

**Cultural Policy Research in the United States:
An Introduction to Studies and Articles Relevant to Folk Arts and Traditional Culture**

**Written and Compiled by Betsy Peterson
Supported by the Public Programs Section of the American Folklore Society
March 2011**

A Note about this Document: This brief essay and annotated bibliography/webography was inspired by a series of sessions focused on domestic cultural policy held at the 2009 American Folklore Society annual meeting in Boise, Idaho. The sessions were organized by the Alliance for California Traditional Arts, the American Folklore Society and its Public Programs Section, the Fund for Folk Culture, the National Council for the Traditional Arts, and Preserving America's Cultural Traditions (PACT). My thanks go to all of those organizers, and to the AFS Public Programs Section for its support of the creation of this bibliography in particular.

The goal of the sessions was to encourage debate among AFS membership regarding US-based and focused cultural policy scholarship and discussion. In particular, the sessions were intended to focus on the US cultural policy research emphasizing cultural participation that has been published over the past 10-15 years. Much of this policy research is not well known to the fields of folklore and ethnomusicology, yet its content, methodology, and impact is of great relevance to these fields.

Most of these studies would be considered "gray literature"—a term scholarly communications specialists use to describe a body of materials that cannot be found easily through conventional channels such as publishers, but which is usually recent, often available online, and offering substantial, original research. Many were commissioned by public and private funding agencies to inform their practice and their funding decisions.

At the most basic level, research on cultural participation has shaped a decade or so of cultural policy terminology, discussion, and funding practice that in turn directly influence current and future support for the field of folklore studies, particularly for those working in arts and cultural organizations and agencies. In general, the public folklore field has engaged only minimally with cultural policy work at the national level (beyond specific focus on relevant federal agencies or federal funding). Our field continues to ignore this work at its peril.

I hope the following information will provide a resource for, and stimulate a broader discussion among, scholars and cultural workers engaged in the folk and traditional arts. It is not intended to be comprehensive, but tries to include the most significant and influential recent work and, admittedly, reflects the interests and perspectives of the compiler. In other words, it is designed to be expanded on and commented upon as the field sees fit—as a living document to be augmented over time.

Setting the Stage: Brief Background and Context

From the 1960s through the 1980s, it is fair to say that the National Endowment for the Arts (expanding on funding strategies developed by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations), and a growing number of state and local arts agencies, focused their funding support on strengthening the “supply” of art for audience consumption—that is, on building an infrastructure for arts presentation and production throughout the country. As we know, these efforts fueled an explosion of non-profit development and programming in numerous fields. In the folk arts, most of the infrastructure activity focused on the development of a large network of state folk arts programs housed in state arts agencies, humanities councils, and non-profits, which helped to provide support to a broad swath of decentralized and often unincorporated grassroots activity. During this same period, a smaller group of independent folk arts non-profits (e.g., City Lore, the Vermont Folklife Center, the Philadelphia Folklife Project, the Western Folklife Center, etc.) also emerged as did cultural centers of color and community arts organizations (e.g., Appalshop and the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center).¹

In the late 1980s and 1990s, however, in part as a response to mounting financial pressures on arts organizations and the intensifying “culture wars,” arts funding trends and policy conversations began to shift. With the NEA politically embattled, the arts community, led by a handful of national private foundations supporting the arts (most notably the Wallace Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and the MacArthur Foundation), turned their attention to cultivating “demand,” constructing arguments to engage broad public support and expand markets. What began as audience development and market-oriented research and funding strategies (“butts in seats” arguments, as they have often been called) has steadily transformed into a broader conversation about arts and cultural participation that is directly relevant to the folk and traditional arts. Over time, the discussion has attracted the interest of practitioners, cultural workers and scholars working in public administration, planning, sociology, anthropology, business and non-profit management, and the emerging field of cultural policy.

