offered by others, but the final decision is made by the legislative body. A big task of the commission is to build networks and alliances of interested groups, such as developers and neighborhood associations.

Area-wide planning, zoning, and economic development are knotted with the social issues addressed by cultural planning and should be addressed in concert. One of the goals of my research is to help planners to better appreciate the potential and possibilities of the arts in the planning areas, so that planning commissions can see that cultural organizations should be part of the alliances they are putting together and, meanwhile, encourage cultural policy makers to see the importance of getting connected to the urban planning process.

\(^{13}\) An Overlay is a type of zoning district that modifies another underlying zoning district. Thus, a property subject to an overlay zoning district prescribed by a plan has also an underlying, basic zoning district (City of Columbus).
2.4.2 Cultural Planning

“The term cultural planning is relatively new, emerging out of Europe in the 1960s and 1970s as cities and towns faced changing economies and demographics” (Russo & Butler, 1991, p. 1). It emerged as part of the urban regeneration strategies that integrated the arts into other aspects of local culture. “Most recently, ‘cultural planning’ has been hailed as essential to the formation of an economically successful city, especially one that expects to be competitive in a global network of ‘creative cities’” (Gibson & Stevenson, 2004, p. 2).

In the literature, cultural planning has been defined in several ways (Dowling, 1997; Evans, 2001; Guppy, 1997; Landry, 2000; Russo & Butler, 1991; Stevenson, 2005). Evans (2001) offers a definition that highlights the main focus of cultural planning, articulating the factors involved and the actions recommended related to them: “Cultural planning concerns activities, facilities and amenities that make up a society’s cultural resources” (p 7). Activities, facilities, and amenities are the objects of the strategic plans laid out in cultural planning. Moreover, cultural planning implies the allocation of resources for cultural development.

If the main focus is cultural development, a cultural planning perspective also offers policy formulation a consideration of the broad impact that cultural resources have on the community: “a process of monitoring and acting upon economic, cultural, social, educational environmental, political and symbolic implications of a city’s cultural resources” (Evans, 2001, p. 7). Cultural development has several outcomes that provide public goods for the general well-being of the community. “Public officials especially
are learning that they can plant the seeds of urban renewal and, at the same time, promote their city’s culture and arts, not only to renew their neighborhoods and downtowns, but also to attract tourists as well as private investment” (Kemp, 2004, p. 1).

In my dissertation, I argue that physical form and economic, social, and cultural issues should be kept in concert in cultural planning. However, it is not clear how policy makers could grasp and connect these factors. My research aims to provide a strategy that can connect urban form (in terms of jurisdictional boundaries) to economic, social and cultural factors.

2.4.2.1 Cultural Planning in the United States

As explained in section 2, lately, American cultural policy is committed to developing cultural plans for the cities in order to purse the benefits of cultural economy. This means that cultural policy is intertwined in urban policymaking. However it is not clear what is the connection of cultural policy with the flow of the urban policy process, and the political structure within the metropolitan governance, in particular in regards to its planning sector.

American local government planning is constantly evolving. At first, it was mainly concerned with the physical form of the land; today, its concern has expanded to social and economic issues. Now that also culture has become an issue of interest for local governments, it is making its way into the planning process developed by city departments. Leading city planners, arts administrators, and government officials from across the nation convened in San Antonio in 1979 to explore the arts and city planning
for the first time (porter, 1980), the potential of a collaboration between the arts and city planning. The mutual concern was the vitality of the city.

Cultural policy moved at local level when the arts became of interest for responding to the crisis of American cities. In other words, the local interest for cultural policies was associated with revitalization and focused on pursuing the benefits associated with arts and culture (Stern & Seifer, 2007).

Kemp (2004) offers an overview of policy discourse about local and regional revitalization efforts that emphasizes the arts. He groups some articles developing a rationale about the connections between the arts and the cities and gives some examples of best practices of cities working either on a cultural plan or main cultural projects, such as building facilities, promoting public art, and promoting historical preservation.

Cultural planning takes place in the form of cultural plans or cultural projects. Over the past years, numerous plans have been created. Based on Americans for the Arts’ report, 2003 Triennial Report on the Nation’s Local Arts Agencies (Americans for the Arts, 2005c), up to 22% of the local arts agencies have cultural plans. However, scholars have not yet analyzed them to provide a comprehensive view of trends and best practices of such plans. “More research comparing cities’ cultural planning capabilities and performances is badly needed” (Markusen, 2006a, p. 28).

On the other hand, academic research has criticized some strategies of cultural planning. “In the United States, there has for some time been a critical engagement with cultural programs that are designed to be part of urban planning schemas that attempt to interact ‘holistically’ with the everyday living needs of local communities” (Gibson &
Stevenson, 2004, p. 2). Works by Zukin (1989; 1995) and Deutsche (1984; 1996) have pointed to the social inequality and social segregation resulting from this kind of urban planning.

“At present, there seem to be three models of cultural planning. The models do represent different stages in the thinking of the cultural policy arena (i.e. they develop out of each other), but they do not necessarily follow each other at a given site. Any one city may be using any of these models at a given point, regardless of what they have or have not done in the past” (Americans for the Arts, 1998, p. 53). The three models of existing cultural planning in the United States are: description and direction, where arts try to reach out a broader community; inventories and impacts, where there is a description of what is the role of the arts in the civic community; and planning and projection, which start with a discussion on the need of the community and examine how the arts can serve these goals. These three models have evolved over time, but were not used sequentially and all exist simultaneously in the field.

2.5 Conclusion

The cultural economy of American cities emerged as an important topic in cultural policy at the end of the 21st century, when the cultural paradigm changed and the cities started to pay attention to the multifaceted dynamics of cultural activities. The change in the cultural policy paradigm showed a shift in the geographic unit of interest, from national to local, and a different policy model, from subsidy model to community and economic development models.
Looking at urban policymaking was valuable in determining what is the relevance of my research for each of its three main stages. First of all, (1) mapping *cultural economy* can provide information to two stages of the policy process: in cities where culture is not on the agenda yet, it can help cultural advocates to move it into the agenda and get the attention of policy makers. In cities where culture is already an issue on the agenda, the data collected with mapping will provide the information necessary for decision making and move from agenda setting to policy formulation. Secondly, (2) cities as unit of analysis present several governance challenges: local fragmentation, tangled jurisdictional boundaries, and economic realities bigger than political entities. These three aspects point to the complexity of urban policymaking and should be taken in consideration when dealing with the unit of analysis because the choice of a city seams to require much more than collecting data about the single central city. Finally, (3) the political structure of the city showed how the localization of culture is specific to each single city. Municipal home rules provided by the State give cities the right to choose their own form of government and formalize in a context-specific bureaucratic structure the administration of local matters. Therefore, to identify the primary interested parties of my research and understand its relationship with the overall political machine, I need to study the political structure of the city chosen as a case study.

The investigation of urban planning illustrated its main activities (area-wide planning and zoning) and goals (economic development). At the meantime, it also disclosed potentials for an involvement of cultural organizations in the planning process.
The purpose of my dissertation is to provide a research strategy that can make these potentials clearly visible so policy makers can act upon them.

The section on cultural planning provided an overview of what cultural planning is and gave a quick overview of the current situation in the United States. Overall, what emerged is that cultural planning in American cities is associated with revitalization and pursues the benefits of *cultural economy*: cultural development and its outcomes for the well-being of the community.
CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

Over the last ten years, American local governments have produced several reports studying the status of culture in their area\textsuperscript{14}. The main purposes of these reports are either to suggest solutions for cultural development or to point out the economic and social outcomes of cultural activities. These studies contributed to create a better understanding of the multifaceted value of culture and raised the awareness of the importance of the sector at the local level. However, looking at them from a theoretical standpoint, what emerges is that “practitioners tend to draw upon a mixture of rationales” (Pratt, 2005, p. 39). There is no consistency in (1) the language utilized and (2) the boundaries of the object of analysis are different from one study to another (i.e. non-profit arts organizations, creative industries, etc.).

\textsuperscript{14} Some examples are: The Minneapolis Plan For Arts And Culture (2005); Vibrant Culture-Thriving Economy. Arts, Culture and Prosperity in Arizona’s Valley of the Sun (2004); Capital Culture. A Cultural Plan for the Future of the City of Tallahassee and the Capital Area (2003); Investing in Austin’s Arts for Cultural Prosperity and Economic Growth: Findings and Recommendations (2002); The Indianapolis Cultural Development Initiative: Building Participation Through Cultural Tourism (2001); Designing Portland Future: The Role of The Creative Services Industries (1999).
In order to navigate this theoretical confusion, I drew an analytical distinction drawing from the different discourses about culture that are mobilized in policymaking. I reviewed the principal academic literature and categorized the different approaches, identifying three domains and their main differences. Each domain – industries, institutions, and districts - has its specific foundational concept, economic function, and interaction mechanism so it is important to understand these differences. However, it is also important to realize that they are parts of a whole and they must be considered together to have a comprehensive understanding of the object of cultural policy that could be addressed as the cultural economy of American cities. Therefore, I review the literature using the term cultural economy and illustrate the characteristics of my definition.

This chapter is divided in three main parts. In section 2, I ponder the meaning of the term culture; in section 3, I offer a definition of the three domains and explore their differences; in section 4, I assemble the three domains in an inclusive definition of cultural economy.

3.2 Culture: A Problematic Definition

In order to clarify the language and the object involved in cultural planning, I explore the meaning of the term ‘culture’. A step that will help me to identify the type of products and the range of activities that I need to take in consideration.

“Culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language. This is so partly because of its intricate historical development, in several
European languages, but mainly because it has now come to be used for important concepts in several distinct intellectual disciplines and in several distinct and incompatible systems of thought” (Williams, 1976, p. 76). Different languages, distinct disciplines, and distinct system of thought have shaped the meaning of this word. For the purpose of my dissertation I need to understand what it means in the United States.

In North America anthropology, culture refers to “a complex argument about the relations between general human development and a particular way of life” (Williams, 1976, p. 81). In the political arena it has been used to describe the works and practices of intellectual and artistic activities. Anyway, this seems to be the most widespread use. “Culture is music, literature, painting and sculpture, theatre and film” (p. 80).

Mostly important for my research is the fact that in America, for a long time, there has been a big struggle between high-culture and popular culture that now, at least in some scholarly research, seems to be solved (Peterdon & Roger, 1996). High-culture is the artistic and literary activity developed by the European tradition and perpetuated by well educated people. Popular culture, or also more negatively mass culture, is a commercially concocted activity for the leisure hours and for a long time was considered just an aberration of commercial greed and public ignorance.

Gans (1999) qualifies this struggle between high-culture and popular culture as a battle between diverse populations and has become known as ‘culture wars’15, “a term that describes a variety of conflicts between liberals and conservatives (both cultural and political) as well as between religious and secular peoples. The culture in these wars

---

15 On ‘culture wars’ see also Frascina (1993) and Wyszomirski (1995).
expands to fit the battles of the moment, which currently include “Family values,” as well as sexual ones, but the terrains in which these wars are fought change from time to time. Moreover, the wars are now an intrinsic part of the electoral struggles between and within the parties” (Gans, 1999, p. 3). Nowadays there is still a certain relationship between class and culture, however from an aesthetic point of view there is a considerably better agreement in having high-culture and popular culture blur together (Freedman & Stuhr, 2004; Wyszomirski, 2000)

Levine (1990) traces this distinction tracking the use of the terms highbrow and lowbrow. He claims that in the early 19th-century, America was characterized by no rigid cultural divisions between elite and mass culture. By the later part of the century, however, a clear line had been drawn; Shakespearean plays, classical music, and art of the old masters increasingly became the property of the elite only. The pendulum has swung back now, he observes, as there is a lessening of cultural divisions in contemporary America.

In the policy arena these two different groups of cultural products were referred to as commercial and non-profit arts (Wyszomirski, 2000). My argument is that both, pop-culture goods and the high culture goods, need to be taken into consideration in order to portray the cultural life of a place. Therefore, a pluralistic conception of culture (Gans, 1999) is the base of the following discussion.
3.3 Cultural Industries, Cultural Institutions, and Cultural Districts

Studying the cultural sector, academic research has pursued specific directions of inquiry and different disciplines have defined their objects of study in different ways. Through an extensive literature review, I categorized three main domains: industries, institutions, and districts. Industries have been studied by geography, economics, and cultural studies; institutions have been theorized by sociology and aesthetics and their system has been the focus of attention of cultural policy; districts have been studied by urban planning and marketing has emphasized their economic value.

In the table below, I summarized my categorizations of the three domains, showing the disciplines studying them, giving their descriptive definition, and synthesizing their differences in terms of foundational concepts, economic functions, interaction mechanisms, and policy types. In the following sections I will analyze each of these elements in detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Cultural Policy</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Cultural Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Local Arts Agencies (LAAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Artists work/live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual</td>
<td>Art Departments in Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td>spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Nonprofit Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphony Orchestras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Industrial system</td>
<td>Organizational field</td>
<td>Mixed-use area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Experience and Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replicable</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass-production</td>
<td>Event production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational</td>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>Sectors</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Areas</td>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>Cultural Policy</td>
<td>Urban Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.1: Three Domains and their Differences**
3.3.1 Definitions

3.3.1.1 Cultural Industries

“Culture industry” is a term that was originally used to criticize mass entertainment. It was utilized by members of the Frankfurt School\(^\text{16}\) who were shocked when looking at American culture with European eyes. Their critique attacked the industrialization of culture, the distribution of cultural commodities on an industrial scale, and the rise of “dream factories”.

The term was picked up by French sociologists (Miège, 1987) and policy makers (Unesco, 1982) and was converted to the term “cultural industries”. “The French ‘cultural industries’ sociologists rejected Adorno and Horkheimer’s use of the singular term ‘Culture Industry’ because it suggested a ‘unified field’, where all the different forms of cultural production which co-exist in modern life are assumed to obey the same logic. They were concerned instead to show how complex the cultural industries are, and to identify the different logics at work in different types of cultural production” (Hesmondhalgh, 2002, p. 16).

Most of the literature uses the term ‘creative industries’ (Americans for the Arts, 2005b; Caves, 2000; Hartley, 2005); however, I consider much more appropriate the term ‘cultural industries’ because the term creativity is not a distinctive trait of the cultural sector. “Although many cultural industries rely heavily on creativity and innovation as their core competencies, it is difficult to maintain that this reliance sets these industries apart from others” (Power, 2002, p. 106). All types of industries rely on creativity and

innovation. Those two qualities do not characterize a specific sector, setting it apart from others.

Different studies create different lists of industries encompassing the cultural industries. In Table 3.2, I provide an overview of them, including also my list as a working definition.

|---------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|

Table 3.2: Cultural Industries

Americans for the Arts’ (AFTA) list is composed of six categories: Museums and collections, performing arts, visual arts and photography, film, radio & TV, design and publishing, arts schools and services. It very innovative because puts together nonprofit arts organization and for-profit businesses. However, the use of the terminology “industries” is not appropriate for some of the categories in the list.

It is important to consider arts and culture in its multifaceted aspects, blurring the boundaries among nonprofit and for-profit. However, this comprehensive consideration
must be done without losing important specificities. It is not accurate to consider museums, theatres (opera, dance, symphonies, etc.) and schools as industries. They are institutions, entities that have developed in a specific organizational field (DiMaggio, 1983; DiMaggio, 1991a) rather than in an industrial system (Hirsh, 2000).

3.3.1.2 Cultural Institutions

I use the term institutions in the way it is conceived by “cultural institutions studies” (Becker, 1984; Dickie, 1974; Hasitschka, Tschmuck, & Zembylas, 2005) within the organizational field theory. Art world institutions are “cultural entities (artefacts and practices) bound by a specific institutional framework” (Hasitschka et al., 2005, p. 149).

The institutional approach to art originated from the effort to define art beyond aesthetic parameters (Becker, 1984; Danto, 1964; Dickie, 1974). “The institutional theory of art concentrates attention on the nonexhibited characteristics that works of art have in virtue of being embedded in an institutional matrix which may be called “the artworld” and argues that these characteristics are essential and defining” (Dickie, 1974, p. 12). Instead of looking at the characteristics of the “art object”, the attention is drawn to its nonexhibited characteristics: a set of practices and conventions that make possible the existence of a specific artworld.

I argue that the institutionalisation (Bürger & Bürger, 1992; Hodgson & Hodgson, 2004) of arts organizations took place through the interaction of three sectors: private, public, and nonprofit. In the table below, I provide some examples of organizations in each sector.
### Table 3.3: Cultural Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Nonprofit Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Arts Agencies (LAAS)</td>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Theatres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Schools</td>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Departments in Universities</td>
<td>Symphony Orchestras</td>
<td>Service Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3.1.3 Cultural Districts

A cultural district is a “well-recognized, labeled, mixed-use area of a city in which a high concentration of cultural facilities serves as an anchor of attraction” (Frost-Kumpf, 1998). The key words are “mixed-use area” and “anchor of attraction”. “Mixed-use area” implies development of residential, commercial, and entertainment buildings in a concerted way, while “anchor of attraction” is an idea that relies on the domino effect: once you build a cultural facility the rest will follow (Strom, 2003).

The creation of cultural districts is based on the idea that the arts are a primary tool for urban revitalization. Through the creation of a cultural district a neighborhood can achieve a beautification of the area, a more livable environment, and economic growth (Schupbach, 2003).

The idea of a possible productive cooperation between the arts and urban development started in the 1960s. At first, the idea was to group arts facilities in one spatial area as an economic development strategy. The Lincoln Center in New York is a prime example of this kind of development. However, harsh critiques about the lack of
integration between the arts buildings and surrounding community challenged the effectiveness of this idea.

Starting in the 1980s, the mixed-use area of cultural district was the new formula that aimed to integrate the arts in the surrounding community. This formula encouraged links between place marketers and cultural institutions (Strom, 2002), creating a connection between urban economy and cultural economy.

3.3.2 Foundational Concepts

Cultural industries, cultural institutions, and cultural districts are domains based on different concepts: industrial system, organizational field, and mixed-use area. Each concept represents the idea that grounds these three different approaches about culture, setting the foundations of each discourse.

3.3.2.1 Industrial System

The idea of “industrial system” is based on the segmentation of the product line and the interdependencies among firms. Hirsh (2000) offers a brief history of the cultural industry system model. In the 1940s the Frankfurt School criticized the spread of mass culture, in a time where the industry was stable, controlled and vertically integrated. Between the 1950s and 1970s the industry started a diversification and a segmentation of the product line and this is evident especially in the recording industry (R. Peterson, 1996). Finally, starting from the 1980s, a ‘mass customization’ process changed companies’ practices (Turow, 1992) trying to spread everything everywhere.

The advantage of analyzing economic actors involved in cultural activities from an industrial perspective is that “the concept of industry system takes the focus of
attention away from any single firm or role in the sequence of discovering, producing, and delivering a product, redirecting attention to the interconnections and interdependencies between them in order to get to the final product or outcome” (Hirsh, 2000, p. 356).

A large variety of approaches to the ‘cultural industries’ exist, but little has been done to treat them as part of an integrated industrial system. The works by Scott, Power, and Pratt (Hasitschka et al., 2005; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Power, 2002; Power, 2003; Power & Scott, 2004) have been groundbreaking research in delineating this important perspective.

3.3.2.2 Organizational Field

“Institutions should not be identified exclusively with organizational entities (for example, theatres, galleries, publishing houses, music labels, etc.), but also with explicit rules (for example, legal norms, established professions), forms of exchange (markets, social prestige), as well as with implicit conventions (behavioral patterns such as social roles) that constitute and stabilize professional practices” (Hasitschka et al., 2005, p. 153). This intertwined system is what Powell and DiMaggio (1991) call an “organizational field”.

“By organizational field we mean those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products” (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991, p. 64). Organizations, which operate in aggregates, form an organizational field. Those organizations are part of an institutional
life that means they are connected by having the same consumers, being regulated by the same agencies, and by producing the same products. A field is an arena of common purpose but also of strategy and conflict. The virtue of this unit of analysis is that it encompasses connectedness and structural equivalence.

3.3.2.3 Mixed-Use Area

In the 1980s the attention of urban planners focused on creating a city with well-defined urban patterns, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, and mixed-use areas, where people work, live, and shop. These sets of urban principles shaped what now is called the New Urbanism (Hall, 2002; Schaffer, 1988). This ideas emerged from Jacobs’ (1961) critique of the urban planning of the 1950s who called for reconsidering the single-use housing projects, large car-dependent areas, and segregated commercial centers.

The mixed-use area is one of the fundamental principles of New Urbanism and states that in the same area there must be shops apartments, restaurants, and entertainment facilities (NewUrbanism.org). Cultural districts represent a perfect realization of this principle.

3.3.3 Economic Functions

Each domain has its specific economic functions and they interrelate with each other: production and consumption. Production and consumption are stages in a process of cultural transaction, and are not independent. “The spaces where people consume culture are also the places where the production of culture occurs. Production and consumption are, in other words, best viewed not as separate and opposed activities but
as two necessary stages in a process of cultural transaction” (Crewe & Beaverstock, 1998, p. 305). Nevertheless, in this unity it is possible to articulate differences.