Since the 1997 publication of *The Arts and the Public Purpose*—which asserted a public role and place for the arts in American life, and defined the arts broadly to include the non-profit, commercial and unincorporated sectors—an explosion of research has expanded our knowledge about the range and presence of cultural participation in neighborhoods and communities around the country, and about the organizations and social systems that make this participation possible. Studies such as the RAND Corporation’s *The Performing Arts in a New Era*, commissioned by the Pew Charitable Trusts, synthesized data to describe a more inclusive and interdependent performing

¹ This paragraph was written before the controversial remarks of NEA Chairman Rocco Landesman at a theater conference in January 2011, in which he noted an oversupply of arts nonprofits for lessening public demand.

arts system comprised of artists, audiences, organizations and funders across multiple market sectors. Other research tracking individual motivations for and experiences of cultural participation—including various field-based research projects supported by the Wallace Foundation, the important 2002 ethnographic study *The Informal Arts* in Chicago conducted for the Chicago Center for Arts Policy at Columbia College, and, most notably, the Rockefeller Foundation’s work with cultural indicators (undertaken by the Urban Institute)—further expanded definitions of art and culture by providing ethnographic and quantitative documentation demonstrating the breadth and depth of cultural participation and vitality and other forms of community and civic engagement.²

So what does a conceptual framework or approach emphasizing cultural participation or vitality look like? Simply, as defined by the Urban Institute and expressed in *Culture Counts in Communities*, cultural vitality refers to "a community's evidence of creating, disseminating, validating, and supporting arts and culture as a dimension of everyday life." Such a framework attempts to identify or map those venues, activities and supports that are indicated as significant by members of a community. In *Culture Counts*, for instance, the phenomena in question were tracked in three primary domains of measurement: “*presence* of opportunities for cultural participation, cultural *participation* itself, and *support* for cultural activities.” While many researchers do not necessarily use the specific cultural indicators developed by the Urban Institute, the general definitions of the terms italicized above summarize the basic tenets of much cultural participation research.

Cultural Participation, Public Purpose and Folk Arts

For folklorists, this may seem like old news. At last, we say, the rest of the arts world is catching up with us or confirming what we knew or intuited. While there is some truth to such sentiments, complacency is premature. Clearly, much of this research confirms and validates the work of folklorists in the public sector over the past few decades. Yet, some of it adds greater depth and richness to our findings, questions some of our assumptions, and opens a door for folklorists’ greater involvement in cultural policy discussions. Most importantly, it begins to build a concrete body of data that which we can contribute to and adapt. This is critically important, since public policy and support gravitate to data-rich problems and sectors.

As a conceptual system, a framework emphasizing cultural vitality and cultural participation enables the arts community (including the folk arts) to engage with public policy in terms that are relevant to the allocation of public resources and development of services. To use policy-speak, it is work that is developed with an understanding of the regulatory constraints and authorizing environments familiar to most non-profits

² See <http://www.urban.org/projects/cultural-vitality-indicators/index.cfm> for a fuller discussion of the Arts and Cultural Indicators Project. Accessed April 7, 2011.

and funding agencies. By focusing on social behavior, socio-economic contexts and systems of support, it provides practical tools and arguments to identify the breadth and depth of public involvement, to measure types of participation and impact, to identify barriers and obstacles, and to make cases for the value of arts and culture in community life.

By design, the language is relatively neutral, inclusive and descriptive and offers a way out of the simple dichotomies that have plagued the arts and the folk arts far too long—that is, folk/fine, amateur/professional, high/low, elite/pop, formal/informal, traditional/contemporary. Rather it identifies a continuum of cultural engagement and activity. Bill Ivey acknowledges this continuum in his characterization of expressive life when he describes heritage and voice as two poles.³ Accumulated data clearly illustrates that all individuals (artists, producers and consumers alike) move in and out of diverse life worlds, contexts, and groups on a daily basis and over the course of a lifetime. The point may seem obvious, but it has consequences for the folk arts. The data confirms a significant presence of folk arts in daily community life and, at the same time, demonstrates a permeability and fluidity of cultural expression that may question the bounded presentation of traditional forms. Traditional communities are dynamic, fluid, and permeable.

At its best, cultural participation research is profoundly “emic” in its assumptions and begins to introduce nuances of cultural context and setting into the discourse. From the outset, some of the earliest site-specific studies examining cultural participation (such as Wali, Moriarty, and Alvarez) employed field-based methods and took great pains to identify and employ terms marking artistic and cultural activity used by artists and relevant community members. The value of artistic expression is expressed and defined by the community.

As an organizing concept, cultural participation research is sufficiently broad to make room for concerns of individual creativity and motivation, while acknowledging relationships to community values, interests, and heritage, and to acknowledge and incorporate individual agency and creativity into the discussion. In the context of public folklore practice to date, this last point is worth stressing: if the mainstream arts world enshrines notions of individual genius and creativity at the expense of community context or cultural values, folklorists sometimes err in the other direction.

At a Glance: Linking Bibliographic Examples to Folk Arts Issues

1. Folk and Traditional Artists (including topics related to artist definition and roles in creating community; needs and support; training and transmission of artistic skills)

³ See Ivey. See also Barre Toelken’s 2001 eloquent address to the National Council on the Arts, later published in the *Journal of American Folklore* 116:460 (Spring 2003): 196-205.

Relevant Studies: The best places to start are *Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for U.S. Artists* (Jackson, et al.), *Crossover: How Artists Build Careers across Commercial, Nonprofit and Community Work* (Markusen, et al.) and *The Pro-Am Revolution* (Leadbeater and Miller). *Investing in Creativity* may be familiar to many folklorists and deservedly so. The researchers included folk artists and discussion of the folk arts very explicitly, placing their needs and concerns within a broader discussion of artist support. The report also offers useable data that clearly illustrates the lack of support for the field. *Crossover*, however, deserves more recognition, for its concrete and detailed examination of the trajectory of artists' careers over time and across diverse sectors. It also, I think, challenges folklorists to remember that folk and traditional artists (like other artists) move within and across varied creative and cultural worlds, and provides methodology for further pursuit of issues related to creativity and artist life-paths.

2. Motivations and Social Functions for Cultural Participation (works which look at factors of individual involvement and community influences; in-group/out-group functions of cultural participation; socialization, connoisseurship, and consumption; and relationships to civic engagement and community life)

Relevant Studies: More than most foundations, The Wallace Foundation has focused significant research on parsing and understanding motivations for participation and socialization in the arts. *Reggae to Rachmaninoff: How and Why People Participate in Arts and Culture* (Walker, et al.) is perhaps the best place to start. Much like the work on individual artists, this work identifies a range of individual motivations for cultural participation and builds a more nuanced picture of intrinsic benefit.⁴ The social functions and sense of community engendered by artistic experience receive significant attention. The work is based on survey work and interviews. A number of smaller briefs developed from that study are available on the Wallace Foundation website. Pia Moriarity's *Immigrant Participatory Arts* also examines functions and motivations for participation within newly arrived immigrant communities, drawing much on Robert Putnam's ideas about social capital. The bridging and bonding terminology relates directly to public folklore's distinction between "inreach" and "outreach." *Beyond Attendance*, the most recent monograph by Alan Brown and Jennifer Novak-Leonard, looks at participation in the digital realm and expands basic definitions of participation beyond attendance and face-to-face interaction. The study (available on the National Endowment for the Arts website) has implications for our notions of folk communities and transmission.

3. The Role of Context, Space and Place (works which look at community validated and controlled space; the significance of context in performance)

⁴ A later Wallace Foundation report, *The Gifts of the Muse*, more specifically investigates the intrinsic benefits arguments.

Relevant Studies: “Challenge, Change, and Space in Vernacular Cultural Practice” (Markusen); *There’s Nothing Informal About It* (Alvarez); and *The Informal Arts* (Wali, et al.) are good places to start. The Markusen article looks more specifically at the appropriation of space for cultural communities and performance (particularly looking at issues of community control and validation). Markusen’s article specifically addresses issues of space shortage for cultural and artistic activity. Wali and Alvarez, on the other hand, are focusing more on appropriation of multi-use space and participant attitudes about performance space. The NEA monograph *Beyond Attendance* also specifically addresses issues related to context and setting that are germane to folk arts.

Over the past decade, the cultural participation literature has placed extensive emphasis on setting and context and has accumulated overwhelming data that confirms and strengthens folklorists’ arguments and assertions about the significance and diversity of cultural context in understanding arts participation. The field should make greater use of the data and should consider adapting some of these research tools.

So Now What?