Industries and institutions are part of the production stage, with some overlaps in the consumption, while districts are involved mainly in the consumption stage. The main difference between industries and institutions is that the first mass-produces replicable objects, while the latter produces events which offer unique experiences and education.

3.3.3.1 Production

“Cultural products may be defined tentatively as ‘nonmaterial’ goods directed at a public of consumers, for whom they generally serve an aesthetic or expressive, rather than a clear utilitarian function” (Hirsh, 1972, p. 641). This definition gives a theoretical idea about how to distinguish cultural products from other commodities in the economic system. Cultural products offer entertainment, information, social display, and self-affirmation.

Hesmondhalgh (2002) claims that cultural industries are involved in the making and circulating of products that have an influence on our understanding of the world. He uses the term texts to refer to these products that are complex, ambivalent, and contested. “All cultural artifacts are texts in the very broad sense that they are open to interpretation. Cars signify, and most cars involve significant design and marketing inputs. However, the primary aim of nearly all cars is not meaning, but transport. What defines a text, then, is a matter of degree, a question of balance between its functional and communicative aspects” (Hesmondhalgh, 2002, p. 12).
Usually the definition of the products of cultural industries stresses the specificity of these products trying to differentiate them from other kinds of industrial products. In this paper, in the attempt to clarify the theoretical rationale of the policy discourses about culture, I need to differentiate the products of cultural industries from the products of cultural institutions:

- Cultural industries products are objects, replicable, and mass-produced
- Cultural institutions products are experiences, unique, and produced as events

For example, the publishing industry produces an object (a book is a material object), which is replicable (it can be reproduced) and mass-produced (numerous copies of it can be made). While an opera house, which is a cultural institution, produces an experience (a show is a sensorial participation in an activity), which is unique (it can be lived once) and it is produced as an event (every single show is different).

3.3.3.2 Consumption

Cultural districts are places for consumption of culture. Marketing literature has offered several insights for a better understanding of the consumption of culture: it is a symbolic action that offers social interactions, an entertainment experience, and it is driven by several motivations.

If cultural products have as a distinctive trait symbolic power, scholars have also looked at the consumption of those products as a symbolic action similar to rituals. “In addition to the symbolism of material artifacts or products, the actions involved in consumption may have symbolic meaning” (Gainer, 1995). Cultural events are analysed as shared consumption rituals creating bonding relationships among the consumers and
sharing symbolic meanings among producers and consumers. At the same time, however, the importance of social interactions at arts events has been also critically analysed as perpetuation of upper class dominance. “Arts events became ritual occasions for the reaffirmation of elite solidarity” (Whitt, 1987, p. 17).

For many people a cultural event is an entertainment experience that includes a wide variety of elements: easy parking, a nice neighborhood to walk through, a good choice of restaurants, lots of people, and a safe environment. “Many cultural consumers are not arts aficionados willing to go anywhere to see, say, a particular Rembrandt, but rather those for whom arts events are part of an entertainment experience” (Strom, 2002, p. 10).

Several are the motivations that drive art consumption: symbolic, social, and emotional benefits. “Art consumption can be distinguished from other forms of consumption because of the importance that the non-utilitarian, emotional aspects take on” (Botti, 2000, p. 18). In other words, art fulfils emotional needs. On this basis, marketing research for the arts is moving from demographic segmentation to psychographic and value segmentation (Thyne, 2000).

3.3.4 Interaction Mechanisms

Finally, a major difference among industries, institutions, and districts is the mechanism of interaction of their components. Industries produced cultural products through industrial systems organized in clusters; institutions produce cultural experiences through organizational fields organized in sectors; districts offer cultural consumption in mixed-use areas created by partnerships.
3.3.4.1 Clusters

Cultural industries “are frequently subject to competitive pressures that encourage individual firms to agglomerate together in dense specialized clusters or industrial districts, while at the same time their products circulate with increasing ease on global markets” (Scott, 2004, p. 462). A local system of production, employment, and social life makes up clusters of the creative field, which are geographically-structured.

“Clusters like these are replete – in the language of the economic geographer – with agglomeration economies (i.e. increasing returns effects), and agglomeration economies in turn give rise – in the language of the business economist – to potent competitive advantage” (Scott, 2001, p. 17).

Clusters have been scrutinized under several labels (Maskell & Kebir, 2006), to the point that it has become a chaotic concept (Paniccia, 2006). The common idea among the main theories is that industrial systems develop in local context where firms are linked directly by business relations and indirectly through the market for labour and for private or public services. The outcomes of a successful match of these business connections and fruitful relations with the sources of the territory are locational economies or “spillovers”.

A spatial concentration of firms working at different stages of a specific good production is key to understand what a cluster is. Overall, the idea of cluster has three

---

17 Marshall’s (1890) industrial district was the first label. His characterization was cast in terms of a simple triad of external economies: “the ready availability of skilled labour, the growth of supporting ancillary trades, and the development of a local inter-firm division of labour in different stages and branches of production” (Asheim, Cooke, & Martin, 2006) Then Beccattini (1990) applied Marshall’s concept to the particular industrial structure of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the North of Italy, stressing that the industrial district is a socio-cultural as well as economic entity. Finally, Porter (1990, 1996) used the term cluster with a particular focus on the strategies of growth and competitiveness.
main elements: first, the firms in a cluster are linked in some way; second, there is a geographical proximity of the interlinked firms; third, the firms take advantage of the sources offered by the territory in terms of labor market and services (Maskell & Kebir, 2006).

3.3.4.2 Sectors

Cultural institutions operate in three sectors: private, public, and nonprofit.

“Artistic and cultural activities in each of these sectors are organized around a set of distinct priorities and parameters established by law, custom and economic imperatives that are historically evolving” (Markusen, Wassall, DeNatale, & Cohen, 2006, p. 14). In this section, I will focus on the history of each of them.

Private Sector

As in many other sectors of American life, cultural institutions started at the private level. Private patrons (Rathbone, 1984) have nourished the cultural life of the nation with individual donations. Private foundations have supported several arts programs with grants, and since the late 1970s corporate philanthropy has been a rapidly growing area of private giving.

Nowadays the private sector of the cultural system encompasses different levels of organizational forms: galleries, theatres (i.e. Broadway), service and interest organizations (Wyszomirski & Cherbo, 2003), arts schools, donors, and agents.

Public Sector

The debate over governmental support for the arts, at federal, state, and local level has a troublesome history in America due to the longstanding ambivalence about the role
of the arts in society (Levy, 2000). Nevertheless, the government has had indirect and direct involvement in the arts. The indirect support comes from tax legislation and school funding, while the direct support comes from the national, state, and local public agencies.

Since the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in 1965, an extensive intergovernmental system for administering support for the arts has evolved. During the 1970s, the State Art Agencies (SAAs) spurred the development of local arts agencies\(^\text{18}\) making funding available for the support of their activities. Moreover, the emergence of state advocacy groups has been an important factor for the growth of state support, facilitating the creation of a network to exchange information and promote linkages among various state organizations (Dworkin, 1991).

During the past two decades SAAs have grown steadily, while the NEA’s funding has declined and stagnated (DiMaggio, 1991b). Clearly, this indicates a need for a reappraisal of the existing intergovernmental arts support system.

**Nonprofit Sector**

Two main steps of the legislature are the bases for the creation of the nonprofit sector: the tax exemption enacted in 1894 with the Revenue Act, which exempts the charitable organization from paying income taxes; and the income tax deduction enacted in 1917, which benefits the donor (Fishman, Schwarz, & Fishman, 2000).

\(^{18}\) “Americans for the Arts defines a local arts agency (LAA) as a private nonprofit organization or an agency of local government that provides services to artists and arts organizations, award grants to artists or arts organizations, participates in community cultural planning, presents programming to the public, and/or manages cultural facilities” (Davidson, 2004, p.1)
The arts world flourished in the form of nonprofit arts organizations (DiMaggio, 1986a; Wyszomirski & Cohen, 2002). The role of nonprofits’ organizations has been fundamental in the diffusion of the “high arts” and there have been interesting studies to measure their economic scope and impact (Americans for the Arts, 2002; Cohen, Schaffer, & Davidson, 2003), to understand why so much of American artistic production is nonprofit (Hansmann, 1986), and to track the history of the nonprofit organizational form in the arts (DiMaggio, 1986b).

Since the 1950s the nonprofit arts organizations have grown extensively. At first because of the massive effort made by the Ford Foundation to support the performing arts, and later because of the creation of the NEA (DiMaggio, 1986b). Today, the nonprofit arts sector encompasses not only organizations operating according to professional standards, but also organizations engaging amateurs and community groups (Wyszomirski, 2002).

3.3.4.3 Partnerships

In cultural districts, several actors are involved - cultural organizations, real estate firms, retail companies, restaurants, etc. – therefore, the creation of partnerships responds first of all to challenges of governance (Mommaas, 2004). Even though multiple forms can suit different contexts, research has pointed out the essential role of few factors for successful cultural districts: strategic coalitions (partnerships), stable funding mechanisms (e.g. sales taxes), effectiveness of regional governance, and institutionalization of publicly funded programs (Moon, 2001).
The need to create partnerships to coordinate them can be also understood looking at some explanations offered by interorganizational relations theory. Galaskiewicz (1985) reviewed several studies in interorganizational relations and identified three main explanatory concepts: resource allocation, political advocacy, and organizational legitimation. *Resource allocation* is a theory that explains organizational transactions as necessary for the procurement of adequate resources.

*Political advocacy* is an important explanation of interorganizational relations. As the legal norms of the larger society are the ultimate authority governing organizational actions, the organization will attempt to use the power of the larger social system to pass legislation more favorable to its goals.

Finally, organizations build interorganizational relations in order to enhance their *legitimacy*. In a study of board interlocks between corporations and cultural organizations in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) (J. Galaskiewicz & Rauschenbach, 1988) found that both the corporations and the cultural organizations were striving to enhance their legitimacy by aligning themselves with prestigious organizations or influential companies.

Districts have to face challenges of governance because they involve several actors. The creation of partnerships is one answer to this challenge and addresses issues of resource allocation, political advocacy, and legitimacy.
3.4 Cultural Economy

In the previous section, I drew an analytical distinction within the different discourses about culture, reviewing the primary academic literature. I categorized the different approaches and identified three domains characterized by three main differences: foundational concepts, economic functions, and interaction mechanisms.

The three domains described merge into an inclusive definition of the cultural economy. This analytical framework pulls together the differences of the three domains and draws the contour of the object of local cultural policy.

3.4.1 A Literature Review

Policy makers and scholars have been increasingly talking about the cultural economy. However, there is no agreement about what the cultural economy is (Markusen et al., 2006). Gibson and Kong (2005) offer an overview on the numerous perspectives about cultural economy explored in the literature. Attention has been focused on the sectors that make up the cultural economy, trying to classify and measure in this way the economic relevance of the cultural economy (Pratt, 1997; A. J. Scott, 2004; Wyszomirski, 2004a; Wyszomirski, 2005). The labor market has been another primary focus, following the argument that post-Fordist modes of production created flexible and creative workers which identify the cultural economy (Christopherson & Storper, 1986; C. Gibson, Murphy, & Freestone, 2002; Markusen, 2004; Markusen & Schrock, 2006; A. J. Scott, 1996). An approach that has had a lot of success, especially among policy makers and elected officials of cities, is the one that uses a “creative index” to measure cultural activities and record their impact on urban and regional economies (Florida,
Finally, some authors have looked at the convergence upon a common digital platform as the common factor to define cultural economy (Aksoy, 1992; Pratt, 2000).

Among this multifaceted literature, however, two main approaches emerge: one stressing the importance of an economic model as a tool to understand culture (economics of cultural economy), the other pointing the attention to the cultural context of the economy (signifying practices of cultural economy). In order to define the cultural economy of the cities, I will review the literature supporting these two main points of view taking into consideration their strengths and limitations in order to develop a synergetic definition of cultural economy.

3.4.1.1 Economics of cultural economy

The discussion about the economy of culture has been formed by the discipline of economics. The economic reasoning about culture aimed to collect data with statistical and econometric techniques, trying to introduce culture in the private and public choices in the use of limited resources (Peacock & Rizzo, 1994). In other words, cultural economics applies to culture the paradigm of neoclassical economics, looking at the artistic market in terms of demand and supply and applying the rational method as explanation for decision-making. “It concentrates on the production and consumption of culture (mostly the arts) characterized as purely economic processes” (Throsby, 2001, p. 11).

The roots of the subdiscipline of cultural economics are planted in economics, and are established as a distinctive area of specialization, with its own international
association, congresses, and scholarly journal. It traces its origins in the 1960s to John Kenneth Galbraith’s (1960) first writings on the economics and art, and Baumol and Bowen’s (1966) book *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma.* Since then several scholars have focused their attention to this approach and expanding theoretical and applied literature has appeared since then (Chartrand, May 16, 2007; Frey & Pommerehne, 1989; Ginsburgh & Menger, 1996; C. Gray & Heilbrun, 2000; Heilbrun & Gray, 2001; Peacock & Rizzo, 1994; Towse, 2003).

3.4.1.2 **Signifying practices of cultural economy**

The supremacy of neoclassical economics, so popular among policy makers, has been challenged by postmodern epistemologies (Du Gay & Pryke, 2002; C. Gibson & Kong, 2005) raised from the ‘cultural turn’ in the social sciences (Cook, 2000). This challenge has involved the application of critiques to orthodox economic geography and political economy (Amin & Thrift, 2004; Gibson-Graham, 1996) and the calls to acknowledge the position of the researchers who will have to spell out the perspectives and personal beliefs from which they are starting (McDowell, 1992). Most generally, this strand of work shows how culture impinges on the economic, giving an appreciation of the economy as a cultural practice.

Amin and Thrift (2004) stress the centrality of themes like passions, moral sentiments, knowledge, evolution, power, and symptoms, while Ray and Sayer (1999) highlight the turn towards discourse and away from materialism and the Marxist-influenced political economy. Furthermore, the cultural turn coincides with the decline
of socialism and the diversification of concerns from economic questions of distribution to cultural questions of recognition (Fraser, 1995).

“Doing economics means acting on the assumption of a determinate nature waiting to be described and calculated about by a neutral observation language; doing ‘cultural economy’ means acting on the assumption that economics are performed and enacted by the very discourses of which they are supposedly the cause” (Du Gay & Pryke, 2002, p. 6). Economics operates ignoring its cultural or social constitution, applying its rational system as a powerful explanatory tool (Hodgson, 2001). The power of economics is also in the fact that among economists there is almost total consensus about the scope and the content of their discipline (Throsby, 2001). On the other hand, ‘cultural economy’ starts from the assumption that a contingent cultural context creates a specific set of beliefs that makes a discipline. This claim of contingency is just a brute fact that has to be dealt with, and it is not a matter of celebration or suspicion (Du Gay and Pryke, 2002, p. 5).

Amin and Thrift (2004) explain the emerging critique to the dominance of the neoclassical economics with several reasons starting from the awareness of several ways of organizing the economy that do not coincide with the western model and getting to the realization that the methods of economics, such as the countable, the modelable, and the predictable make it difficult to understand a number of crucial dimensions. They claim that the pursuit of prosperity has always been a cultural performance, but with the growth of economics it is taken for granted that there are two activities called culture and economy. Trying to break the two apart creates epistemic monsters. “The pursuit of
prosperity must be seen as the pursuit of many goals at once, from meeting material needs and accumulating riches to seeking symbolic satisfaction and satisfying fleeting pleasure” (p. xiv).

3.4.2 My Definition

The economics of cultural economy and the signifying practices of cultural economy offer two different approaches to cultural economy more than two different definitions. They are two different logic of inquiry, one rational and quantitative, the other critical and genealogical.

One of the goals of my dissertation is to build a definition of the object of local cultural policy, with a clear contour that can be used to create a classification useful for the collection of empirical data. A clear definition will help not only to standardize the issue at stake in cultural reports, but also will help empirical research giving a better understanding of the current situations. Only after providing a clear definition, I can articulate a logic of inquiry that fulfills my purpose of research.

My purpose is to develop a research strategy that can support decision making for cultural planning, exploring the connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking. Therefore, I will develop a definition that can be operationalized and afterwards I will pick a methodology that can analyze the empirical object obtained and grasp administrative, social, and economic aspects intertwined with culture. This logic of inquiry bridges the two approaches described above as it collects the elements necessary for understanding both the economics and the signifying practices of cultural economy.
My definition is obtained by pulling together different streams of literature, focusing on three different domains: cultural industries, cultural districts and cultural institutions. After investigating their differences, I claim that it is important to look at them as a *cultural economy* rather than separate entities. The reason why I pull these different streams of literature together is that for the purpose of understanding the *cultural economy* of a city it is important to keep these perspectives in concert as an economy. In a capitalistic society, the economy is based on a market system of redistribution (Halperin, 1994) and it encompasses all the activities involved in producing, distributing and consuming goods and services in a specific area. Therefore, it is important to characterize cultural industries, districts, and institutions as an *economy* rather than as separate entities: this inclusive definition will offer a comprehensive overview of the *cultural economic* process and will provide (1) a clear object of inquiry within consumer culture, (2) an articulated illustration of the complexity of contemporary system of cultural production, (3) a comprehensive overview of the cultural economic process, and (4) an understanding of the multiple policy processes related to it.

Moreover, a nested definition can be used by any number of different constituencies: arts advocacy groups, trade associations, artists’ service organizations, foundations and philanthropists, educators, state and local governments’ cultural affairs, economic development, and workforce development agencies (Markusen et al., 2006).

3.4.2.1 Consumer Culture

“Whether the ‘cultural is embedded in the economic’, or vice versa, it is becoming more and more difficult to determine where the *cultural economy* begins and
the rest of the capitalist economic order ends” (Evans, 2001, p. 133). On the one hand culture is increasingly subject to commodification and its empirical manifestations have the characteristics of commodities; on the other hand contemporary capitalism has the tendency to infuse outputs with aesthetic and semiotic content. These considerations lead to think that contemporary capitalism can be overall described as a cultural economy.

The concept of ‘consumer culture’ (Baudrillard, 1981) encapsulates the notion that consumption is deeply cultural, therefore an economic analysis needs to focus on this signifying process. However, Warde (2002) finds that it is easy to exaggerate the aesthetic component of consumption and overstate the importance of culture in economic relation of production. The outputs of the cultural industries are greater than in the past, but this does not imply the cultural saturation of everyday life nor the attenuation of the logic of economic practice.

When I looked at the economic functions of the three domains, I used Hesmondhalgh’s definition of cultural products as texts to differentiate cultural product from other industrial products. “All cultural artifacts are texts in the very broad sense that they are open to interpretation. Cars signify, and most cars involve significant design and marketing inputs. However, the primary aim of nearly all cars is not meaning, but transport. What defines a text, then, is a matter of degree, a question of balance between its functional and communicative aspects. Texts (songs, narratives, performances) are heavy on signification and tend to be light on functionality and they are created with this communicative goal in mind” (Hesmondhalgh, 2002, p. 12). Texts, or cultural products
have an influence on our understanding of the world, and their communicative aspects override their functionality.

Cultural products have an influence on our understanding of the world and “in contrast to pure economic goods, the economic function and the symbolic function of cultural goods coexist and interact” (Frey & Pommerehne, 1989). Cultural industries, institutions and districts take in consideration this specificity of cultural products and define a contour of the cultural economy that differentiate it from the overall contemporary capitalism.

3.4.2.2 Complexity of Contemporary System of Cultural Production

Williams (Williams, 2004) offers an historical overview of the development of cultural production. He identifies three main eras: patronage (from the middle ages until the nineteenth century when aristocrats would support artists), market professional (from the early nineteenth century onwards when more and more work was sold through intermediaries), and corporate professional (from the early twenties when the cultural production field expanded immensely). Hesmondhalgh (2002) suggests a change of the latter label to avoid confusion where corporate would be interpreted as large private companies. Therefore, he suggests the term complex professional because the word complex points to one of the most important features of this era which is the complexity of systems involved in cultural production. “The term refers to social relations between symbol creator and patrons or businesses, but it also describes an era of cultural production, encompassing associated issues of company ownership and structure, cultural policy and regulation, and communication technologies” (Hesmondhalgh, 2002, p. 51).
So the term refers to a whole set of conditions necessary to cultural production.

Patronage and market professional forms continue to exist, so the term complex professional refers to a mix of different form.

The complexity of the contemporary system of cultural production described by Williams and Hesmondhalgh can be articulated in the three domains previously described: industries, districts, and institutions. In American society these three domains illustrate and articulate the complexity of *cultural economy* in the cities.