By necessity, many in the institutionalized arts universe are beginning to develop stronger relationships with related fields and sectors—community and economic development, historic preservation, urban planning, environmental studies, health and human services. Shrinking resources and a prolonged recession are no doubt encouraging this behavior, as is a changing public consensus about the social contract. Folklorists need to broaden their relationships as well and are beginning to do so. As folklorist Richard Vidutis remarked in a *Publore* posting in 2010: “...folk elements, the intangibles, are everywhere embedded in all sorts of historic and modern day forms waiting for us to find and analyze them and add our findings to those of others. So, instead of always thinking that folk forms have to be isolated as a separate species, how about we also work and study collaboratively and respectfully with other disciplines in their landscapes and venues?”⁵

Building on that observation, I find that cultural vitality and participation research offers realistic and accurate observations about the way folklore or traditional expression functions and occurs in everyday life—as part of a reservoir of ideas, emotions, responses and habits that we draw upon—which have implications for folk arts programming. All people move fluidly through numerous roles and group identities on a daily basis and folklore makes most sense when seen, heard and experienced in relation to everything else. Let’s acknowledge that point explicitly with the artists and communities we work with, in our programming, in collaborations with others. Let’s put folk arts squarely in a bigger mix of daily life. Let’s not be afraid to engage and program with other fields, to learn from and contribute to other fields: the arts, historic preservation, community development or organizing, tourism, to name just a few. After

⁵ *Publore*, November 3, 2010.

many years of working in this field, I have come to think that those organizations who are most organically “folk arts” in their purpose or orientation are the ones that are community based, offering folk arts as one of many options in a menu of services. In these instances, folk arts or folklife are not so much bracketed or aestheticized, but are understood and presented as a part of the broad repertoire of lived cultural concerns and responses. Such organizations may not define folklore exactly in the way the field of folklore studies does, but they understand its value and significance to community life. It is part of their organizational DNA.

Our field has a great deal to contribute to cultural policy discussions that can deepen and expand theory and practice in a range of areas, if we will seize the opportunities. Here are a few topics that I think are especially crying out for folklorists’ perspectives:

Mediation. Discussions about brokerage, mediation, and community engagement can benefit from folklorists’ input. We can certainly contribute to discussions about the roles and responsibilities of cultural workers—especially in service-provider contexts—and the range and types of organizations engaged in cultural programs/services. Most of the literature is strongly biased towards the functions and roles of programming and artist-centric institutions and yet we know that much cultural work continues to emanate from or is initiated by non-arts institutions and other service-oriented organizations.

Aesthetic diversity. For all of the discussion of cultural participation, of course, most of the literature still embodies a strong, lingering emphasis on European art forms, venues, and modes of participation. There is also frequently a conflation of cultural or ethnic diversity and aesthetic diversity. With fellow arts colleagues, folklorists have tended to couch diversity discussions in terms of cultural or ethnic difference. Aesthetic diversity may be an equally fruitful and perhaps less charged framework. It also offers more specificity.

Cultural, artistic change and tradition. Our field has much to contribute to these discussions, if we would begin to articulate the relationships of individual creativity and agency more seriously and in greater depth (beyond acknowledging that individuals exhibit creativity within a framework of tradition). Much of the literature on “professional-amateurs” or DIY cultural activity, for instance, tends to describe this expression in a conceptual vacuum without much sense of cultural, historical, or socio-political context, and without attention to the creolized interaction and products of traditional, popular, and elite cultures.

Cultural commons/habitat migration and loss. As the arts world becomes more aware of vernacular cultural practice, contexts, and spaces, folklorists have much to say about the loss or migration of habitat and of strategies for adaptation, and the impact of these losses on communities and artists. In the sphere of intellectual property, folklorists have become more vocal about the enclosure of the public domain of ideas and expression in

United Nations and WIPO discussions, and have critiqued the incompatibility and detrimental effects of official cultural property regimes on traditional communities and on responsible, engaged scholarship. We need to be more vocal advocates for the protection of the broader cultural commons. What happens when materials and resources disappear, street-corner hangouts are demolished, and neighborhoods are gentrified? What happens when the social networks that nurture the community festival collapse or migrate to virtual realms and different countries? How do folklorists begin to more vigorously integrate the political, social and aesthetic dimensions of their work?