### 3.4.2.3 Policy Breadth

Defining *cultural economy* as a single unit allows to see the multiple policy processes involved: different policy areas, outcomes, and geographic units (see Table 3.4). Industries are addressed by economic development policy, with the profit as outcome and the region as geographic unit. Districts are framed by urban policy which aims to the vitality of a neighborhood. Institutions are structured by cultural policy and educational policy animated by social values. “Because demand is fueled by higher education, the shape of the university system – the site of the most vigorous debates over the status of high culture – will also have important implications for the direction in which the cultural economy evolves” (DiMaggio, 2000).
Table 3.4 - Policy Breadth

A better understanding of the multiple policies intertwined in *cultural economy* allows to avoid ineffective strategies developed from the illusion that “one size fits all” (Pratt, 2005, p. 35). For instance, possible consequences of the understanding of the different layers of policy involved in *cultural economy* are to work across governmental sectors, and to expand the expertise of cultural policy makers.

3.4.2.4 Overview of the Cultural Economic Process

An inclusive definition of *cultural economy* offers a comprehensive overview of the cultural economic process putting together the production and consumption stages, the different production systems, products, and mechanisms. It is important to point out that production and consumption are stages in a process of cultural transaction, and they are not independent. “The spaces where people consume culture are also the places where the production of culture occurs. Production and consumption are, in other words, best viewed not as separate and opposed activities but as two necessary stages in a process of cultural transaction” (Crewe & Beaverstock, 1998, p.305). Nevertheless, in this unity it is possible to articulate differences (see Table 3.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Production Systems</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mass production</td>
<td>Object Replicable</td>
<td>Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>Event production</td>
<td>Experience + Education</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>Sectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 - Economic process

Industries and institutions are part of the production stage, with some overlaps in the consumption, while districts are involved mainly in the consumption stage. The main difference between industries and institutions is that the first mass-produces replicable objects, while the latter produces events which offers unique experiences and education. Moreover, industries operate in clusters, districts in partnerships, and institutions in sectors.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, a multidisciplinary approach exposed me to a variety of literature: a multidisciplinary investigation based on a pluralistic conception of culture (Gans, 1999), claiming that both pop-culture and high-culture need to be taken in consideration in order to portrait the cultural life of a place. This attempt to navigate the theoretical confusion created by the multiple rationales used in local cultural policy reports (1) helps to clarify the language utilized through an understanding of the theoretical rationale behind it and (2) draws the boundaries of the object of inquiry.
Industries are organizations founded on the concept of industrial system, focused on mass-production and interacting in clusters; institutions are shaped in organizational fields, characterized by event-production and interacting in sectors; finally, districts are mixed-use areas, mainly dedicated to consumption and interacting through partnerships. On top of these differences, described in detail along the chapter, the three domains are involved in three different types of policies that aim to different values as outcomes of their actions. Industries are addressed by economic policy, with the profit as outcome and the region as geographic unit. Institutions are structured by cultural and educational policy animated by social values. Districts are framed by urban policy that aims to increase the vitality of distressed neighborhood. Moreover, each type of policy is usually carried out by different departments of the city government and utilizes different methods and discourses. Table 3.1, at the beginning of the chapter, summarizes the characteristics of this three domains: the different disciplines that illustrated them, the definitions that described them, and the three main theoretical elements that differentiate them – foundational concepts, economic functions, interaction mechanisms - which implies different policy types.

If the analysis of their differences helps to clarify the language and the theoretical rationale implied, pulling them together helps to draw the boundaries of the object of attention of local cultural policy, displaying a clear and inclusive image. Industries, institutions, and districts merge into an inclusive definition of cultural economy of the American cities. I drew from the academic disciplines the definition of their objects of
inquiry and I considered them the three slices that form cultural economy of an American city.

This inclusive definition brings a lot of organizations and activities as the focus of attention of local cultural policy. Industries develop cultural activities such as Advertising, Architecture and Design, Audiovisual, Photography, and Publishing. Example of institutions are Local Arts Agencies (LAAS), Arts Schools, Arts Departments in Universities, Associations, Museums, theatres, Symphony Orchestras, Community Organizations, Arts Schools, Galleries, Service Organizations, and Interest Groups. Finally, districts are areas with cultural facilities, artist’s work/space, apartments, stores and restaurants. A schematic view of the breadth of organizations encompassed by the three domains can be found under the category “definition” in Table 1.
4.1 Methodology: Rationale

4.1.1 Cultural Economy and the territory

In the previous chapter, I drew an analytical distinction among the different discourses about *cultural economy* that are mobilized in policymaking. In particular, digging in academic research, I systematically categorized the different approaches identifying three domains - industries, institutions, and districts - and their main differences. I also highlighted the two main approaches to *cultural economy*: one rational and quantitative, focusing on the economics of *cultural economy*; the other one critical and genealogical, focusing on the signifying practices of *cultural economy*. After articulating the definition of *cultural economy*, I need to choose a lens of analysis that can locate it on the territory and grasp its connections with administrative, political, social, and economic elements. In other words, I need to select a logic of inquiry that can be the basis for an integration of the two main approaches represented in the literature, as it will
collect the elements that can enable to see both the economics and the signifying practices of cultural economy.

The need to locate cultural economy on the territory comes from the goal to define it within specific jurisdictional boundaries, as they are one of the major criteria that define the mechanism of urban policymaking. However, the attention to location and territory is based also on theories that emphasize the relationships between culture, economy and places. “The relationship between culture and economy is dialectical, for while local cultures contribute to the nature of economic activity, economic activity is also part of the culture-generating and innovation in particular places” (Kong, 2000).

In particular, Scott (Scott, 2001) claims that the city functions as an ecology of commodified symbolic production and consumption, creating intertwined relations between the urban landscape and the goods and services produced there. “In an ecology like this, moreover, there will tend to be powerful and recursively intertwined relations between the meanings that adhere to the urban landscape and the symbologies of the goods and services produced in the local area” (Scott, 2001).

Culture and economy influence each other in a particular place. For instance, in a city there are symbolic relations between the urban landscape and its production and consumption. These observations, added to the policy implications of land boundaries, makes emerge the concept of space as fundamental to study the multiple aspects of a place.
4.1.2 Spatiality

Scholars looking at space and its relationship with social aspects, used the term *spatiality* to refer to these ties. *Spatiality* highlights how “space is inseparable from social processes and relations” (Pavlovskaya, 2006, p. 2015). Given the “land-oriented character of local politics” (Oliver, 2003, p. 326) and the territorial dimension of the ‘culture-economy nexus’ (Henriques & Thiel, 2000), I will focus on space as glue that brings together the three domains of the *cultural economy* of American cities.

In the 1980s human geography and social theory found a common ground that put the interconnections between social relations and spatial structures as a central focus of inquiry. “As a result of these changes, spatial structure is now seen not merely as an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather as a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced” (Gregory & Urry, 1985, p. 3). Society and space have reciprocal and dialectic effects on each other (Wildner & Tamayo, 2004), and this theory is particularly insightful for the analysis of the urban space.

In a city the space is built and socially produced. Urban space is the result of human design that plans the land use and the built form. “The design of the built environment is an important element of the productive forces of society, not just a reflection of them” (Knox, 1987, p. 356). Urban space is the transformation of natural space, but also function as a productive force itself. “The space of physical nature is thus appropriated in the social production of *spatiality* – it is literally made social” (Soja, 1985, p. 93).
The concept of *spatiality* is used to refer to socially-produced space, where landforms and social relations influence each other, and as such is an important analytical lens to understand urban dynamics. This production of space can be described as both the medium and outcome of social action and relationship. In this way *spatiality* becomes apparent as a concrete arena of social dynamics.

This theory is considered the retheorisation of *spatiality*. Its formative roots are found in the conceptualization of the production of space developed by Henri Lefebvre. Some of his ideas influenced a parallel movement, that can be labeled Marxist geography, which greatly emphasized the connection between class struggle and spatial problematic. “The retheorisation of *spatiality* is being built upon this increasing demystification and politicization of *spatiality* in social practice. Its fundamental premise is that *spatiality* is the real manifestation of social relations rather than their incidental reflection or mirror, that social space is where the reproduction of society is located and where it must accordingly be acted upon and progressively transformed. The alleged categorical opposition of space and class is being replaced by a transformative notion of spatial *praxis*: the active and informed attempt by spatially-conscious social actors to reconstitute the embracing *spatiality* of social life” (Soja, 1985, p. 114).

My research focuses on the organizational structure of *cultural economy*. Mapping its elements is a critical inquiry that informs spatially these specific kinds of social practices and opens up opportunity of investigations of the relationship with other social practices. It is an invitation to social actors, from urban planners to cultural policy
makers, to take in account the *spatiality* of their projects: a dimension where space and social practice are intertwined and one cannot be considered without the other\textsuperscript{19}.

4.2 Method: Case Study Research

4.2.1 Case Study Research

As a method of inquiry, in my dissertation I utilize case study research. There are several ways to think about what style of research is a case study. “The case study is a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 534). I understand the case study research as a in-depth analysis of more then one single settings or units and a case as examples of the unit of analysis employed in a given study (Collier, Brady, & Seawright, 2004). A case is a theoretical construct that is studied in-depth and is observed in empirical units. The theoretical construct is the answer to “What is this a case of?” (Ragin & Becker, 1992), and an empirical unit is a spatially bounded phenomenon, observed in a single point in time (Gerring, 2004). My theoretical construct is the organizational structure of *cultural economy* in its spatial relationship with the urban territory and my empirical unit is the American city and the time period is the contemporary era. Within a unit there are several levels of analysis, and in my research the levels within the unit/city are industries, districts, and institutions (Eisenhardt, 1989).

\textsuperscript{19} For studies pushing the notion of *spatiality* even further as explanatory theory, see Hutton (2006) and Soja(2000). Hutton studies the influence of spatiality on industry development in the inner city; Soja investigates the “industry-shaping power of spatiality”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>My Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study research</td>
<td>In-depth analysis of more than one single setting or unit</td>
<td>Organizational structure of the Cultural Economy and its relations with urban policymaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Theoretical construct that is studied in depth and is observed in empirical units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical unit</td>
<td>Spatial bounded phenomenon, observed in a single point in time</td>
<td>• American city • Contemporary era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>Within each single unit there are several levels of analysis</td>
<td>• Industries • Districts • Institutions • Relationships with urban policymaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 - Case study research elements

4.2.2 Case Study Research Design

“A research design is the logic that links the data to be collected (and the conclusion to be drawn) to the initial questions of study” (Yin, 2003, p. 19). The research design is a work plan that helps to avoid the collection of evidence which does not address the research questions. It helps to keep the research on the right track while collecting data.

Yin claims that five components are especially important for a research design: study’s questions, its proposition, its unit of analysis, the logic linking the data, and the criteria for interpreting the findings (Table 4.2).
### Study’s Questions

- What is the organizational structure of the local *cultural economy*?
- Is the local *cultural economy* connected with urban policymaking?
- How can I study its relations with the territory and urban policymaking?
- How can I deal with the complex articulation of urban policymaking?

### Proposition

Inform decision making, developing a **research strategy** that can help the policy formulation step of the policy process of cultural planning.

1. Develop a definition of *cultural economy* that can be operationalized.
2. Identify *cultural economy* on the territory to track its connections with political, social, and economic aspects, with a peculiar attention to the process of policymaking.

### Unit

- City (and suburbs)

### Logic linking data

- the policy process has five basic steps
- research for policy should be a thick description of the real world
- cultural planning should be integrated into urban policymaking
- from space to place, through *spatiality*, create connection among social, economic and cultural aspects

### Criteria interpreting the data

- Description of the city government structure
- Search for the involvement of arts and culture in the policy process
- Identification of actors of the cultural scene
- Induction of the conception of what arts and culture are
- Presence of the three domains, distribution and patterns of each of them, spatial patterns of each single category, and predominance of a category (= analysis of the *spatiality* of the *cultural economy*)
- Most and least, density within areas which boundaries have a jurisdictional connotation (= analysis of the connections of the *cultural economy* with urban policymaking)

---

**Table 4.2 - Research Design Components**
Study’s questions

The main question that my research is addressing reads: what method can help to integrate cultural planning into urban policymaking? In order to explore this topic I need to deal with (1) the lack of a clear understanding of what is the topic of cultural planning, that I rephrased as what is the organizational structure of the cultural economy of American cities and (2) the need of a research strategy able to track the presence of cultural economy in a city and identify its connections with the different aspects of the territory. I proceeded tackling two sets of questions:

1. one considering the necessity to pull together the perspectives developed from different disciplines in the effort define the organizational structure of cultural economy and aiming to build an inclusive theoretical framework

Cultural Economy

- What is the organizational structure of the local cultural economy?
- What are the different elements of the cultural economy that each single discipline makes to emerge?
- What are the policy implications of a synergetic map?

2. The other one emerging from the idea that mapping is the visualization of selected elements on a cartography and in so doing displays new points of attention, allows to see connections in the complexity of reality, and unfolds potentials (Corner, 1999)

Mapping: Cultural Economy and Urban Policymaking

- What is the relationship of cultural economy with the territory?
- What are the existing and possible connections with urban policymaking?
Its proposition (plan, proposal)

In order to be able to plan for the development of cultural economy of their city, policy makers need a tool that allows them to map the current situation in their city, and visualize the possible area of intervention. Mapping is a powerful informative research tool that draws a clear picture of the reality and identifies new opportunities. A cultural plan is more likely to tackle the needs of the city and its cultural community if informed with the context specific picture offered by mapping. In other words, the proposition of my research is to build a research strategy which informs the stage of policy formulation in the overall policy process. In particular, the case studies will allow me to show a couple of examples of how this strategy works.

Its unit of analysis

In Chapter 2, I enhanced the complexity of the geographical unit “city” in America. I explained some issues related to metropolitan governance which are related to local fragmentation and urban morphology highly influenced by suburbanization. This means that there is not an agreement on the political or economic unit that is implied when mentioning the name of a city. Therefore, each of my cases will require a specific explanation.

The logic linking the data

The data collected must be linked to the purpose of the study. The logic that links the data I am collecting to the purpose of my study is based on the idea that the policy process has five basic steps; research for policy should be a thick description of the real world, and aims to integrate cultural planning into urban policymaking and create
connection among social, economic and cultural aspects (from space to place, through *spatiality*).

**The criteria for interpreting the findings**

The findings will be interpreted using several criteria: description of the city government structure, search for the involvement of arts and culture in the policy process, identification of actors of the cultural scene, induction of the conception of what arts and culture are, presence of the three domains, distribution and patterns of each of them, spatial patterns of each single category, and predominance of a category (= analysis of the *spatiality* of *cultural economy*), most and least, density within areas which boundaries have a jurisdictional connotation (= analysis of the connections of *cultural economy* with urban policymaking).

4.3 Unit of Analysis

In the section about the rationale of my methodology, I referred to *spatiality* as a concept to understand space as socially produced, medium and outcome of social actions. Another consideration necessary for understanding space is the construction of scalar identities: an important conceptualization underlying the discussion that aims to replace urban policies with policies for metropolitan regions.

Given the increasing sensitivity to the production of new state spaces, the debate in human geography about scale claims the need to unpack the territorial hierarchies and territorial discourses in order to act upon contemporary political, economic and environmental changes (Jonas, 1994; Jonas, 2006; Leitner & Miller, 2007). In this
section, I will explore the implications of picking the city as unit of analysis, which is a specific scale of thinking about space, and will explain my choice for Columbus and its suburbs.

4.3.1 The City

What is a city in America? Tangled urban morphology and political fragmentation, as results of the suburbanization that took place in the past fifty years, redefined the city in the United States (Lewis, 1996; Oliver, 2003; Rusk, 2003). “Despite the enormity of this change, we know very little about how suburbanization is shaping American political life, particularly at the local level” (Olivier, p. 312). The political implications of this fragmentation are not well understood. The study of urban politics continues to focus on large central cities. “Although most Americans now live in suburban areas, most political scientists concerned with local affairs continue to focus on the politics of large central cities. As a result, our knowledge of suburban politics is far behind what it should be” (Oliver, 2003).

There is not agreement on the political or economic unit implied when mentioning the name of a city. Often times, people mention a city and imply either the central city and its suburbs or the city’s metropolitan area, referring to cities without giving consideration to their specific legal boundaries, preferring instead to focus on their larger social and economic dynamics. When speaking about Pittsburgh or New York or Columbus, people consider each as a city broadly speaking, not as a specific legal entity. But this is not a technicality without consequences. A thorough understanding of urban policymaking cannot afford to be simplistic.
As political entities, cities must be understood in their organizational structure (i.e. the large central city or municipality). As economic entities, cities must be viewed as larger territory and studied as metropolitan statistical areas (MSA). As historical entities, they must be reconsidered through the recent change caused by suburbanization, looking at a local political entity that encompasses the central city and its suburbs (county). No single focus will do\(^20\).

4.3.2 Columbus and its Suburbs

The choice of the city as unit of analysis requires a detailed explanation of the political boundaries taken in consideration. In my case study, at first, I considered the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)\(^21\). Many scholars consider the MSA as the best unit of study for an understanding of places (Orfield, 2002; Rusk, 2003) because social and economic problems tend to be area-wide rather than jurisdiction-wide. “Any attack on urban social and economic problems must treat suburb and city as indivisible parts of a whole” (Rusk, 2003, p. 7) Columbus MSA comprises 8 counties: Union, Delaware, Morrow, Licking, Fairfield, Pickaway, Madison, and Franklin. However, I discarded the idea because the MSA is not a political entity, therefore it does not help to gain insights on the urban policy bureaucratic mechanism. Moreover, the main elements that created

\(^{20}\) For a perspective showing the new political spaces for cities created by interurban networks see *The City is Dead, Long Live the Net* (Leitner & Sheppard, 2002).

\(^{21}\) As mentioned in Chapter 2, the census defines an MSA as a central city of at least 50,000 residents and the surrounding counties that have a high degree of social and economic integration with that nucleus. Within metropolitan areas, the census categorizes places as being either the central or the noncentral city (suburbs).
the bond between culture and urban policymaking are connected to municipal-specific political goals: branding, urban revitalization, and community development.22

The other option was to focus on the **county** as significant unit of analysis because it would represent the historical transformation of the city including the territory of the central city and its economic influential suburbs. For example, Franklin county encompasses the city of Columbus territory plus the territory of its suburbs. However, there is not evident connection between cultural planning and the outcomes connected to it and the policy making developed at county level. Therefore, the same reasons that led me to discard the MSA as unit of analysis were valuable also in the case of the county: branding, urban revitalization, and community development are objective that can be pursued by policy at city level.

Discarded the county and the MSA, nevertheless I could not consider only the municipality of Columbus as unity of analysis, but I had to take in consideration its **suburbs** as well, given the peculiar morphology of Columbus area. The growth of suburbs and the process of annexation that allowed the boundaries of the inner city to follow the economic development, have created numerous municipalities within the metropolitan area.

Following this rapid territorial growth, the city of Columbus has several suburbs (see **Figure 4**) that give to the territory a tangled morphology. Some of them are located around the edge of the city (Westerville, New Albany, Gahanna, Reynoldsburg, Pickerington, Canal Winchester, Groveport, Obetz, Grove City, Hilliard, Dublin, and

---

22 See Chapter 1, “The Creative City” Agenda
Powell) and some of them are included within its territory but they have their own political governance (Worthington, Whitehall, Bexley, Grandview Heights, Upper Arlington). Additionally, there is New Rome which is an unincorporated area.

Figure 4: Columbus and its Suburbs

The growth of suburbs and the process of annexation that allowed the boundaries of the inner city to follow the economic development have created numerous municipalities within the metropolitan area. In Ohio, municipalities with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants are called villages, while bigger ones are called cities (see Figure 4).

The choice of mapping Columbus and its suburbs has been made keeping in mind the purpose of my research that is to offer a strategy for integrating cultural planning and
urban policymaking. Gathering information about the overall urban territory will give a comprehensive understanding of the situation and will help the municipality to deal with the political fragmentation.

4.4 Data collection

4.4.1 Documents

In collecting the data for my case studies, important sources are documents of different kinds: plans, city reports, and monographic studies. Documents analysis is one of the most used method in studying political phenomena (Johnson & Reynolds, 2005). Informal interviews with members of the city government bureaucracy and of the cultural scene will give the background information that points towards documents that are useful for my research.

4.4.2 Data sets

4.4.2.1 Classification

In the previous chapter about cultural economy, I provided a definition for each of the domains: industries, institutions, and districts. In order to be able to collect data about each of these domains, I need to create a classification\(^{23}\) of their components. In other words, I need classification criteria that will lead the collection of data in groups of establishments (see Table 4.3).