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND RESOURCE LIST

The following bibliography and resource list provides an overview of the most significant cultural policy work of the past decade or so that implicates cultural participation, emphasizing studies that are available or readily accessible either online or elsewhere. It highlights studies written by researchers and scholars working in the cultural policy universe because they are the primary individuals building this body of scholarship (as opposed to scholars working in folklore, ethnomusicology, or cultural studies). For good bibliographies about public folklore issues compiled by scholars in the field, go to: Timothy H. Evans, "Toward Critical Theory for Public Folklore: An Annotated Bibliography." *Folklore Forum* 31:2 2000. Pp. 115-122. Also, Steve Siporin, "Public Folklore: A Bibliographic Introduction," in Baron, Robert and Spitzer, Nick, eds. *Public Folklore* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992).

This bibliography emphasizes research that specifically focuses on national quantitative data and research, or conveys site-specific studies that explicitly advance or implicate nationally significant arguments of relevance to the folk and traditional arts. Basic policy-oriented websites are included at the end.

Cultural Participation, Engagement and Vitality: Site-Specific and National Studies Based on Qualitative and Quantitative Data

NOTE: The following studies rely heavily on primary quantitative and qualitative data-gathering and statistical analysis. They present findings to develop arguments or illuminate aspects of cultural engagement or participation. All or in part, they focus on the informal arts, the unincorporated arts, participatory arts, avocational/amateur arts, folk and traditional arts, cultural heritage, community-based arts, and so forth. The meanings and definitions for all of these terms vary from study to study, and many overlap, but they describe a constellation of artistic activities and cultural expression in community life that are informal, often folk or popular in orientation, amateur, voluntary, often involving direct community participation, and occurring in myriad social contexts beyond the boundaries of the museum, the concert hall, and the traditionally defined non-profit arts universe.

Most if not all these studies were commissioned by various foundations, but all of the studies have implications for public folk and traditional arts practice and methodology.

Alvarez, Maribel. *There's Nothing Informal about It: Participatory Arts within the Cultural Ecology*. San Jose, CA: Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley, 2005. 102 pp. Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley is no longer in existence but the monograph is available as a PDF. http://www.ci-sv.org/pdf/MAlvarez_PA_study.pdf. The monograph is based on a six-month field study in Silicon Valley examining a range of informal and participatory arts activity (including but not limited to folk arts) to identify participant motivations, support systems and structures for the activity, and their relationship to the formalized, arts nonprofit sector. The opening and concluding chapters are especially pertinent to folk arts and Alvarez is cogent in her analysis of cultural participation as a conceptual framework and equally perceptive in identifying ways in which folk arts challenges arts practice and definitions. The author concludes with a series of policy recommendations.

The Asia Society. *Artistic Production and Cultural Identity in U.S. Immigrant and Diasporic Communities*. December 2005. 94pp. The monograph is a collection of eight case studies and two general articles commissioned by the Asia Society and supported by the Ford Foundation that examine at the contexts, functions and meanings of artistic practice and presentation in immigrant and diasporic community settings. Concepts of tradition, innovation, identity and authenticity are debated throughout. The emphasis here is on genre, art making and practice (as opposed to cultural program development). Examples of genres included Mexican American corridos, Cambodian classical dance in the U.S., and the development of the Taiko tradition in Japanese American communities. A concluding chapter by folklorist Amy Kitchener offers a useful summary of modes and styles of teaching, transmission and mentorship in the folk and traditional arts. Contributors include artists, composers, anthropologists, folklorists, ethnomusicologists and political scientists.

http://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/Artistic_Production.pdf

Brown, Alan S., and Jennifer Novak, with Amy Kitchener. *Cultural Engagement in California's Inland Regions (with implications for cultural service providers)*. October 2008. Commissioned by James Irvine Foundation. www.irvine.org/publications. Groundbreaking study that is directly relevant to folk arts and traditional culture. Combines phone surveys, field interviews, focus groups, etc. There are various versions—policy brief, executive summary, and full report. Over 6,000 people were surveyed for the study in 6 distinctly different neighborhoods in San Bernardino, Riverside and Fresno to ascertain modes and patterns of cultural engagement. Like most of the other studies here, this one uses a broad definition of cultural participation. More than many other studies, this study also attempts to develop a systematic typology of *modes* and *vectors* for cultural engagement. Modes of engagement, including invention, interpretation, curatorial and observational engagement, describe the degree of creative control, while vectors enumerate the social and cultural settings and context for participation. Folk arts and folk culture (or “heritage-based” arts) are placed very

deliberately and prominently in a broader spectrum of cultural activity in this study. Includes recommendations arts support, policy and practice that is very germane and sympathetic to heritage-based arts.