\(^{23}\) For conceptual issues about an economic classification see Conceptual Issues (Economic Classification Policy Committee, 1993)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial system</td>
<td>• Organizational filed</td>
<td>• Mixed-use area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replicable products</td>
<td>• Events</td>
<td>• Culture: main anchor of attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clusters</td>
<td>• Sectors</td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product**

Broader categories that reflect production, distribution, and consumption

**Organizational function**

Broader categories that reflect the type of activities/functions within the cultural world

**Area**

Governance

| 1. Advertising       | 6. Museums and galleries | Governance |
| 3. Audiovisual (TV, Radio, Film, Recording) | 8. Schools | Boundaries |
| 4. Photography       | 9. Community organization |
| 5. Publishing        | 10. Services (agents, booking agencies...) |

Table 4.3 – Domains, Classification Criteria and Groupings

The first criteria for the classification are the characteristics identified for each domain in the theoretical framework defining cultural economy (see previous chapter).

For the cultural industries are: clusters of establishments working on the same production line, and distributing replicable cultural products. For the cultural institutions: three economic-legal sectors, comprised of different entities working on production, distribution, and consumption of cultural events. Finally, for cultural districts: partnerships of different kind of actors settling in the same area, where cultural amenities are the anchor of attraction.

Within each domain, organizations are grouped following specific classification criteria. For industries the classification is facilitated by the numerous literature in
economic geography and the data set collected by AFTA offers an excellent starting point. In addition, the idea of clusters facilitates the grouping towards one product and suggests a spatial analysis. Therefore, drawing from the existing literature, I identified five products and for each of them a category of industry: advertising, architecture and design, audiovisuals, photography, and publishing. I decided not to include fashion and furniture, but I believe that these products have a huge symbolic value and need to be considered in future studies. On the other hand, I considered retail stores part of an industry (for instance, I counted Blockbuster as part of the audiovisual industries), as I consider an industry a collective name which includes all the establishments involved in the value chain of a product, from production to distribution and consumption.

For institutions the classification is more challenging. Traditionally, literature about cultural institutions did not have a classification approach, but focused on the sectors or form of organizations (DiMaggio, 1983; DiMaggio, 1991a). The aim seemed to be always to spell out the structural relations rather than list or measure them. Lately, the focus changed, however, the attempts to create a classification either did not collected empirical data (Cherbo & Wyszomirski, 2000; Wyszomirski & Cherbo, 2003; Wyszomirski, 2005) or used overaggregated data (Americans For the Arts, 2002). Finally, data about institutions are scattered and a lot of them are statistically invisible because either are embedded in other institutions or are so called “minimalist organizations”24.

24 DiMaggio (2006) points out that several nonprofit programs are embedded within organizations that are not considered producers or distributors of the arts, such as churches, universities, community
My choice for the description of cultural institutions was to building off the traditional definitional perspective of public, nonprofit and private sectors. However, even though this definition explains the dynamics of the institutional domain of the cultural reality, it is inadequate for a classification which purpose is to provide elements for a spatial analysis of distribution of institutions in a city. Therefore, drawing from the arts administration literature, which focuses on the organizational structure, I created a classification with categories of organizations determined by their “organizational functions”: artworks exhibition (museums and galleries), live performance (performing arts companies and presenters), education (schools), community well-being (community organizations), and general support services (services). In so doing, the categories blur the boundaries between the three sectors, showing how an organizational field works through the interaction of them. The division in sectors was useful to illustrate the elements of the interaction mechanism of organizational fields, but this revised categorization helps to identify the different typologies of cultural services and analyze their distribution over the city territory. In addition, it keeps the organizations as point of attention, continuing along the line of the arts administration tradition.

development organizations, or youth-assistance programs. Also, DiMaggio (2006) defines “minimalist organizations” as “unincorporated associations with minimal or intermittent program activities, part-time or volunteer staff, and tiny budgets” (DiMaggio, 2006, p. 433). For a reflection of the economic role of small-scale groups, see Toepler, S. (2003), Grassroots Associations Versus Larger Nonprofits: New Evidence from a Community Case Study in Arts and Culture, Nonprofit and Voluntary Quarterly, 32 (2), 236-251.
I recognize that this classification system has some limitations, as the drawing of boundaries never really makes justice of the *continuum* of reality\textsuperscript{25}. There are establishments that for some characteristics would belong to a group and for other characteristics would belong to another. Overlaps can occur between two domains. For example, on a closer inspection we can see how the publishing industries can be organized in a small nonprofit institutions, so there is an overlap between the industries domain and the institutions domain. Also, architecture firms can produce products which are unique. Additionally, if we focus on the art form\textsuperscript{26} these boundaries should be neglected. For example, music organizations can be found in the industries domain in the category audiovisuals, but also in the institutional domain under the categories performing arts companies, school and community organizations.

Finally, within the same domain, there are also mutual relationships among categories. Industries often time collaborate together, at several levels. “There is a strong mutually reinforcing relationship between activities such as publishing, film, music and television. For example, there are clear inter-dependencies of technologies, labor markets, and content between these activities” (Pratt, 1997, p. 9).

Despite some limitations, this classification system seems to serve in an appropriate way the need of mapping *cultural economy*. “The overriding objective for a

\textsuperscript{25} The limitations of classifications are often pointed out in the literature: “Strict classifications are made extremely hard by the crossovers between many of the firms in each category” (Power, 2002, p. 111).

\textsuperscript{26} As examples of case studies focusing on the single art form see: for music *The Economic Impact of Seattle's Music Industry* (Beyers, Bonds, Wenzl, & Sommers, 2004); for motion picture *The Community Dynamics of Entrepreneurship: The Birth of the American Film Industry* (Mezias & Kuperman, 2000) and *Flexible Specialization and Regional Industrial Agglomerations: The Case of the U.S. Motion Picture Industry* (Storper & Christopherson, 1987).
classification is to develop a system that meets user needs” (Economic Classification Policy Committee, 1993, p. 27). The operationalization of the framework, obtained compiling the main approaches offered by the literature, provides an inclusive big picture. This can be utilized as a starting point for more detailed studies, exploring the overlaps between the domains and their categories.

A special consideration should be given to the data about districts. A cultural district is a “well-recognized, labeled, mixed-use area of a city in which a high concentration of cultural facilities serves as anchor of attraction” (Frost-Kumpf, 1998). A variety of names have been identify to refer to cultural districts: arts district, cultural arts sector, arts and entertainment district, arts and science district, downtown cultural district, avenue of the arts and artists’ district (Frost-Kumpf, 2001).

Besides the different labels, there are several types of districts. Americans for the Arts (Frost-Kumpf, 1998) classifies the different types of cultural districts looking at their focus: cultural compounds, major arts institution, arts and entertainment, downtown, and cultural production. The focus of the district is its most prominent attractions. “The formality of the classification may range from consistently applied nomenclature in planning and promotional documents to a legal designation in a zoning ordinance” (Frost-Kumpf, 1998). Areas of a city (or multiple cities) can be identified as cultural districts by:

---

27 In the UK scholars use the term Cultural Quarters (Roodhouse, 2006)
• a government agency (i.e. Arts and Entertainment District Program, Maryland\textsuperscript{28})
• a private development group (i.e. Avenue of the Arts, Philadelphia\textsuperscript{29})
• a promotional bureau or planning authority (i.e. Gateway Arts District, Prince George County\textsuperscript{30})

For the purpose of my research, I will use these labels and look for all kinds of typology to identify cultural districts in Columbus and its suburbs. The main objective is to identify their location on the territory of the city.

4.4.2.2 Sources

After facing the difficulties linked to the lack of organized data about arts and culture\textsuperscript{31}, I decided to compile a database of industries and institutions listings using pre-existing data sets. The two major sources are (1) the database pulled together by American for the Arts (AFTA) using Dun & Bradstreet’s national database\textsuperscript{32} and (2) the Unified Database of Arts Organizations (UDAO) created by a partnership between the National Center of Charitable Statistics (NCCS), the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and The National Assembly of State Arts Agency and distributed by the Urban Institute.

\textsuperscript{28} For more information about the Maryland Art and Entertainment District Program and a list of cultural district in Maryland see http://www.msac.org/programs.cfm?sec=Programs&id=232, retrieved January 31, 2008.
\textsuperscript{32} Dun & Bradstreet’s national database lists 13.3 million active businesses and 135 million employees in the United States. It is recognized as the most comprehensive and trusted source for businesses profiles and listings by both global industry associations and the U.S. Federal Government.
For districts, given that they are defined by different legal characteristics (e.g., institutional governance, business organization, etc.), the sources to identify them are of several kinds. The starting point was a list compiled by American for the Arts using the data collected with a national survey in 2006. Afterwards, I consulted the Census of Governments (US Census Bureau, 2005), and I proceeded with an exploration of the websites and phone calls of the local arts agencies, the convention & visitors bureaus, the Franklin County and the city halls of each municipality. Keyword searches on the internet and word-of-mouth referrals from the field were also informative sources.

4.5 Context Analysis

Mintzberg (1994), in his book *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*, points out that beyond planning, an important task for planners is to understand their context. “We have also learned about our need to solidify our descriptive understanding of complex phenomena-and to face up to our ignorance of them-before we leap into prescription” (p. 416).

Mintzberg’s claims are based on his vision of the policy process and the consequent role of policy research. Policymaking research “should be rich in real-world description and not obsessed with rigor” (Mintzberg, 1979, p. iv). Description, supported by research in underlying fields such as cognitive psychology, organizational sociology and political science, offers to practitioners the knowledge necessary to prescribe. In fact, the best prescription comes from the application of conceptual knowledge about a phenomenon in a specific context. “I am firmly convinced that the best route to more
effective policy making is better knowledge in the mind of the practitioner of the world he or she actually faces” (p. vi).

In order to describe the context for cultural planning in a city, I focus on the official policy makers (the city government: its department and activities), the actors of the arts and culture scene, and the conception of what arts and culture are (the nongovernmental participants to cultural policy).

4.6 GIS Analysis

“GIS analysis lets you see patterns and relationships in your geographic data. The results of your analysis will give you insight into a place, help you focus your actions, or help you to choose the best option” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 9). GIS is a process for looking at patterns and relationships in your data. This analytical process consists in mapping, describing, and interpreting.

Spatial analysis is thought as more sophisticated than mapping. In this way we miss how mapping and analysis are intimately linked (Mitchell, 1999). Mapping makes some elements emerge from the complex territory and displays relationships. This means that mapping is already an analytical tool. However, the analysis can be pushed further: narrative description and interpretation will articulate some insights emerging from the maps.

4.6.1 Beyond The Existing Mapping Reports

Since the late 1990s, a flourishing of mapping reports have appeared all over the world, proving the growing interest of mapping cultural economy in research and policy
making (see Table 4.43). The main purposes of these mapping reports are to provide visibility of the sector, identify its social and economic potentials, and show its impact on different constituencies.

33 The table has been compiled putting together the reports analyzed in the most recent publications: Guide to Producing Regional Mappings of the Creative Industries (2007) and Australia’s Creative Economy: Mapping Methodologies (2007).
Table 4.4 - Mapping Reports

The United Kingdom pioneered the adoption of the term mapping to refer to diagnostics made for the sector in term of measuring its contribution to the economy.

“Mappings are studies aimed at diagnosing a given situation by identifying its constituent elements, the relations between them and the results of such interactions.” (Prada Rios, Martinez, Taborda Figueroa, Vallejo, & Soto Builes, Yair de Jesus, 2007). Mapping the
Creative Industries (1998) was the first attempt to systematically measure the contribution of the entire group of creative industries in a national economy.

The mapping reports produced since then, have been focusing on measurement using two main approaches: measurement of the industries (employment generated, characteristics of the firms, and outputs) and measurement of the occupations. Overall, their main objective is the analysis of economic trends and impacts. Lately, the occupational approach has been very successful, given the importance of employment in the political agenda.

The objective of my study is different: by mapping I do not mean measurement, but the actual creation of a cartography that draws cultural economy into the city territory. First of all, I identified cultural economy, developing a definition that guides me in collecting and grouping the organizations; secondly, I will layer the cartographies of cultural economy and of the territory of the city, to facilitate an integration within urban policymaking and identify problems and opportunities for policy development at local level.

Drawing upon the existing mapping reports’ purposes, I will develop a map that is a visualization of the data about cultural economy: I will identify the locations of the establishments for each single domain and, afterwards, I will analyze the visualization of these data looking at their relationships with the overall urban plans and the political boundaries. It is a spatial analysis of the data, based on the ideas that (1) there is a “land-oriented character of local politics” (Oliver, 2003, p. 326)), that (2) the ‘culture-economy
nexus’ has a territorial dimension (Henriques & Thiel, 2000), and that (3) “space is inseparable from social processes and relations” (Pavlovskaya, 2006, p. 2015).

4.6.2 Mapping as Geographic Visualization

A visualization of cultural economy can make evident the relationship between culture (cultural economy), government (urban policymaking), and spatiality (land forms and social relations influence each other). I move forward from the meaning given to mapping by the existing reports. By mapping I mean not just a diagnostics of the sector but also its visualization on a cartography34. After collecting the listings about the three domains of cultural economy - industries, institutions, and districts - I will map them using the geographic information system (GIS), creating cartographies that visualize their location and distribution over the city territory. Maps, as cartography, are data visualizations essential for making sense of spatial distributions (Desai, Greenbaum, & Kim, forthcoming, p. 1). For instance, the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce produces maps that show the spatial distribution of economic activity across the nation35.

Mapping is an activity that implies new points of attention, allows to seeing connections in the complexity of reality, and unfolds potentials (Corner, 1999). Mapping is not a mechanical photograph of reality, or its plain mirror, rather it is a process that highlights specific elements and makes them emerge from the surroundings. For instance, Mitchell (1999) explains how GIS can produce maps performing several

34 The Creative Industries by AFTA, beside a count of the establishments, provided a map with their distribution in each city or county. However, in order to be informative for future planning, these spatial analysis needs to go further, articulating connections and new potentials.

analytical choices: mapping where things are, mapping the most and the least, mapping density, finding what is inside, finding what is nearby, and mapping change.

The GIS is a powerful mapping tool capable of making visually available information previously unmapped. Some of this information may include spatial configurations of networks, relationships, activities, meaning of places and events, flows that link people and places. Using GIS to map previously unmapped elements and relationships make them “visible and, therefore, theoretically and politically significant” (Pavlovskaya, 2006, p. 2016). GIS can help to visualize data to better understand patterns and concentration of spatial phenomena, and also can portray layers of information, to help uncover spatial relationship among multiple set of data (Jardine & Teodorescu, 2004; Steinberg & Steinberg, 2006).

Considering the complexity of municipal governance, the visualization of these phenomena will help to better understand its intricate nature. Also, creating layers that combine information about political boundaries and cultural economy distribution, some insights will emerge for future action.

Finally, maps can be tremendous reporting tools, helping academic research to be communicated effectively to a wider audience (Jardine & Teodorescu, 2004) and present the data promoting the discovery of inherent structure and pattern (Gahegan, 1998; Gahegan, 2000). “Maps are powerful data visualization devices, and the ability of GIS to manipulate these data displays provide decision-makers information in a form that is simultaneously dense and yet easy to interpret” (Desai et al., forthcoming, p. 1).
4.6.3 Describing and Interpreting

Mapping is an incredible analytical tool: maps have the power to display complex information in a very intuitive way. However, mapping can be considered only the first step of the GIS analytical process. The analysis can be pushed further by describing and interpreting. After mapping out the data collected, I will analyze them looking for patterns - concentration and distribution - of cultural economy and for their relationships with political, administrative, and jurisdictional boundaries.

I will proceed with two main steps. The first one will focus on the cultural economy:

- Are all three domains present?
- Do the different categories have different spatial patterns?
- What category of each domain is predominant? Is there a variety or an emerging one?

I will gather evidence for another level of analysis overlying cultural economy map with the maps that visualize the jurisdictional boundaries, the city plans, and the area commissions. Therefore, the second analytical step will investigate the links with urban policymaking:

- What is the link between the cultural economy and the territory?
- How does the city manage the territory?
- What are the areas of the city and suburbs with the most and least cultural economy?
- What are the areas of the city and suburbs with the highest density – that is the cultural offer related to the population – of cultural economy?
- What are the characteristics of cultural economy in each area and in each suburb?
- How do areas of the city and suburbs compare with each other?
The idea of *spatiality* is the fundamental concept from which mapping is valued as *medium* between territory and social practices. Maps present examples of appropriation of space (i.e. political boundaries) and convey information through images (e.g. where things are, what is near by, where is density, etc). An accurate description coupled with an insightful interpretation could offer a point of view that can unfold aspects of reality that have not been noticed yet, leading to new opportunity for future action.
CHAPTER 5

CONTEXT ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

Considering that the main purpose of my research is to inform decision making for cultural planning in a city, my goal is to gather information on the existing conditions in order to enable policy makers to determine the needs and directions for future policies. My research has a descriptive purpose and it is based on Mintzberg’s idea that policymaking research should be rich in real-world description. “I am firmly convinced that the best route to more effective policy making is better knowledge in the mind of the practitioner of the world he or she actually faces” (Mintzberg, 1979, p. vi).

The real-world description for my research consists in the examination of the current connections of cultural planning with urban policymaking. In particular, I need to get a picture of the city government structure, including its planning process, of Columbus and its suburbs. After gathering information about the existing conditions, I will assess the needs for further research that can give to practitioners a better knowledge about the situation they are actually facing.
The baseline data for an understanding of the context are: (1) learn about the city government structure, finding out how the City of Columbus and its suburbs organize the planning management and the administration of arts and culture; (2) verify if arts and culture are incorporated in the planning process looking at the city plans of Columbus and its suburbs; (3) identify the actors of the arts and culture scene, and (4) discover the current conception of what arts and culture are looking at cultural reports.

In the following chapter, I will proceed studying the organizational structure of the city and its relation with the local arts agency. Then, I will examine the comprehensive plan of the city looking for the presence of arts and culture, and search for studies about arts and culture in Columbus released in the past few years.

5.2 City Government: Planning Division and Local Arts Agency

In Chapter 2, I explored the dynamics related to the structure of the city government. Municipal home rules, provided by the State, give to the cities the right to choose their own form of government and formalize in a context-specific bureaucratic structure the administration of local matters. Each single city decides its own political structure. For the purpose of my research, I will focus on how the City of Columbus and its suburbs organize (1) the planning management and (2) the administration of arts and culture.

5.2.1 Planning Division

5.2.1.1 Columbus

Planning is the core part of the policy process and helps public officials to move from agenda setting to policy formulation and implementation. At different times,
planning has meant different activities: the design of comprehensive plans or discrete urban spaces, or the creation of legislation, or the conduct of social research\textsuperscript{36}. Over time, the emphasis moved from shaping the use of land to addressing social issues and economic needs. It encompasses two main operations: (1) comprehensive and area-wide planning and (2) zoning. Its main focus is economic development.

In Columbus, the Planning Division is one of five interdependent divisions of the Department of Development. The other four divisions are: neighborhood services, housing, economic development, and building services. “The Planning Division is organized to guide and shape growth and change in Columbus with the aim of balancing the social, aesthetic, cultural, political and economic requirements of life” (City of Columbus, 2007b). Its day-to-day activity is organized in three main areas: long range planning, neighborhood planning, and urban design.

\textsuperscript{36} Planning history emerged as a recognized field only quite recently, but since the 1960s it has produced layers of knowledge. Scott’s \textit{American City Planning since 1890}, published in 1969, is the first systematic study of institutionalized planning. \textit{Two Centuries of American Planning}, edited by Daniel Shaffer in 1988, is the product of the extension of planning history to urban history. Schultz offered an interdisciplinary perspective in 1989 with his book \textit{Constructing Urban Culture: American Cities and City Planning, 1800-1920}. Nowadays, scholars want to expand the geographic breadth of planning history, challenging the tradition that draws national trends from too few metropolitan areas.

Two main references for a clear perspective on urban planning history and theories are: (Hall, 2002) and (Sies & Silver, 1996).
5.2.1.2 Suburbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Planning Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>Building Development <a href="http://www.bexley.org/">http://www.bexley.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Winchester</td>
<td>Development <a href="http://www.canalwinchesterohio.gov/departments/default.aspx">http://www.canalwinchesterohio.gov/departments/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Planning <a href="http://www.dublin.oh.us/">http://www.dublin.oh.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahanna</td>
<td>Development <a href="http://gahanna.org/">http://gahanna.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
<td>Building and zoning Development <a href="http://www.grandviewheights.org/">http://www.grandviewheights.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td>Building Development <a href="http://www.grovecityohio.gov/">http://www.grovecityohio.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveport</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development <a href="http://www.groveport.org/">http://www.groveport.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>Planning Department Economic Development <a href="http://www.cityofhilliard.com/">http://www.cityofhilliard.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development <a href="http://www.villageofnewalbany.org/">http://www.villageofnewalbany.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obetz</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development <a href="http://www.obetz.oh.us/">http://www.obetz.oh.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Building &amp; Development <a href="http://www.cityofpowell.us/">http://www.cityofpowell.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg</td>
<td>Department of Development Zoning Department <a href="http://www.ci.reynoldsburg.oh.us/">http://www.ci.reynoldsburg.oh.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>Business &amp; Development <a href="http://www.ua-ohio.net">http://www.ua-ohio.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development <a href="http://www.ci.westerville.oh.us/">http://www.ci.westerville.oh.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>Office of Economic &amp; Community Development <a href="http://www.ci.whitehall.oh.us/">http://www.ci.whitehall.oh.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>Business &amp; Development <a href="http://www.worthington.org/">http://www.worthington.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Suburbs' Planning
All the suburbs’ governments have a development department (see Table 5.1) where planning is located. This bureaucratic structure enhances how the focus of planning for all the suburbs is economic development. Bexley, Grandview Heights and Grove City have two different departments for building (planning of the constructions and use of land) and development (economic planning). Upper Arlington and Worthington have a “Business & Development Department” that suggests how for them development is mainly connected with businesses assistance.

5.2.2 Local Arts Agency

5.2.2.1 Columbus

Arts and culture are managed at the local level by arts agencies that can have different structures and different ways of being integrated in the city government. “Americans for the Arts defines a local arts agency (LAA) as a private nonprofit organization or an agency of local government that provides services to artists and arts organizations, award grants to artists or arts organizations, participates in community cultural planning, presents programming to the public, and/or manages cultural facilities” (Davidson, 2004, p.1). The local arts agencies of the nation’s 50 largest cities created an alliance called The United States Urban Arts Federation (USUAF)37. USUAF meets twice a year to discuss the social, educational, and economic impact of the arts in their regions.

In Columbus, the Greater Columbus Arts Council (GCAC) is an independent private agency that administers funds received from the City as established by contract.

37 For a list of the current USUAF members see (Americans for the Arts, 2008).
In 1970, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce charged its Cultural Affairs Committee to form a community arts agency to serve Columbus. In 1973, GCAC was incorporated as a nonprofit organization and City Council set aside funds to be administered by the GCAC and distributed to nonprofit arts and arts related organizations serving the citizens of Columbus. In 1977, City Council allocated part of the revenue from the hotel/motel taxes that in 1981 was fixed to a percentage of 20% of the 4% tax. Today, GCAC receives over $2,000,000 of the funds from the city and distributes them to more than 70 organizations. GCAC provides funding, leadership and collaboration to the art community, and also promotes events and educational services.

In 2007, the first Columbus Art Commission (CAC) was convened and given authority over the city’s acquisition of art and the placement of art owned by the city (City of Columbus, 2008a). Mayor Michael Coleman appointed seven community leaders with expertise in the arts to this commission. The CAC has. Once a work is installed, the CAC has to give its approval before it can be moved again. The authorization for the formation of the commission is part of the Columbus City Code and dates back to 1960.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Local Arts Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canal Winchester</td>
<td>Community Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Dublin Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Guion, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahanna</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td>Grove City Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveport</td>
<td>The Arts Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>Hilliard Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Brenneman, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>Cultural Art Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park &amp; Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynette Santoro-Au, Arts Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>Worthington Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Jewell, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Suburbs’ Local Arts Agencies

Only eight suburbs, out of seventeen, have a local arts agency. Dublin (Dublin Arts Council, 2008), Hilliard (Hilliard Arts Council, 2008) and Worthington (Worthington Arts Council, 2008) have an arts council which are private organizations with the mission of enhancing the cultural life of their cities. Grove City also has an arts council active in the city (Grove City Arts Council, 2008), but it does not have a facility and it is volunteers based.

Upper Arlington is the only suburb that has a Cultural Art Division integrated in the structure of the city government. It is a division of the Park & Recreation Department.

Other suburbs have different ways to promote arts and culture. For instance, the village of Groveport has The Arts Alliance (The Arts Alliance, 2007), a fellowship of artists and community to promote cultural advancements. The city of Gahanna has a
Community Development department that is very active in promoting cultural events, just like the Community Affairs department in the village of Canal Winchester.

5.3 Documents: City Plans and Cultural Reports

After a descriptive analysis of the bureaucratic structure of the planning management and the administration of arts and culture, I will proceed with an analysis of (1) the city plans of Columbus and its suburbs in order to verify if arts and culture are incorporated in the planning process. Afterwards, I will look at (2) cultural reports to identify the actors of the arts and culture scene and the current conception of what arts and culture are.

5.3.1 City Plans

5.3.1.1 Columbus

Planning moved from shaping the use of land to addressing social issues and economic needs. Nowadays planning entails two main operations (1) comprehensive and area-wide planning and (2) zoning and the plan is one of the planner’s primary tool (Baer, 1997). I will focus on the first operation and look into the comprehensive and area-wide planning. In particular, as the comprehensive plan is the document resulting from the attempt to establish guidelines for the future growth of a community (Conglose, 1999; Goodman & Freund, 1968), I will analyze the Columbus Comprehensive Plan (City of Columbus, 1993) to evaluate if arts and culture are issues taken in consideration in the planning process for the growth of the community in Columbus.

“In the early 1980s, the city of Columbus was divided into 30 planning areas. These planning areas served as a geographical guideline for research conducted by the
Columbus Planning Division. Data was collected for all planning areas and compiled into separate area information profiles. The profiles acted as a guide for a great number of planning programs and policies throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s” (City of Columbus, 2008b)\textsuperscript{38}. As of today, the Planning Division has prepared 45 plans and overlays, with 3 plans in progress, and about 8 plans for the future.

In 1993, a comprehensive plan was written to provide citywide recommendations for land use, infrastructure, and community facilities. It was intended to serve as a decision making tool and provide a policy framework. The horizon year was 2010. Special issues of interest addressed are neighborhoods, downtown, development districts, and environmental districts. In this document there are only two brief references to arts and culture. In the community facilities section, while making an inventory of recreation facilities, three cultural arts facilities are mentioned, but without any suggestions for future plans. In the downtown chapter, there is a paragraph entitled “Arts and Entertainment”, where some recommendations are given for future development of the downtown area: build more cultural facilities and promote arts festival. “Downtown should be the priority location for development of regional arts and entertainment facilities; encourage the continued use of downtown as the regional showplace for major cultural and civic festivals” (City of Columbus, 1993).

\textsuperscript{38} Zoning and planning deal with policy formulation; then implementation is carried out by organizations created specifically for that purpose. See for example: CDDC/Capitol South organization for the Downtown plan; Campus Partners for the High Street Plan.
5.3.1.2 Suburbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
<td>Greenview Heights Commerce District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>Economic Development Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Village Center Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- performing arts center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne McCoy Community Center (Feb 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2006 Leisure Trail Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Economic Development Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Suburbs’ Comprehensive Plans

Even though all the suburbs have a planning department, few of them prepared a comprehensive plan. Dublin’s 2007 Community Plan (City of Dublin, Ohio) focuses on future needs in regards to land use, transportation, utility infrastructure, parks and open space and community facilities. Hilliard’s Economic Development Master Plan (City of Hilliard, Ohio) studied how the community could maximize revenues while maintaining and enhancing its quality of life. Upper Arlington’s Master Plan (City of Upper Arlington) preserves and enhances the residential nature of Upper Arlington while encouraging the development of existing commercial areas as higher-density, mixed-use centers. Overall, arts and culture are not issues taken into consideration.

New Albany’s Strategic Plan Update (Village of New Albany) focuses on the future land use and development pattern and is considered the land use portion of a more broad strategic plan which now consists of a number of documents; the Village Center Plan (2005), the Leisure Trail Strategic Plan, and the Economic Development Strategic Plan. The Village Center Plan recommended investments by the community in a
Performing Arts Center, that led to the creation of the Jeanne B. McCoy Community Center for the Arts, inaugurated February 20th, 2008.

5.3.2 Cultural Reports

5.3.2.1 Actors

In the last few years, several studies about arts and culture in Columbus have been initiated. The Columbus Partnership\(^{39}\), a business organization with a broad agenda in local economic development, commissioned a document listing and summarizing these studies, *Brief Summary of 12 Major Arts and Culture Related Studies and Projects in Columbus* (Proctor Consulting, 2007), in order to highlight the emerging awareness of the importance of art and culture in economic development and the need to coordinate collaboration among the private, public, and nonprofit sectors. I added three reports to this list (see Table 5.4): *2006 Market Research Effort* (AMS Planning & Research Corp., 2007), *Widening the Focus: meeting the Challenges of Changing Times for Arts, Cultural and Creative Industries* (Wyszomirski, 2007), and *Building Creative Capital* (Benefactors Counsel, 2005). The purpose for identifying these studies is to analyze them and learn (1) which actors are interested in studying the situation of art and culture in Columbus and (2) what definitions for art and culture are used in each report.

\(^{39}\) The Columbus Partnership was initiated in 2002 by 15 central Ohio business leaders. The group had grown to 30 members. Led by Robert Milbourne, the partnership helped to secure more than $66 million for a rail-air-truck hub at Rickenbacker International Airport, represented Columbus on the state public works bill, lobbied the Ohio department of transportation for an alternative plan for the I-70/I-71 split, worked with Franklin County to plan for a new baseball park in the Arena District and brought together Ohio’s congressional delegation in Washington to emphasize central Ohio high priority projects (Pramik, 2006).
Table 5.4: Columbus’ Cultural Reports

The studies have been commissioned by the Columbus Partnership, the City Council, Greater Columbus Arts Council, and the Columbus Leadership Consortium.

Among them, the commissioner that grabs the attention is the Columbus Partnership because it is not an organization active in producing arts and culture, nevertheless it had a leading role in the promotion of different studies about it and encouraged the creation of a network among the flagship arts organizations: the Columbus Leadership Consortium. For instance, the first study that started the flourishing of studies of these last few years, *Arts and Culture* (Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium, 2006), was commissioned by the Columbus Partnership.

---

40 The Columbus Leadership Consortium is a group of the 16 largest nonprofit arts and cultural institutions that formed a coalition in late 2005 at the encouragement of the Columbus Partnership.
to portray the state of arts and culture as part of a larger initiative finalized at the economic development of the city, aiming to help Columbus to compete worldwide.

The document prepared by Porter (2004), *The Competitive Advantage of Regions*, set up the conceptual framework that identified competitiveness as the target for the Columbus Partnership’s actions. “Compete Columbus”, from being just the slogan of a vision, became an organization\(^{41}\) that implemented the directive recommended by Porter. In his presentation to a Columbus Partnership retreat, Porter suggested that, in order to improve the economy, Columbus should build on its four established business clusters: Automotive, Advance Logistics, Entertainment, Arts and Tourism, and personalized Medical Services (Monitor Company Group, L.P., 2005, p. 5-6). However, Porter does not define the businesses included in each cluster: his objective was to identify potential chairs that could be representative of each cluster in working groups of the organization.

In the overall effort of creating a competitive Columbus, the Columbus Partnership had tried to define the cluster of arts and culture, commissioning several studies and trying to figure out the existing assets and possible ways of development.

5.3.2.2 Definitions
Fifteen studies about the arts and culture emerged in the last five years. They present different definitions of arts and culture displaying a situation where there is need for a definition, however, none has emerged with a strong kind of agreement or commitment and there is not a consensus yet. Among the reports, three are the main

\(^{41}\) Compete Columbus was created by the Columbus Partnership and the Columbus Chamber in 2005 (Kemper, 2006). Since October 2007, the organization is under the day-to-day direction of Battelle, an international science and technology enterprise based in Columbus (Kemper, 2006).
definitions of arts and culture that emerge: one narrow, old style, preconceived and not
data driven; another one instrumental that sees the arts as a tool for a bigger goal; the last
one inclusive and diverse. In the following section, I will describe the characteristics of
each definition and summarize the way they emerge in each single report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Cultural Economy Definition/Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Columbus Partnership</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Columbus Partnership</td>
<td>Focuses on raising money for three or four cultural organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Cultural Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Creative Capital</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GCAC</td>
<td>Organizational assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrive in Five</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium</td>
<td>16 organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Market Research Effort</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>GCAC</td>
<td>18 organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Economic Prosperity III</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>AFTA</td>
<td>47 Nonprofit arts organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting art. Advancing culture</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>GCAC</td>
<td>preconceived and not spelled out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Narrow Definition

The first group of studies provides a definition that is old style, linked to the
nonprofit subsidy model and not data driven (see Table 5.5). In *Supporting Arts.*

*Advancing Culture* (Greater Columbus Arts Council, 2007) the definition is not even
spelled out and appears to be preconceived and taken for granted. *The Columbus
Partnership. United Cultural Fund* (AMS Planning & Research Corp., 2005) is a
feasibility study to appeal for funding for three or more cultural organizations and
analyzes the situation of the 16 major nonprofit organizations in the city. The same
group of organizations created the Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium and
prepared the *Thrive in Five* (Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium, 2007) report in
order to be able to gather enough money to create a thriving set of flagship arts
organizations in five years.
Building Creative Capital (Benefactors Counsel, 2005), a reflection on the available capital, studies the financial resources available to nonprofit arts organizations. “We defined the search criteria for organizations generally considered “arts” or “culture” eliminating zoos, nature centers, colleges of art, and other entities that might artificially inflate the statistics” (p. 9). Nonprofit arts organizations are also the focus of the 2006 Market Research (AMS Planning & Research Corp., 2007) and Arts and Economic Prosperity III (Americans for the Arts, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Cultural economy Definition/Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compete Columbus</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Columbus Partnership</td>
<td>Tourism, Entertainment and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artspace Preliminary Feasibility Report</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>GCAC</td>
<td>Artist live/work project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Bicentennial</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mayor and council</td>
<td>Arts and culture focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting and Retaining Talent to Columbus</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Columbus Chamber</td>
<td>More arts and culture options downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor Coleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The City of Columbus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chase Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience Columbus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbus Arts Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Columbus Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Research Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking Central Ohio</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Columbus Partnership</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing – Arts Establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Research Partners</td>
<td>- Theatres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dinner theatres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dance companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Musical groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Performing arts companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Motion picture theatres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Historical sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Zoos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Botanical gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Arts school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ancillary art participation venues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Instrumental Definition

The second group of studies uses a definition that is instrumental to broader community goals (see Table 5.6). Compete Columbus (Monitor Company Group, L.P., 2005) designs an economic development strategy, where the arts are one of the four major industrial clusters. The 2012 Bicentennial (City of Columbus, 2007a) and
*Attracting and Retaining Talent to Columbus* (Next Generation Consulting, 2007) define the arts as a tool for a more attractive city. All of them though do not articulate what is art.

The *Artspace Preliminary Feasibility Report* (Artspace Projects, 2007) is a feasibility study “to establish an affordable artist live/work project either in or near downtown Columbus [...] which is not a lively place, especially after dark” (p. 1). This study looks at artists as people that need to be supported in their living infrastructure, but at the same time can bring a healthy environment in the inner city.

Finally, *Benchmarking Central Ohio* (2007), written jointly by The Columbus Partnership and Community Research Partners (The Columbus Partnership & Community Research Partners, 2007), included arts establishments as a measure for the community well-being. The report counts the numbers of arts organizations in the top 100 metro areas in the United States. “”Arts organizations” is broadly defined and includes theater companies and dinner theatres, dance companies, musical groups and artists, other performing arts companies, motion picture theatres, museums, historical sites, zoos and botanical gardens, nature parks, arts schools, independent artists, ancillary art participation venues (bookstores, music stores, video rental stores) and retail art dealerships” (pp. 4-17).
Table 5.7: Inclusive Definition

The last group of studies is pointing towards an inclusive definition (see Table 5.7). *Arts and Culture* (Clark & Robinson, 2004) is the first study on arts and culture in Columbus and somehow represents also the first attempt of giving an inclusive definition of arts and culture. In fact, the study gives the profile of major nonprofit arts and culture organization, including also COSI, The Franklin Park Conservatory and the Columbus Zoo and Aquarium.

*Widening the Focus: Meeting the Challenges of Changing Times for Arts, Cultural and Creative Industries* (Wyszomirski, 2007), a report prepared for Columbus City Council by Margaret Wyszomirski sets the stage for an understanding of arts and culture in Columbus in a way that broadens the traditional conception. Wyszomirski states that “the creative sector includes individual artists as well as small arts-based businesses, nonprofit arts organizations of all sizes and in all fields, commercial arts and entertainment businesses, campus-based arts training, presentation and production...
A shift in the conception of the arts and culture that was heralded by two national reports: *Creative America* issued by the President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities and *The Arts and Public Purpose* issued by the American Assembly.

The report *Arts and Culture in Columbus. Creating Competitive Advantage and Community Benefit* (2006), presented by the Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium, was prepared creating forums for discussion about art and culture and without imposing a specific definition of art or culture. “Perceived as an equilateral triangle, all aspects of the arts and culture inform one another and add to diversity, with no individual side or angle being greater than the other” (Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium, 2006, p. 9). The three sides of the equilateral triangle are: traditional culture (nonprofit arts and cultural organizations), popular culture (for-profit arts and culture), and independent culture (individual artists and small arts and culture organizations).

The report issued by the Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee, *The Creative Economy. Leveraging Arts, Culture and Creative Community* (2007), draws from Wyszomirski’s ideas and presents a definition of the creative ecology which elements are: creative support systems, creative scenes, creative cluster, and creative experiences. However, it also highlights the lack of data that can accompany this inclusive definition. “The full depth and range of arts and culture assets in Columbus is underestimated in current data because there is no single source that includes nonprofit, for-profit, entertainment, and community-based arts and culture” (p. 15). The policy goal
of the report is to cultivate a creative profile for Columbus that will emphasize the mix of organizations and activities that make up the creative economy.

After this overview on the numerous cultural report produced in Columbus, it is noteworthy notice that I did not find any similar study for the suburbs. The report *The Creative Economy. Leveraging Arts, Culture and Creative Community* points out that there is not formal network for the arts council in central Ohio because each is focused on the municipalities that found them (Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee, 2007, p.16). In the process of releasing the report, only Upper Arlington, Worthington, and Dublin were invited to present perspectives on regional arts council (Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee, 2007, p.12).

5.4 Conclusion

Arts and culture are on the political agenda of Columbus. Now the following step should be the policy formulation\(^\text{42}\) that requires careful planning, starting with descriptive research about the existing situation. I collected data about the city government structure, the planning process, the actors of the arts and culture scene, and the current conception of what arts and culture are.

Regarding the city government structure, I paid specific attention to the bureaucratic organization of planning and arts and culture. The Planning Division in Columbus is located in the Department of Development. Even though in its principles the Division states that its vision is to organize and balance the social, aesthetic, cultural,

\(^{42}\) For an overview of the theory describing the stages of the policy process see Chapter 2
political and economic requirements of life, its planning activity is mainly focused on the physical changes of the land.

Arts and culture are not integrated into the bureaucratic structure of Columbus. However, very recently, the city government has become directly involved in arts and culture convening the Columbus Art Commission. A funding partnership with GCAC shows an intention to support the development of the arts; an interest reiterated in 2006, when the City Council started to rethink its arts and cultural policy by appointing a Creative Columbus Steering Committee. The Committee was asked to make recommendations to foster a cooperative approach within the arts community. Among the suburbs, Upper Arlington is the only one that has a Cultural Art Division integrated in the structure of the city government as a division of the Park & Recreation Department.

Arts and culture are also barely incorporated in the planning process. Looking at the cities plans I found out that the Columbus Comprehensive Plan tackle arts and culture in terms of facilities that need to be built and festival that needs to be promoted. Among the suburbs, New Albany’s Strategic Plan is the only one that pays attention to arts and culture, recommending investments by the community in a Performing Arts Center.

The actors of the arts and culture scene are of different kinds. GCAC is the local arts agency that provides funding and leadership for the arts community. Besides GCAC, civic groups are also very active in advancing the arts. In particular, the business leaders of the group Columbus Partnership showed interest in promoting the arts in several ways:

---

43 The analysis of the cultural reports does not give a thorough representation of the actors of the arts and culture scene, but focuses on the ones that are engaged in the cultural planning process.
they encouraged the formation of a coalition among the major arts institutions, commissioned studies about culture, took into consideration arts and culture also in reports dealing with the broader economic context, and created a website compiling all the arts and culture studies produced for Columbus\textsuperscript{44}. They considered Tourism, Entertainment and the Arts among the four major industries clusters to be part of working groups of by Compete Columbus, an economic development organization established by Columbus Partnership and the Chamber of Commerce.

Fifteen studies about the arts and culture emerged in the last five years. They present different definitions of arts and culture displaying a situation where there is not consensus. However, no one of the definitions suggested has been operationalized. In other words, the discussion of what is arts and culture was not followed by how to classify the organizations and collect data that would empirically show what they had in mind with their definitions. For instance, the Creative Economy report, which calls for a broad and inclusive definition, in the survey about the existing assets does not articulate them in a way that can offer a framework usable for collecting data. It mentions the idea of a creative cluster\textsuperscript{45} but this needs to be refined to enable an identification of its components.

A clarification of the definition is needed and my research aims to fill this gap. Using a conceptual framework about the organizational structure of cultural economy, built from a multidisciplinary investigation of the topic, I created a classification of the

\textsuperscript{44} See www.columbuspartnership.com
\textsuperscript{45} See The Creative Economy: Leveraging the Arts, Culture and Creative Community for a Stronger Columbus (Creative Columbus Policy Steering Committee, 2007, p. 15).
organizations and I will collect data about them. In particular, this conceptual framework takes into consideration the need to widen the focus and encompasses different art forms without any hierarchical distinctions, and at the same time offers a definition that can be operationalized to collect empirical data. However, even though it aims to be inclusive and comprehensive, it is important to remember that my definition has focused on the organizational structure of the arts and culture. Therefore, in the collection of data, individuals (i.e. singular artists) are not taken in consideration.

In terms of connections with urban policymaking, what emerged from this context analysis is that the planning divisions are focused on the physical aspect of the land, the advancement of arts and culture is not managed by a city department, and the cities plans do not have arts and culture as one of their goals or tools. Also, in this context analysis, little surfaced about the relations between Columbus and its suburbs. The Greater Columbus Arts Council, whose name points to a comprehensive way to consider the fragmentation of the territory, in reality has a delimited focus on the large central city. Among the cultural reports, only Upper Arlington, Worthington, and Dublin have been called at the table.

Further research that can help to create a connection with the urban policymaking is needed, both at the level of city bureaucracy and at the level of relations with the suburbs. The following chapter, besides a definition of cultural economy that can be operationalized, aims to fill this other gap in the knowledge required by practitioner about the situation they are actually facing.
CHAPTER 6

GIS ANALYSIS

6.1 Introduction

The analysis of the organizational structure and of the documents provided the baseline data about the existing situation in Columbus, but also offered a perspective on the kind of information that is still missing: (1) a definition of cultural economy that can be operationalized helping to gather empirical data about it and (2) a tool to connect cultural economy to urban policymaking, able to navigate the complexity of American metropolitan governance.

The conceptual framework constructed through the literature review will serve as operationalized definition of cultural economy, while cartographic maps will provide a tool to analyze the empirical data and to explore the complexity of American metropolitan governance, offering some guidance to deal with it. Maps are a geographic visualization of elements on a cartography that implies new points of attention and make emerge connections in the complexity of the reality (Corner, 1999). “A simple rule of thumb when considering output from an analysis is to limit maps to just a few variables and, if necessary, to use multiple maps, much like an atlas, when you are attempting to
communicate lots of information resulting from an analysis” (Steinberg & Steinberg, 2006, p. 119). Following this simple rule, I will produce multiple maps and for each of them I will focus on specific variables.

In the following chapter, I will proceed with GIS analysis following the analytical steps suggested by Mitchell (1999): mapping where things are, mapping the most and the least, and mapping density. First, I will collect the data about cultural economy using my conceptual framework and map them highlighting several aspects: presence of the three domains, distribution and patterns of each of them, spatial patterns of each single category within the domains, and predominance of a category. Second, I will look for connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking, mapping the most and the least, the density, and the articulation in categories choosing areas whose boundaries have a jurisdictional connotation.

6.2 Cultural Economy

Three main steps led me to a comprehensive definition of the cultural economy of a city (see Figure 4). First, trying to navigate the theoretical confusion behind local cultural policy in the United States, I looked at literature in geography, economics and cultural studies that focuses on cultural industries; literature in cultural policy, aesthetics and sociology that pays attention to cultural institutions; literature in urban planning and marketing that addresses cultural districts.

Second, I defined the three domains emerging from the literature and articulated their four main differences. These three domains have significant differences, but considered together they make up the cultural economy of a city.
Third, to operationalize this definition of cultural economy, I created a classification which categories enable the collection of data. In this way, I can proceed with an empirical investigation of the unit of analysis chosen for this research: Columbus and its suburbs.66

The empirical investigation consisted in the collection of data about the three domains. I created a database about Industries and Institutions and a table about Districts. Data about industries and institutions were compiled all together because the existing datasets do not consider the difference between them. Their classification in two groups is a theoretical construct that I developed through the literature review. So, even though initially the databases did not consider the difference, I classified separately the two domains. I compiled a database using two major existing sources: (1) the data set pulled together by American for the Arts (AFTA) using Dun & Bradstreet’s national database and (2) the Unified Database of Arts Organizations (UDAO) created by a partnership between the National Center of Charitable Statistics (NCCS), the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and The National Assembly of State Arts Agency and distributed by the Urban Institute. Plus, I added data about the Universities.

I used a spreadsheet to import, clean, and reorganize the combined data sets. I reorganized the data using the categories of my classification and integrated the two databases. These data presented some complications. For instance, some organizations instead of the address had a PO Box. I used the phone number as a source for a reverse lookup in the White Pages, but in some cases it refers to a private address because the

66 See Chapter 4
organization does not have a specific location\textsuperscript{47} (they are so called “minimalist organizations”. See DiMaggio, 2006, p. 433, note 5). In that case, I decided to eliminate the name from the lists because location – where things are - is the main lens for my analysis\textsuperscript{48}.

The table about Districts collected data from different sources. I searched the website of the Census of Governments, the state of Ohio, Franklin County and each municipality. I also referred to the local arts agencies and the convention and visitors bureau.

The staff working at the Center for Urban and Regional Analysis ( CURA ) at The Ohio State University offered assistance in geo-coding these data. Also, they produced the resulting maps that I am using for my analysis.

6.2.1 Industries

Industries are establishments founded on the concept of industrial system, focused on mass-production and interacting in clusters. This domain of cultural economy is broken down in different categories created according to their product, whose common characteristic is to be mass-produced and replicable: Advertising, Architecture and Design, Audiovisual, Photography and Publishing. Each category includes several types of businesses. The table below (Table 6.1) provides a prospectus of the type of businesses selected\textsuperscript{49}.

\textsuperscript{47} This is different from sole proprietorship in the industries domain. In this latter case, the address refers to the location of the business.

\textsuperscript{48} For considerations about the importance of collecting mappable data in making maps see Making maps : a visual guide to map design for GIS (Krygier & Wood, 2005)

\textsuperscript{49} For limitations and strength of this classification see Chapter 4.
As a first analytical step in GIS, Mitchell (1999) suggests to map where things are. In my research, this means to map where is cultural economy, specifically finding out where industries, institutions and districts are. In Figure 6, the map shows where the industries are. Looking at their distribution, what emerges is that the urban area is cut into two parts with a line drawn just south of downtown. Very few industries are located in the southern part of the city. Industries are widely distributed, especially in the north-west side.

Figure 7 displays the spatial patterns of each single category of the domain industries. Advertising has a cluster downtown and a significant distribution in the north-west suburbs; Architecture and Design has three noticeable clusters: downtown, north

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Advertising agencies, advertising consultant, electronic media advertising representative, printed media advertising representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Architectural services, commercial art and graphic design, interior design services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual</td>
<td>Audio-visual program production, Disc jockey service, Entertainers and entertainment groups, Film rental, Motion picture and tape distribution, Music recording producer, Record and prerecorded tape stores, Television broadcasting stations, Video production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Camera and photographic supply stores, Commercial art and illustration, Commercial photography, Photofinishing laboratory, Photographic studios - portrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>Music books, books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
side, and Upper Arlington; Photography is homogeneously distributed in the city; Publishing does not have a significant presence\textsuperscript{50}.

The predominant category is an indicator that shows the unique arts and culture characteristic of Columbus. Among the industries, in Columbus and its suburbs, the predominant category is Architecture and Design (see Figure 8). It is up to the 41\% of the overall industries. A finding that confirms the idea that the concentration of design firms in Columbus is “a bit extraordinary” (Collaborative Economics, April, 16 2008)\textsuperscript{51}. Noteworthy to notice that most of them are sole proprietorship\textsuperscript{52}.

6.2.2 Institutions

Institutions are shaped in organizational fields, characterized by event-production and interacting in sectors: private, public, and nonprofit. The three sectors interact and therefore my definition goes beyond the nonprofit model. Just like for the industries, I classified the institutions in different categories, this time based on their organizational function: Museums and Galleries (artworks exhibition), Performing Arts Companies and Presenters (live performance), Schools (education), Community Organizations (community well-being), and Services (general support services). Each category includes several types of organizations as shown by the table below (Table 6.2).

\textsuperscript{50} Notice that the data sets utilized did not include bookstores, while I consider retail store part of an industry, in this case the industry is Publishing, because an industry is a collective name which includes all the establishments involved in the value chain of a product. This is a big limitation of the data that impacts the findings.

\textsuperscript{51} This observation is the result of a series of interviews conducted for understanding the Creative Services in Columbus as part of a regional economic strategy promoted by the Mayor of Columbus, the President of The Ohio State University, and the Chair of the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce (Collaborative Economics, 2001)

\textsuperscript{52} A sole proprietorship is a type of legal entity that does not have separate existence from his owner. Essentially, it means that there is only one person that does business in his or her name.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums and galleries</td>
<td>Art dealers, Art gallery, Historical society, Museum, Science center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts companies and</td>
<td>Orchestra, Actors production, Dance production, Live theatre producers, Opera,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presenters</td>
<td>Theatre companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Professional school, University, Recreational education, Music and dance instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>Recreational performance and art production, Foreign countries associations, Festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Local arts agencies, Foundations, Professional Associations, Instrument repair service, Theatrical services, Agents, Advocacy groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.2: Institutions- Category and Type of Business**

Figure 9 shows the distribution of the institutions on the territory of Columbus and its suburbs. Institutions are mainly present in the municipal territory. Particularly, there is a noteworthy concentration in the downtown area. They are almost absent in the southern part of the city and in the southern suburbs.

Figure 10 highlights the spatial patterns of each single category of the domain institutions. Museums and Galleries are mainly downtown; Community Organizations are in the central municipal area; the distribution’s patterns of Performing Arts Companies and Schools are very similar; Services are fairly distributed in the overall central-north area.

Evaluating the predominant category of the institutions gives a picture of what kind of arts and culture scene Columbus is (see Figure 11). The predominant category is Service, even though it represents 32% and Community Organization are the 30% of the overall institutions. This shows how in Columbus there is much attention to services supporting the arts and organizations with a specific attention to link arts and culture with the community.
Scott (2001) claims that the city functions as an ecology of commodified symbolic production and consumption, creating intertwined relations between the urban landscape and the goods and services produced there. In Columbus, Architecture and Design for industries and Services with Community Organizations for institutions are the commodified symbolic production and consumption of the city. This finding opens up the possibility of research about the intertwined relations between the meanings that adhere to the urban landscape and the symbologies of the goods and services produced in the local area.

6.2.3 Districts

As explained in Chapter 3 and 4, there are several types of districts. “The formality of the classification may range from consistently applied nomenclature in planning and promotional documents to a legal designation in a zoning ordinance” (Frost-Kumpf, 1998). In order to identify cultural districts in Columbus and its suburbs, I consulted different sources keeping in mind the different formality of the classification.

Overall, I found five cultural districts (see Figure 12). They are all in the city of Columbus, and none in the suburbs. The list of State of Ohio’s local governments, which groups all the special districts existing in the state, encompasses also “Regional Arts and Cultural Districts” (US Census Bureau, 2005, p. 226). However, according to the data from the 2002 Census of Governments, none of this kind of districts exists in Franklin County53.

Once identified them (see Figure 12) with the geographic boundaries, some specific observations are necessary about the cultural districts in order to understand their

governance, in particular (1) the actors involved and (2) are the mechanisms for their realizations, paying attention if they had city plans.

The **Short North Arts District** is an incorporated business association, with agreements with the city for the Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Program (NCR). A city program that offers technical assistance, loans and matching grants, capital improvements and planning services in conjunction with the business associations, in 15 commercial areas surrounding downtown\(^\text{54}\). Besides this business organization, there is the Short North Special Improvement District\(^\text{55}\), an association of all High Street property owners formed to enhance the pedestrian experience along High Street through daily maintenance and streetscape improvements.

The **University District** has a long history with some main changes in the last few years. The University District Organization is a group of organization operating in the university neighborhood, active since 1971. In 1995, The Ohio State University in concert with the City, incorporated Campus Partner for Community Urban Redevelopment a non-profit community redevelopment corporation to promote improvements to the neighborhoods around the university. It started in charge to develop a comprehensive neighborhood plan (Columbus Partners, 1996), later approved by the city in 1996 afterwards it commissioned a plan for an implementation program focusing on High Street (Goody, Clancy & Associates, 1998) that led to the creation of South Campus Gateway. Campus Partners employed Jones Lang LaSalle as the development

---


\(^{55}\) A Special Improvement District (SID) is a self-help tool that allows property owners to assess themselves for area-wide services and capital improvements. It is established as form of local government within the municipality by the code of the State of Ohio.
management advisor and Turner as the construction management advisor during the development and construction phases of Gateway. Elkus/Manfredi Architects of Boston designed Gateway and CB Richard Ellis is now in charge of the management of the area.

In 2006, several area stakeholders decided that was time to promote the University District developing a branding campaign (mlicki). South Campus Gateway and the Wexner Center began discussion for creating a University Arts & Entertainment District. The final decision was to keep the original name, positioning the district around originality and diversity.

The Franklinton Arts District was established in 2007 with the purpose to revitalize the distressed areas of the neighborhood, creating affordable housing for artists and involving them in creating public events. The arts district was promoted by the Franklinton Development Association, a community development corporation formed to lead the revitalization of Franklinton, the oldest community in central Ohio. An official policy document for the Franklinton planning area was adopted by the city in 2003.

The King-Lincoln Arts and Entertainment District has a plan focused on the arts as a major thriving tool. The city released the plan in 2002 (City of Columbus, 2002) and in 2007 posted an updated document about the development progress (City of Columbus, 2002). Nevertheless, I was not able to find information about an association in charge of the governance of the area, so it is not clear how the implementation has been managed.
The **Discovery District**, a special improvement district established in 2007, chose to brand itself as a place of discovery, instead of arts and culture. The major concern of the group is the safety of the area.

Focusing on the actors involved, one trait that emerges is that each district has an overlap of several types of governance, each with a different objective. The role of the city is to guide the vision of the district but great impact is in the hands in civic groups such as businesses associations, and community development corporations. Private and public work in concert, but the private actors are strong in the implementation stage of the policy. In particular, the University District shows a clear example of the steps and mechanisms involved in the planning process.

Finally, Figure 13 shows the three domains of *cultural economy* all together. In the table, the number of establishments for each category of industries and institutions are collected for each district. The Short North has an interesting variety of cultural industries and institutions, while Franklinton has very few of them. They are two examples of cultural districts at a different stages: one is well established; the other just recently found the arts as a possible direction for urban development.

Compared to the overall territory of Columbus and suburbs, the districts do not have an outstanding number of cultural assets. However, I think even though the point of a cultural district is to use cultural amenities as anchor of attraction, the foundational concept is mix-used area. In other words, a cultural district uses arts and culture to attract people and businesses, but its success does not necessarily compare with having the
highest concentration of cultural resources, but rather a well-calibrated mixed-use area and an effective partnership among the actors involved \(^{56}\).

Markusen (2006b) makes a case for “minimal clustering and dispersion on the grounds that artistic space can play powerful roles in stabilizing and revitalizing neighborhoods and in generating greater cultural participation by diverse group” (p. 25). Even though cultural districts can grow naturally and organically as a participants decision to locate one near the other, (Stern & Seifert, 2007) if cities celebrate the many and distinctive cultural venues they can encourage cross-neighborhood visits and increase understanding and cohesion across the city.

6.2.4 Cultural Economy

**Figure 14** offers an overall picture of *cultural economy* in Columbus and its suburbs. My conceptual framework allowed to understand what are the elements of *cultural economy*; this was an essential step to gather data and operationalize the definition. It shows the complexity of the contemporary system of cultural production and consumption, which products have an influence on our understanding of the world. The breadth of the elements included in *cultural economy* is articulated in domains which are broken down in specific categories and involve different purposes: vitality of the community, economic development, and social values.

Mapping with GIS gave a picture of *where* things are on the territory, setting the stage for a spatial analysis that through space also highlights connections among cultural, social, economic and policy aspects. The overall picture shows a concentration in the downtown area and see Architecture and Design stick out as 27% of the overall arts and

\(^{56}\) See Chapter 3 to understand the foundational concept and interaction mechanism of cultural districts.
culture establishments. This finding suggests a characterization of the city as a milestone of this industry and proposes a branding of the city image that exploit this strength in order to attract people and new businesses.

6.3 Cultural Economy and Urban Policymaking

My research on cultural planning in the United States aims to tackle two problems: (1) the theoretical confusion due to a lack of consistency in the use of the language and blurry boundaries of the object of investigation; (2) the unclear connections with urban policymaking, both within the city bureaucracy and its planning process and the relations with the suburbs. The definition of cultural economy offered an answer to the first problem, now I will explore how mapping can help to clarify the connections with urban policymaking.

First, I will investigate the connection at the city level and then I will expand it to the suburbs. The choice of mapping Columbus and its suburbs is based on the territorial fragmentation of the urban area that gives a peculiar morphology to the city and creates tangled jurisdictional boundaries. Therefore, gathering information about the overall urban territory is pursued with the purpose to get a general understanding of the situation and help the municipality to deal with the political fragmentation.

6.3.1 Columbus: Neighborhood Liaison Areas

“The choice of political structure has certainly been the key decision for municipalities throughout the past century” (Morgan et al., 2007, p. 61). Cities are creatures of the States, however municipal home rule provided by state law gives cities the right to make decisions on local matters and choose their own forms of government.
Columbus has a strong mayor-council form of government\textsuperscript{57}, where the mayor has almost total administrative authority (City of Columbus).

Mayor Michael B. Coleman took office in 1999 and is now in his second term. He has made it his mission to serve neighborhoods in a more effective, efficient and responsive manner. Recognizing that each Columbus neighborhood is unique, with different attributes, Mayor Coleman created the Neighborhood Liaison program in the Department of Development (City of Columbus). The Neighborhood Liaisons are a team of advocates created to work across department lines to address citizen requests, problems and questions.

The city has been divided in 12 service areas (see Figure 15) and a liaison has been assigned to each of the areas to work with citizens and neighborhood organizations. The liaison are city staff responsible for: coordinating the exchange of information among citizens, neighborhood organizations and city staff, providing technical assistance and serving as an advocate on neighborhood issues, and managing the investment of city resources in the neighborhoods.

Each Neighborhood Liaisons also serves a specific Area Commission which is an elected body renewed every year that acts as a liaison between neighborhood groups, property owners, residents, developers and city officials (City of Columbus). Columbus City Council established area commissions in the early 1980s. Mayor Coleman added to this initiative the Neighborhood Liaison program which assigns members of the staff of the office of development to the task coordinating citizens, city departments and city officials.

\textsuperscript{57} See the description of the two basic forms of municipal government in Chapter 2
My analysis of cultural economy is a cartographic map that locates it on the territory and draws the connections with jurisdictional boundaries but also social and economic elements. In the previous section, I mapped cultural economy of Columbus and its suburbs highlighting some of its features such as the presence of the three domains, the distribution of each of them, the spatial patterns of each category within each domain, and the predominance of a category. In order to connect cultural economy to the way the current administration is dividing the territory and organizing the conversation among citizens, elected officials and bureaucrats, I will map cultural economy choosing the Neighborhood Liaison Areas as delimitations of the unit of territorial observation, tracking the number of industries and institutions, the number of establishments (industries and institutions) per 1,000 residents, and the presence of each category for each area.

Choosing the Neighborhood Liaison Areas as geo-political unit of analysis (1) enable to connect the cultural establishments with the economic and social characteristics of a specific area (Figure 16 - 17), and (2) offers to the Neighborhood Liaison a picture of the characteristics of the cultural scene (Figure 18), pointing to its actors that can be involved and brought to the table among the other representatives of that specific area.

Mapping the Most and the Least show which areas of the city are rich in cultural economy, and which one are poor of it. In Figure 16, I show a map with the areas grouped by quintile\(^{58}\) and a table with the rankings. The area where cultural economy is

\(^{58}\) In descriptive statistics measures of relative standing are designed to provide information about the position of particular values relative to the entire data set. A quintile divides the data into fifths. For instance, the first or lower quintile is equal to the 20\(^{th}\) percentile, which contains the first fifth of the total sample (Keller, Warrack, & Duxbury Resource Center, 2004).
present the most is area 6 (Clintonville, Northwest & Far North), while the one with the least is area 9. Area 4 and 6 are in the upper quintile, displaying a great concentration of arts and culture establishments in the upper west side of the city. While area 5, 3 and 9 are in the lowest quintile, displaying a lack of arts and culture in the south side and in two main area adjacent downtown.

At this point I can also look into the social and economic features of those areas. In terms of social indicators I collected data (Community Research Partners, April, 2008) about number of population, ethnicity (percentage of White and African American people), and median\textsuperscript{59} age. For economic indicators I collected data about the median household income. I also ranked each of these indicators so I can make comparison among them.

It is interesting to notice that the area where \textit{cultural economy} has the most numerous establishments is the one ranking first also for number of population and median household income, but it is the last one in terms of African American population. This shows that well-off neighborhoods have more cultural assets. While area 9, last in \textit{cultural economy} ranking, is also the last for number of population, seventh for income, but second for African American concentration.

In Chapter 4, I explained the rationale behind mapping as methodology of analysis as spatiality: a concept that highlights how space is inseparable from social processes. Now it is evident that maps can help to understand the “land-oriented character of local politics” (Oliver, 2003, p. 326) and create connections between space and socio-cultural-economic factors. This depiction raises compelling questions - what

\textsuperscript{59} The median is a measure of relative standing that divides the data set into halves.
kind of links exist among these factors? Does one have an impact on the other? - and opens up new lines of research.

Mapping the **density** of cultural economy shows the areas with the highest concentration of opportunities for arts and culture participation creating a relation between the number of establishments and the number of population. In order to map the density, I picked one of the measures recommended by the *Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretations and Indicators*, a study that developed a cultural vitality index articulated in presence, participation, and support\(^60\). Presence is articulated as the presence of opportunities for cultural participation, and one of the measures recommended to evaluate it is the number of arts establishments per 1,000 thousands population\(^61\) (Urban Institute, 2006). This measure enhances the connection between numbers of arts and culture establishments and population. A report about economic development, *Benchmarking Central Ohio* (The Columbus Partnership & Community Research Partners, 2008), adopted this measure as an indicator of the community well-being and raised an animated debate in Columbus after publishing Columbus’ ranking among 16 metropolitan areas\(^62\).

**Figure 17** displays a map with the areas grouped by quintile and a table with the rankings. The area with the highest ranking is area 8 (Near East & Driving Park).

---

\(^60\) In 1996, The National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership launched The Arts and Culture Indicators in Community Building Project which is an exploratory and experimental effort to develop arts and culture neighborhood indicators for use in local planning, policymaking, and community building. The main stone publication of this project is the *Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretation and Indicators* (Urban Institute, 2006), released by the Urban Institute.

\(^61\) This measure is obtained dividing the population for the number of establishments and multiplying the result for 1,000 so the result is a number that is not too small. It is a controlling measure for population and gives a standardization.

\(^62\) See the article *Grim reality: Perception is that City Lacks in Arts* (Sheban, 2008) and the letter to the editor in response to it by Bryan Knicely, President of Greater Columbus Arts Council (Knicely, 2008).
Noteworthy noticing that this area is 9th in terms of number of population, the last one in terms of income and the area with the highest numbers of African American population. Even though in terms of absolute presence of cultural economy area 8 is only 5th, it goes up in the ranking because of the small number of population, much smaller compare to area 6. Anyway, area 6 remains high in the ranking, 3rd, also in terms of density. Area 8 and 4 (University and 5th by Northwest) are both in the upper quintile. The areas with the lowest density are 1, 2, and 5, the south west side of the city.

This lens shows how some, distressed neighborhoods, such as area 8 and 4, already possess substantial cultural resources and can be classified as “cultural over-achievers” 63 because they have more cultural assets that their economic status would lead us to expect. This could suggest that overachieving low-income neighborhoods might be candidates for workforce development efforts directed at training residents for non-artist jobs.

After analyzing the maps making connections between cultural economy and the economic and social characteristics of a specific area, I analyze the characteristics of the cultural scene of each area (see Figure 18 – 19). Architecture & Design is again the most predominant category, not only for the entire city, but also at this disaggregated level. The only exceptions are area 7 (Far East) and area 10 (Northland Communities) where Audiovisual, even for few numbers, is the predominant category.

At this point, I also introduced Downtown in the ranking. Downtown is an area of the city non linked to a neighborhood liaison because the administration chose to

---

63 “cultural over-achievers—that is, they have more cultural assets than their location and socio-economic status would lead us expect” (Stern & Seifer, 2007, p. 59)
create a special office exclusively dedicated to the redevelopment of downtown, focusing on development of residential and commercial office spaces (City of Columbus). I ranked Downtown (see Figure 14) to see what is its standing compare to all the other Neighborhood Liaison Areas in terms of cultural economy, but I did not include it in the overall analysis because all the other socioeconomic data are not available. On the other hand, I think it is really important a better analysis of Downtown because different actors of the city are pointing to the arts to help revitalize Downtown. The Columbus Comprehensive Plan (City of Columbus, 1993), prepared by the Planning Department, calls for more cultural facilities; the Regional Economic Strategy for Greater Columbus (Next Generation Consulting, 2007), commissioned by Mayor of Columbus, the President of The Ohio State University, and the Chair of the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce, envisions Downtown as a hub of creativity, information, arts and entertainment, where creative services thrive the economy; Attracting and Retaining Talent to Columbus (Next Generation Consulting, 2007) asks for more arts Downtown to create a more attractive city; the Artspace Preliminary Feasibility Report (Artspace Projects, 2007) which promote the creation of live/work space for artists downtown because it claims that artists can bring a healthy environment in the inner city.

The ranking in Figure 14 shows how Downtown is rich of arts and cultural establishments. This finding should provide some insights to all the plans that push to use the arts to revitalize Downtown. For instance, the idea of work/live spaces seams to be promising because will attract residents in an area characterized by vacant apartments;

---

64 Columbus Community Partners makes the data available, but they are not reliable because are artifacts, computational aggregates of census block data. Furthermore, the situation is changing rapidly. For instance, the median age is calculated as 5.7.
while the idea of constructing new facilities promoted by the *Columbus Comprehensive Plan* seems to be little aware of the richness already present there.

The charts in **Figure 19** are the results of the GIS analysis of each Neighborhood Liaison Area. They show how each category compare to the other and give a picture of the importance of each category for each area. This enables the liaisons to recognize the actors that can represent arts and culture at the civic table, with their requests, problems and questions, so they can be part of the coordination of the city resources in the neighborhood.

Finally, I examine the cultural districts to verify in which liaison area they are located (**Figure 20**). The Short North Arts District is in part in Downtown and in part in area 4, where also the University District is located. Area 4 ranks 2\textsuperscript{nd} for both richness and density of *cultural economy*, and has also two districts, but it is only 10\textsuperscript{th} for median household income. The Franklinton Arts District is in area 3 which is 11\textsuperscript{th} for richness of *cultural economy* but jumps to the 4\textsuperscript{th} position for density as it has a small population and it ranks 11\textsuperscript{th} for income. The King-Lincoln Arts and Entertainment District is for a small part in Downtown, but mainly in area 8 which is 1\textsuperscript{st} for density but last for income. It is a neighborhood predominant African-American. The Discovery District is entirely in Downtown.

The presence of cultural districts in the distressed area, and especially Downtown, shows how the city of Columbus, even though it does not consider arts and culture in its main planning document\textsuperscript{65}, it has already being thinking about the arts as a tool of urban redevelopment. At this point, it would be interesting to evaluate the efficiency of these

\textsuperscript{65} See Chapter 5
projects in terms of foundational concepts, interaction mechanism, and economic process that emerge from the literature that I summarized in my conceptual framework. The analysis would imply to see if these districts are developed in a mixed-use area, have some strong partnerships in place and involve both production and consumption of culture.

In this section, in order to track the connections between the city bureaucracy and cultural economy I picked the Neighborhood Liaison Areas because they represent the strategy of the City of Columbus to divide the territory and booster the conversation among citizens, elected officials and bureaucrats. Mapping this geo-political unit brings to surface social and economic data and actors of the cultural scene. In other words, this analysis creates the connections with cultural economy and the city administration that can be fruitful for policymakers and the arts and culture community.

6.3.2 Suburbs

America has become a nation of suburbs over the past fifty years. The rapid growth of suburbs has created a tremendous variety of localities within the metropolis. Originally, a suburb was an area subordinated to a major urban area, situated on the edge of the main city. Nowadays, and especially in Columbus (see Figure 21), the situation is much more complex.

“Despite the enormity of this change, we know very little about how suburbanization is shaping American political life, particularly at the local level” (Oliver, 2003, p. 312). Although social and economic implications have been largely investigated (Morgan & Mareschal, 1999), the political implications of this fragmentation are not well understood.
As far as cultural planning, two observations are necessary. First, the existing cultural plans have been issued by the government of the large central city with recommendations directed to it; secondly, the policy of a consolidation between cities and suburbs is still unclear and uncertain. Therefore, in order to inform decision making for cultural planning that takes in consideration the reality of suburbanization, my purpose is to describe the current situation, mapping cultural economy of Columbus in concert with its suburbs. In this section, I will map (1) the number of industries and institutions, (2) the number of establishments (industries and institutions) per 1,000 residents, and (3) the presence of each category by suburbs.

In Figure 22, I investigate which of the 17 suburbs is richer in cultural economy and how they all compare with the larger central city. The map shows the suburbs grouped by quintile and the table shows their ranking collecting also social and economic data. Dublin has the most cultural industries and institutions and ranks 6th for population and 2nd for income. Obetz has none cultural industries or institutions and is 15th for both population and income.

New Albany, at the top for income, is only 14th for cultural economy. Dublin and Upper Arlington are in the first quintile. Gahanna, Westerville and Worthington are in the second quintile.

As a second step of the analysis of the suburbs I look at which one has the highest concentration of opportunities for arts and culture participation (see Figure 23), using the measure suggested by the Urban Insitute: number of arts establishments per 1,000 thousands population (Urban Institute, 2006). Worthington, 11th for population and 5th
for income, is the suburb with the best density of cultural industries and institutions. Therefore, considering the rationale developed behind this measure, Worthington is the best community in terms of presence of opportunities for cultural participation.

In the first quintile with Worthington there are also Dublin and Groveport. Groveport, which has a low ranking for absolute number of establishments, comes up in the ranking for density because it has a small population. Columbus, which is first in terms of absolute numbers of establishments, falls in the fourth quintile for density. Therefore, it is low in regards to opportunities for cultural participation.

In Figure 24 and 25, I gather data that can picture the cultural scene of each suburb. The charts make evident that once again Architecture & Design is the most prevalent category. Looking at the suburbs with at least 50 establishments, Hilliard is the most interesting case with a wide breadth of cultural offerings where all the categories are represented. Noteworthy, in its case, Audiovisual and Architecture & Design are equivalent.

6.3.3 Neighborhood Liaison Areas and Suburbs

The previous analysis of the suburbs gives a picture of the different situations of cultural economy in the suburbs; however, it does not help to foresee connections with the administrative units of the larger central city. It gives a homogeneous picture of the city of Columbus that it is not realistic because from the analysis of the Neighborhood Liaison Areas emerged the big differences among the different neighborhoods. Moreover, it does not take in consideration the way the current administration is organizing the policy flow. Therefore, I will proceed comparing the suburbs to the Neighborhood Liaison Areas.
Figure 26 gives a much more articulated picture about the distribution of cultural economy, compared to the one offered by Figure 22 considering different areas of Columbus. While in the previous map Columbus and its all territory seemed to be the richest in cultural economy, in this map Dublin and Areas 7, 4, 6, and 10 stick out as the richest.

Also in terms of density, an overlay of Neighborhood Liaison Areas and suburbs can give a much more articulated picture. In Figure 27 areas 4 and 8 fall into the penultimate quintile with Canal Winchester, Upper Arlington, Westerville and New Albany. While in Figure 23 the entire territory of Columbus was in the second quintile.

Suburbs and neighborhood could highlight their specific cultural offer: in this way they would not lose their identity and at the same time they can start a conversation with other areas.

Maps overlaying the data of Neighborhood Liaison Areas and suburbs facilitate a conversation and connections between the suburbs and the city, either enhancing similarities or highlighting differences using cultural economy as connecting element. They offer a navigation tool to handle the political fragmentation of suburbanization and open possibility to research that can compare social and economic factors of suburbs and Neighborhood Liaison Areas.

6.4 Conclusion

A comprehensive definition of cultural economy encompasses three domains: industries, institutions and districts. This definition brings together different models to approach the arts and provides a comprehensive perspective. It goes beyond the
nonprofit model, that advocates for financial support, the commercial model, that pursue to maximize the profit through industrial production, and the urban revitalization model, that promotes the arts as a tool for urban regeneration. Without dismissing any of these approaches, it enhances their contributions pulling them together and offering the definition of a cultural economy: a perspective on the arts and culture that encompasses the multiplicity of their characteristics.

In Columbus and its suburbs, all the three domains are represented. This shows an interesting richness and variety of the cultural scene and an incredible breadth of opportunities. Mapping their presence in the city made emerge that all the domains show an evident concentration downtown, while the southern part of the city is pretty empty. Among the Industries, Architecture and Design is the predominant category; a finding that confirms the idea that the concentration of design firms in Columbus is “a bit extraordinary” (Collaborative Economics, 2008). Among the Institutions, Services is on top, closely followed by Community Organizations; this shows how Columbus is a city making some efforts to promote arts and culture providing general support services and to link arts and culture to its community. Among the single categories of both industries and institutions, Photography is the one that sticks out for being the most widespread all over the city. The predominant category overall, for both Industries and Institutions, is Architecture and Design.

Districts are only in Columbus, and none is found in the suburbs. This means that only in the large city there has been a connection between arts and culture and urban development. Among the five districts in the city, the Short North emerges as the one
richer of cultural opportunities, while Franklinton is the one that does not have much yet. Also it emerges that the districts do not have an outstanding number of cultural resources, compared to the rest of the city. This observation brings back to the literature that explains the districts as mixed-use areas created by effective partnership where cultural facilities are only the anchor of attraction.

Mapping, besides locating *cultural economy*, was helpful to deal with the complexity of urban policymaking. In America, urban policymaking is complex for two main reasons: cities do not have a standard political structure and the implications of suburbanization are not well understood yet. Each State can provide its own regulations, plus each city can make its own choices thanks to municipal home rules. Therefore, in order to understand the flow of policymaking it is necessary an investigation of the government structure of the city of interest. For Columbus, an important devise for policymaking is the Neighborhood Liaison and to create a link with each of the 12 liaisons and *cultural economy* present inside their area is a way to clarify the connections and possible collaboration between cultural planning and urban policymaking.

Maps and tables in **Figure 16** and **17**, showed the connection between *cultural economy* and the socioeconomic characteristics of each area. These show how some distressed neighborhood, such as area 8 and 4, have substantial cultural resources and they have more cultural assets that their economic status would lead us to expect. This could suggest that they could be candidates for workforce development in jobs that are arts related, to integrate them in the infrastructure already present. The map in **Figure 13** showed the articulation of the cultural scenes of each area. This enables the
neighborhood Liaison to identify the actors that could represent arts and culture at the civic table and allows the arts community to think about its current drivers. Downtown emerges as a particular area: it has an administrative office but not a Neighborhood Liaison Area and its socioeconomic configuration is very different and difficult to grasp with accurate data. Finally, the presence of five cultural districts brought to the attention how the city of Columbus already implemented the use of culture as a toll for urban revitalization.

The other element that makes urban policymaking complex is suburbanization, and in particular its political implications that are not well understood yet. Mapping cultural economy of Columbus and its suburbs brings to attention the importance of looking into their existing similarities and future possible collaborations. Dublin, 6th for population and 2nd for income, has the most cultural industries and institutions. New Albany, at the top for income, is only 14th for number of industries and institutions. Worthington, 11th for population and 5th for income, is the suburb with the best density of cultural industries and institutions, offering the best opportunities for arts and culture participation. In terms of cultural scene, Hilliard is the most interesting case where all the categories are represented showing a wide breadth of cultural offering.

After comparing the suburbs with the overall central city, an important strategy was to break down the data about the city using the Neighborhood Liaison Areas and create maps that overlay the data about the Neighborhood Liaison Areas and the suburbs. Figure 26 shows Dublin and several areas of Columbus as the richest in cultural economy and Figure 27 shows how some areas of Columbus have a good offer of
cultural participation. Maps comparing the data of Neighborhood Liaison Areas and suburbs facilitate the conversation between the city and the suburbs, either enhancing similarities or highlighting differences. This gives to cultural economy a bridging role, as it becomes the element of comparison and connection.

In this analysis it became evident that maps can help to grasp the fact that space is inseparable from social relations. Also, maps help to connect the land-oriented character of local politics with the territorial dimension of the ‘culture-economy nexus’ (Henriques & Thiel, 2000). In other words, urban policymaking and cultural economy can find in maps a fundamental tool for research essential to their interconnections.

These findings are exploratory. They enable to connect social, economic, and cultural data, but do not offer an explanation of their correlation. Future research could develop a model that explains the connections between these variables, offering a better understanding of how culture is integrated in the community, and how it can be used to revitalize the city.
Figure 5: Steps towards an Operationalization of the Cultural Economy
Figure 6: Industries
Figure 7: Institutions - Categories
ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

Figure 8: Industries - Predominant Category
Figure 9: Institutions
Figure 10: Institutions - Categories
SERVICES

Figure 11: Institutions - Predominant Category
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>City Plan</th>
<th>Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short North</td>
<td>• Short North Business Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>N 11th Avenue S Nationwide Blvd. E E 4th Street W Olentangy Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short North Special Improvement District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King-Lincoln Arts and Entertainment District</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>King-Lincoln Arts and Entertainment District</td>
<td>N Atcheson Street S Broad Street E 21st Street W Jefferson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery District</td>
<td>Discovery Improvement Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td>N 670 S Mound Street E 71 W Fifth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklinton Arts District</td>
<td>Franklinton Development Association</td>
<td>Franklinton Plan</td>
<td>N Scioto River S Mound Street E Starling Street W Central Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>• University District Organization</td>
<td>University Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan</td>
<td>N Arcadia Avenue S 5th Avenue E ConRail Tracks W Olentangy River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12: Districts**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Architecture &amp; Design</th>
<th>Audiovisual &amp; Design</th>
<th>Photograph y</th>
<th>Publishing</th>
<th>Museums &amp; Galleries</th>
<th>Performing Arts</th>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Comm Orga nizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City and Suburbs 90.39%

Figure 13: Districts – Industries and Institutions
Figure 14: Cultural Economy in Columbus and Suburbs
Figure 15: Neighborhood Liaisons Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Neighborhood Liaisons Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Far West &amp; Westland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hilltop &amp; Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Franklinton &amp; Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University &amp; 5th by Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Southside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clintonville, Northwest, &amp; Far North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Far East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Near East &amp; Driving Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Milo Grogan &amp; North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northland Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>North Linden &amp; South Linden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Industries and Institutions by Neighborhood Liaison Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Most and Least</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>64,400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>46,787</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>12,304</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td>62,851</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>64,880</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>133,157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>107,926</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.236</td>
<td>29,355</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>91,495</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>23,152</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>36,832</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16: Neighborhood Liaison Areas - Most and Least**
Figure 17: Neighborhood Liaison Areas - Density
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clintonville, Northwest, &amp; Far North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University &amp; 5th by Northwest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland Communities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East &amp; Driving Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West &amp; Westland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop &amp; Southwest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Linden &amp; South Linden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklinton &amp; Downtown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo Grogan &amp; North Central</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18: Neighborhood Liaison Areas - Categories**
Figure 19: NLA Categories Chart
Figure 20: Neighborhood Liaison Areas and Districts
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Figure 21: Columbus, OH and its Suburbs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Most and Least</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>8 12</td>
<td>rank 5</td>
<td>rank 13,190</td>
<td>rank 14</td>
<td>rank 14</td>
<td>rank 26.2</td>
<td>rank 84,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Winchester</td>
<td>15 12</td>
<td>rank 9</td>
<td>rank 4,179</td>
<td>rank 5</td>
<td>rank 2</td>
<td>rank 38.9</td>
<td>rank 53,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1 13,300</td>
<td>rank 12</td>
<td>rank 711,749</td>
<td>rank 9</td>
<td>rank 15</td>
<td>rank 26.2</td>
<td>rank 36,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>2 116</td>
<td>rank 4</td>
<td>rank 27,021</td>
<td>rank 10</td>
<td>rank 17</td>
<td>rank 24.8</td>
<td>rank 68,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahanna</td>
<td>6 78</td>
<td>rank 10</td>
<td>rank 32,625</td>
<td>rank 15</td>
<td>rank 4</td>
<td>rank 30.6</td>
<td>rank 59,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
<td>10 34</td>
<td>rank 2</td>
<td>rank 6,639</td>
<td>rank 16</td>
<td>rank 11</td>
<td>rank 30.6</td>
<td>rank 51,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td>11 31</td>
<td>rank 14</td>
<td>rank 27,366</td>
<td>rank 14</td>
<td>rank 7</td>
<td>rank 33.8</td>
<td>rank 46,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveport</td>
<td>12 19</td>
<td>rank 3</td>
<td>rank 3,962</td>
<td>rank 9</td>
<td>rank 9</td>
<td>rank 30.8</td>
<td>rank 50,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>7 50</td>
<td>rank 11</td>
<td>rank 24,785</td>
<td>rank 15</td>
<td>rank 13</td>
<td>rank 26.5</td>
<td>rank 68,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>14 12</td>
<td>rank 8</td>
<td>rank 3,931</td>
<td>rank 12</td>
<td>rank 16</td>
<td>rank 26</td>
<td>rank 92,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obetz</td>
<td>18 18</td>
<td>rank 0.00</td>
<td>rank 4,548</td>
<td>rank 8</td>
<td>rank 12</td>
<td>rank 28.3</td>
<td>rank 45,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickerington</td>
<td>16 5</td>
<td>rank 16</td>
<td>rank 14526</td>
<td>rank 6</td>
<td>rank 18</td>
<td>rank 13.0</td>
<td>rank no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>17 2</td>
<td>rank 17</td>
<td>rank 6,247</td>
<td>rank 13</td>
<td>rank 4</td>
<td>rank 34.7</td>
<td>rank 48,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg</td>
<td>9 37</td>
<td>rank 13</td>
<td>rank 26,356</td>
<td>rank 3</td>
<td>rank 8</td>
<td>rank 32.8</td>
<td>rank 48,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>3 106</td>
<td>rank 6</td>
<td>rank 33,683</td>
<td>rank 17</td>
<td>rank 1</td>
<td>rank 40.6</td>
<td>rank 74,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>4 93</td>
<td>rank 7</td>
<td>rank 29,720</td>
<td>rank 7</td>
<td>rank 3</td>
<td>rank 36.4</td>
<td>rank 68,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>13 15</td>
<td>rank 9</td>
<td>rank 19,232</td>
<td>rank 2</td>
<td>rank 5</td>
<td>rank 34.5</td>
<td>rank 35,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>5 80</td>
<td>rank 11</td>
<td>rank 14,139</td>
<td>rank 9</td>
<td>rank 11</td>
<td>rank 34.2</td>
<td>rank 72,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Suburbs- Most and Least
Establishments per 1000 Residents by Suburbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Most and Least Density</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>84,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Winchester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.872</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>53,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>711,749</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>36,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.293</td>
<td>27,021</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>89,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahanna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.391</td>
<td>32,625</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>59,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.121</td>
<td>6,639</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>51,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.796</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>46,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveport</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.796</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>50,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>24,785</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>68,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3,931</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>92,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obetz</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4,548</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>45,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickerington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>14526</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13,0 no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>48,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>26,356</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>48,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>33,683</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>74,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.129</td>
<td>29,720</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>68,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>19,232</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>35,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.658</td>
<td>14,139</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>72,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Suburbs – Density
Figure 24: Suburbs - Categories
Figure 25: Suburbs Categories Chart
### Number of Industries and Institutions of Suburbs and Area Commission Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Most and Least Rank</th>
<th>Density Rank</th>
<th>Population Rank</th>
<th>White Rank</th>
<th>African American Rank</th>
<th>Median Age Rank</th>
<th>Median Household Income Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahanna</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveport</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 26: Neighborhood Liaison Areas and Suburbs - Most and Least**
Establishments per 1000 Residents of Suburbs and Area Commission Together

Figure 27: Neighborhood Liaison Areas and Suburbs- Density
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of my dissertation is to inform decision making that can support the formulation step of the policy process of cultural planning. To this end, I developed a research strategy to help policymakers to better understand their current situation and assess the need for future action and conducted a case study as an empirical example of this research strategy.

Developing a research strategy entailed two steps: (1) building a definition of cultural economy that can be operationalized, enabling the researcher to collect empirical data on a specific place; (2) finding an analytical approach that can link the data about cultural economy to the complexity of urban policymaking. Finally, an empirical investigation showed how this strategy can be applied. Therefore, I proceeded with an exploratory analysis of cultural economy and its connections with urban policymaking in Columbus.
The results of my research provide my best answers to the two problems that I initially identified in contemporary American cultural policy: the theoretical confusion about what cultural economy is and the unclear connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking. In this chapter, I will summarize these results, highlight the contribution to the field, and disclose their limitations. Finally, I will provide some suggestions for future research.

7.2 Cultural Economy

7.2.1 Definition

The cultural economy of American cities emerged as an important topic in cultural policy at the end of the 20th century, when the cultural paradigm changed and cultural policy makers started to highlight the multifaceted dynamics of cultural activities and city officials increased their attention to these great potentials. The change in the cultural policy paradigm showed a shift in the geographic unit of interest, from national to local, and a different policy model, from subsidy model to community and economic development models. The new paradigm can be described as “the creative city” agenda and promotes an urban development vision that fosters interaction between culture, innovation and community.

Even though local governments have increasingly sought to harness the linkage between culture and economy, it is not always agreed what constitutes cultural economy (Markusen et al., 2006). Nonprofit organizations, commercial enterprises, cultural industries, and arts districts have been implicated, but at the same time the use of different approaches and measures has created significant confusion. Also, despite the
fact that “the creative city “agenda encourage the tie between urban policymaking (i.e. urban planning and economic development) and cultural policy this has not happen in most American cities (Markusen, 2006a). Furthermore, institutional and theoretical underpinnings of this synthetic effort need to be explored.

Academic literature has explored the connection between culture and economy in different ways and from different perspectives. In Chapter 3, I reviewed a broad set of literature, categorizing the different approaches and identifying three main domains: industries, institutions, and districts. They are characterized by three main differences – foundational concepts, economic functions, and interaction mechanisms – but merge in an inclusive definition of cultural economy.

The reason why I pull the three domains together is that for the purpose of defining the cultural economy of a city it is important to keep these perspectives in concert as an economy. In a capitalistic society, the economy encompasses all the activities involved in producing, distributing, and consuming goods and services in a specific area. Therefore, in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of all the activities linked to cultural industries, institutions, and districts, it is important to look at them as an economy rather than separate entities. Furthermore, if the analysis of their differences helps to clarify the language and the theoretical rationale implied, pulling them together helps to draw a clear contour of the object of attention of cultural policy in the era of “the creative city” paradigm.

This inclusive definition brings a lot of organizations and activities together. In Chapter 4, I operationalized the definition creating a classification that breaks down each
domain into different categories and enabled me to gather empirical data - such as name of arts and culture establishments - under each category. In Chapter 6, I listed the types of businesses selected for each category.

Among the literature using the term cultural economy (Gibson & Kong, 2005) two main approaches emerge: one stressing the importance of an economic model as a tool to understand culture (economics of cultural economy), the other pointing the attention to the cultural context of the economy (signifying practices of cultural economy). They are two different logic of inquiry, rather than two different definitions: one rational and quantitative, the other critical and genealogical. For my dissertation, I picked a logic of inquiry that can bridge these two different approaches, offering the data necessary for both of them. In fact, GIS analysis can grasp the administrative, social, and economic aspects intertwined with culture: all aspects necessary to gather information about both the economics and the signifying practices of cultural economy.

7.2.2 Comparison with Reports’ Definitions

In Chapter 5, I reviewed the definition of arts and culture presented by the fifteen studies released since 2004 in Columbus. What emerged is that there is a need for a definition, but the current situation is still very fluid and there is not yet a consensus. Three main definitions of arts and culture in the same community: one narrow, old style linked to the nonprofit subsidy model; another one instrumental that values arts and culture as a tool to reach a bigger community goal; the last one inclusive considering high culture, popular culture and independent culture.

The presence of three different conceptions of cultural economy operating simultaneously implies a lack for clarity and consistency in the issue definition of the
policy process. Moreover, it creates difficulties of moving the policy agenda because policymakers do not know which direction they should focus on.

My definition includes all the three aspects emerging from the studies of Columbus and goes beyond their limitations offering a way to frame the complexity of the contemporary world. None of them is more correct of the other, because each of them displays the way the arts and culture community perceive itself. On the other hand, a framework that can show how they interact is beneficial for the creation of a harmony in the community that preserves the richness of diversity.

The old style definition, that sees arts and culture as the group of nonprofit flagship organizations is implicit in my framework in the institutions domain where the primary interaction mechanism is the result of three sectors: private, public, and nonprofit. The instrumental definition is inherent to the district domain where arts and culture are seen as anchor of attraction for a certain area. The inclusive definition is also encompassed in the institutions domains, representing all the three sectors. I also include the industries domain of commercial, popular culture and helps to clarify what kind of businesses operated as cultural industries and what are their prerogatives.

In other words, my framework not only includes all the different ways of thinking about arts and culture present in the Columbus community, but it helps to articulate each of them explaining foundational concepts, economic functions, interaction mechanisms, and elaborates a classifications that allows to collect empirical data.

7.2.3 Reorganization of the Conceptual Framework

Through an intensive literature review, I defined cultural economy as the connection between culture and economy that in a city takes the organizational form of
industries, institutions, and districts. In a city, these three domains function within the same locality. Therefore, I focused on space as glue that brings together the three different domains of cultural economy and I created maps that displayed their distribution on the territory.

The empirical investigation of cultural economy and its three domains brought to the attention another main difference between them: while industries and institutions are single establishments, districts are a more complex form of organization. They include a spatial dimension in their foundational concept that implies also that each districts has several organizations, either industries or institutions, as part of its own realization. Of course industries and institutions are also located on the territory, in space, but they are dots, not areas. This was implied in their foundational concepts, which do not take in consideration neither the territory nor other actors of the same locality, however it became apparent with mapping.

This observation redesigns the shape of cultural economy: industries, institutions, and districts are not just three slices of a pie, but they build a whole in a much more articulated way (see Figure 28). Districts include industries and institutions which represent their anchor of attractions; however, districts include also much more, such as restaurants, apartments, stores, etc.
In pointing to cultural districts as a successful model for integrating arts and community, I am not suggesting that city should pursue them in cultural planning. I encourage a geographic perspective in order to grasp cultural economy assets, but also to clarify policy mechanisms and invite to use at its best what is already in place. Therefore, in terms of cultural districts I agree with Markusen (2006) argument who stated:

Should cities and states try to develop "cultural districts" where cultural activities are clustered together or should they encourage a decentralized mosaic of cultural activities throughout neighborhoods and regions? I argue for minimal clustering and for dispersion on the grounds that cultural space can play powerful roles in stabilizing and revitalizing neighborhoods and in generating greater cultural participation by diverse groups (p. 3).

The empirical investigation made also clear how districts are one way in which the city is already integrating arts and culture in the urban planning process. The five cultural districts identified in Columbus, offered examples of different ways of involvement of the city. For instance, two recall a couple of examples, the Short North
Arts Districts, an incorporated business association, have an agreement with the city that falls into the Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Program (NCR), a city program that offers technical assistance, loans and matching grants, and financial services in the areas surrounding downtown. The Franklinton Arts District, instead, was created with an official policy document by the city in 2003.

7.3 Urban Policymaking

7.3.1 Context analysis and GIS analysis

The first set of results of my research provides a comprehensive definition of cultural economy, looking at an extensive body of literature, and creates a classification that operationalizes this definition. This classification is useful to collect empirical data. The second set of results is concerned with the connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking. In order to analyze this connection, I conducted an analysis in two steps: context analysis, to collect the baseline data about the context, and GIS analysis, to navigate the complexity of urban policymaking, both at the level of city bureaucracy and at the level of relations with the suburbs.

Urban policymaking requires an explanation in terms of governance and policymaking structure. In Chapter 2, I illustrated the five steps of the policy process, claiming that my goal was to gather information for the policy formulation step. After analyzing the reports I can say that my research helps the agenda building step, because it helps to bring clarity and consistency about the issue brought on the agenda and advance policy formulation because it offers information about the current situation essential for the formulation of policies.
What emerged from the context analysis of Columbus is that the Planning Division is focused on the physical aspects of the land, the advancement of arts and culture is not managed by a city department, and city plans do not have arts and culture as one of their goals or tools. The actors of the arts and culture scene are of different kinds: the city created a Columbus Art Commission and has a funding partnership with GCAC; GCAC is the local arts agency and it is a nonprofit organization; several civic groups showed interests in promoting the arts in several ways, in particular the business leaders group’s, Columbus Partnership. Finally, in this context analysis, little surfaced about existing relationship between Columbus and its suburbs.

On this ground, I proceeded with GIS analysis, first looking at the Neighborhood Liaison Areas and then looking at the suburbs. In Columbus, the Neighborhood Liaisons are a team of advocates created to work across department lines in order to address citizen requests, problems, and questions. The city has been divided in 12 service areas and a liaison has been assigned to each of the areas to work with citizens and manage the investment of city resources in the neighborhood.

I mapped the Most and the Least showing which areas of the city and which suburbs are rich in cultural economy, and which ones are poor of it. Then, I mapped the
Density of *cultural economy* showing the areas and suburbs with the highest concentration of opportunities for arts and culture participation, creating a relation between the number of establishments and the population. Finally, I created maps overlaying the data of Neighborhood Liaison Areas and suburbs, facilitating the connections between the suburbs and the city, either enhancing similarities or highlighting differences and using *cultural economy* as the connecting element.

Looking at the maps that analyze the situations of the city - broken down in the 12 Neighborhood Liaison Areas – and the suburbs together, what emerges is that the richest areas, in terms of the most arts establishments, are area 6, 4, 7, 10, and Dublin (see Figure 26). Analyzing data about density, the situation changes because the factor population comes in to impact the data about the number of arts and culture establishments. In fact this measure is obtained dividing the number of establishments and multiplying the results for 1,000. According to the Urban Institute\(^6\), this is an indicator of the presence of opportunities for cultural participation and therefore evaluates the cultural vitality of a place. While measuring the most and the least several areas of the city were doing much better than the suburbs, for density only the suburbs are in the highest quintile: Worthington, Grandview Heights, Groveport\(^7\), Dublin, and Bexley.

Maps comparing the data of Neighborhood Liaison Areas and suburbs offer a navigation tool to handle the political fragmentation of suburbanization and facilitate the conversation between the city and the suburbs. This gives to the *cultural economy* a

---

\(^6\) See *Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretation and Indicators* (Urban Institute, 2006)

\(^7\) Groveport, that has the least number of arts and culture establishment, jumps up in the density measure because it has a small population.
bridging role in the urban fragmentation, as it is used as element of comparison and connection.

7.3.2 Suggestions

My analysis shows how the city could utilize the existing administrative tools to integrate the arts into the urban planning and managing process. The Neighborhood Liaisons are a team of city staff reporting to the Mayor to work across department and address citizens’ request. They coordinate the exchange of information among citizens, neighborhood organizations, and city department, and manage city resources in the neighborhoods. Creating a link between the arts and culture community and the Neighborhood Liaisons could help the former to be integrated in the city, and the latter to incorporate the arts into their larger purposes pursuing in this way “the creative city” agenda utilizing existing administrative assets.

At the same time, the exploration of the urban policymaking mechanisms provided to the arts and culture community information about the actors involved in arts and culture and the role of the government. More importantly, it clarified the urban planning process, highlighting the Neighborhood Liaisons as a key element in the policymaking of the city. This suggests that the arts and culture community could organize themselves in a way that can integrate their members in the urban planning process and encourages them to work within the existing structure rather than proposing a different one. For instance, people working in the same categories of the cultural economy and operating in the same area, could group themselves and identify their
Neighborhood Liaisons in order to seat at the table where decision are made about their area.

With regard to the suburbs and the not well-understood connections with the central city, my analysis can be the starting point to create relations. This implies that the arts would be the bonding element facilitating the conversation: a great opportunity for the growth of the arts, but also for the advancement of the relationships among the several governmental actors of the metropolitan area.

7.4 Contributions

The main contributions of my study impact the perception of cultural economy, the understanding of the urban policy process, and the knowledge of the community of Columbus and its suburbs. The definition of cultural economy engages in the debate represented by the cultural reports and facilitates a common vision of arts and culture that preserve the differences. The main struggle in creating the definition was to create a framework that could put together organizations that traditionally were considered incomparable. At the same time, this comprehensive definition identifies the variety of actors involved, encouraging a better dialogue among them and suggesting a variety of goals for cultural planning.

The context analysis offered a picture of the governmental structure of Columbus and its suburbs, highlighting the independence of one from each other. Mapping identified in the Neighborhood Liaisons and their assigned areas, the key elements for a better involvement of the arts and culture in the community and in the policy process. This is a finding helpful not only for the arts and culture actors but for urban planners and
policy makers as well. Mapping also identified similarities between different areas and the suburbs, laying down the characteristics of each of them that could be the elements for possible future interactions. In other words, mapping emerged as a fundamental tool for the complexity of urban policymaking.

A geographic approach not only highlights jurisdictional boundaries, clarifying the territorial foundations of the policy mechanism, but also focuses on the characteristics of the community. Looking at the Neighborhood Liaison Areas allowed me to understand an administrative strategy implemented by the city and also enabled me to gather socioeconomic data of each community. Moreover, it highlights the community assets instead of dwelling on its deficit.

Overall, my research strategy, by a comprehensive definition of cultural economy and a GIS analysis, offers a policy paradigm where arts and culture are explored as an asset of the community. This is an important approach, necessary before their development is suggested, or their results measured.

7.5 Limitations

My dissertation presents some limitations that require some cautions in using this study. In this section, I will explain why policymakers should be careful in considering the findings of my research. First, the data collected are insufficient for a thorough analysis: bookstores, and libraries were not available in the database utilized. Plus, the Unified Database of Arts Organization was pulled together in 1998, while the database organized by Americans for the Arts is dated 2005. The lack of solid data has characterized the arts and culture sector and its methods of research. However, with a
clear conceptual framework the collection of data can be facilitated and this gap can be quickly overcome.

Second, in my research the focus is on organizations, specifically arts and culture organizations. I did not look at individuals, even though occupational approaches are highly requested, because I was more interested in gaining a systematic way of thinking about arts and culture. This could be beneficial to individuals because it can offer a road map of the sector and can help them in finding their own ways and opportunities.

Third, my approach treats the organizations as they were all the same: single dots on the map. This should not be misleading and the differential impacts that each organization has on the community should be kept in mind. For instance, the Columbus Symphony Orchestra has a regional impact, while a small organization such as Thurber House has a local impact.

Fourth, my analysis is just one point in time. It is a snapshot of the current situation, and in this way it misses some important insights that could be gained studying the changes over time. For instance, it does not capture the direction of *culture economy*, as it does not say if the situation is improving or declining.

Finally, the choice of Neighborhood Liaison as analytical element limits the generalizability of my suggested method, as they are an administrative strategy specific to Columbus, created by the Mayor. In other American cities, the same lens could not be applied as cities do not have the same political structure.

These limitations should be considered as a road map for future research. My dissertation is just a first step in the direction of locating *cultural economy* and exploring
its connection with urban policymaking, and all the limitations emerging show the possible direction for further investigation.

7.6 Future Research

Considering the contributions and limitations of my study, much more needs to be explored to clarify and deepen the thinking about the connections between cultural economy and urban policymaking. Therefore, in this final section, I would like to propose some suggestions for future research that builds on the results of my dissertation and opens new direction that could be added to the ones emerging from the limitations section above.

First, given the findings that Downtown is rich in arts and culture establishments as illustrated in Figure 18, it would be undertake a study about Downtown starting from this perspective. An analysis of these findings should lead to strategies that make the best of these assets, especially in order to help the area grow and be revitalized. Also, it provides some criteria to evaluate the ideas proposed in several reports that are pointing to the arts to revitalize Downtown (see section 6.3.1). For example, the suggestion of the reports Artspace Preliminary Feasibility Report (Artspace Projects, 2007), which calls for the creation of live/work spaces for artists downtown, seams to be promising because it might attract residents in an area characterized by vacant apartments. Conversely, the idea of constructing new facilities promoted by the Columbus Comprehensive Plan, seems to under value the richness already present Downtown.

Second, the existing cultural districts could be evaluated using the criteria emerging from the literature, exposed in Chapter 3. Pulling together how the literature
defines the cultural districts and illustrate their foundational concepts, economic function, and interaction mechanisms will give a set of criteria to evaluate the cultural districts in Columbus.

Third, the analysis of the connections between socioeconomic factors and the cultural economy needs to be deepened in order to figure out the following points: What kind of links exists among these factors? Does one have an impact on the other? For instance, what is the correlation between number of arts and culture establishments and the median household income?

Fourth, the data gathered opens up the opportunity to investigate the relationship between the Columbus local area and the symbologies of the goods and services produced there. Scott (2001) claims that the city functions as an ecology of commodified symbolic production and consumption, creating intertwined relations between the urban landscape and the goods and services produced there. In Columbus, Architecture and Design - for industries - and Services with Community Organizations - for institutions - are the main cultural production and consumption. What is the relation with the local areas? What are the symbologies of those emerging modes of cultural production? Answering these questions not only will help to grasp the signifying practices of cultural economy in Columbus, but also will offer arguments valid to brand the city.

Finally, this model can be used in a bigger context. It can be applied to any American city, not only to the Columbus metropolitan area. The operationalization of the definition can connect cultural economy to the urban policymaking in every city.
Moreover, it can open up the possibility to compare different cities, creating benchmarking studies that allow cities to learn from each other.

The recommendations listed above are only some of the possible implications of my study. The actual plan for future research is going to be determined by the comments of scholars in the field and the immediate needs identified by the city and its arts and culture community.
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