Field Museum. *Creative Networks: Mexican Immigrant Assets in Chicago*. Chicago: Field Museum and the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, October, 2006. Executive summary, 14 pp. <http://www.fieldmuseum.org/creativenetworks/report.html> The website presents the results of a collaborative research project conducted by The Field Museum's Center for Cultural Understanding and Change (CCUC), the University of Illinois' Team Engineering Collaboratory (TEClab), and the Science of Networks in Communities (SONIC) research group. The project, employing ethnographic, quantitative and social network analysis, investigates the artistic, cultural and social networking practices and capacities of recent Mexican communities in Chicago as strategies for identity formation and community-building. Serious social network theory in practice. The website itself is remarkable, a wonderful example of online research presentation. The project involves some of the team who worked on *The Informal Arts* study.

Jackson, Maria-Rosario, and Joaquin Herranz. *Culture Counts in Communities: A Framework for Measurement*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2002. Commissioned by the Rockefeller Foundation. This is a significant study that provides guiding principles and measurement frameworks and a conceptual framework for the UI's Arts and Cultural Indicators in Community Building Project. This is the publication that most fully and explicitly develops the ideas and principles of cultural participation. Many projects draw on this study as a basic framework. 68 pp. A PDF is available at the Urban Institute website. http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310834_culture_counts.pdf A later companion study, *Cultural Vitality in Communities: Interpretation and Indicators* (2006), by Jackson, Herranz and Florence Kabwasa-Green, develops and applies cultural indicator methodology to US metropolitan areas. It, too, is available from the Urban Institute website.

Jackson, Maria-Rosario, Florence Kwabasa-Green, Daniel Swenson, Joaquin Herranz, Jr., Kadija Ferryman, Caron Atlas, Eric Wallner, and Carole Rosenstein. *Investing in Creativity: A Study of the Support Structure for U.S. Artists*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2002. Groundbreaking influential study that had significant impact on the development of funding support for individual artists. The study considers support for artists across six dimensions: validation, demand/markets, material supports, training and professional development, communities/networks, and information. It addresses concerns and problems of particular artist populations and contains discussion of folk and traditional artists throughout, citing specific issues and examples of particular folk artist populations. <http://www.urban.org/publications/411311.html>. As of 2010, the field research is being conducted in some of the original sites to update data.

McCarthy, Kevin F., and Kimberly Jinnett. *A New Framework for Building Participation in the Arts*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 2001. Supported by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, now Wallace Foundation. This report does not focus on folk or participatory arts in any significant way, but it is the culmination of a lot of the Wallace research on cultural participation developed throughout the 1990s (broadening, deepening, diversifying audiences; outlining types of organizations as creativity, community or canon focused). The study acknowledges informal and for-profit sectors as part of a larger ecology but focuses on nonprofit organizations. 112 pp. A PDF copy of the document is available at the Rand Corporation website: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1323/.

Markusen, Ann, Sam Gilmore, Amanda Johnson, Titus Levi, and Andrea Martinez. *Crossover: How Artists Build Careers across Commercial, Nonprofit and Community Work*. Minneapolis: Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota. October, 2006. Research study commissioned by the Hewlett Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation and Leveraging Investments in Creativity to map income sources for artists and the ways in which diverse kinds of artists move between commercial, non-profit and community/informal arts spheres to build artistic careers. Includes a few traditional artists and artists who employ folk and traditional arts in broader community-based work. Based on email surveys and in-depth interviews. See also studies by Joan Jeffri, who has done extensive research on the career experiences of various artist occupational groups (such as actors, jazz musicians, painters, craftspeople, etc.). While folk artists are only occasionally included in these studies, the methods and findings are pertinent to the folk arts and suggest implications regarding the types of services and technical assistance developed for traditional artists. In general, the researchers are very willing to expand the data to include a greater aesthetic diversity, if folklorists engage them in dialogue. <http://www.extension.org/pages/Crossover: How Artists Build Careers Across Commercial, Nonprofit and Community Work>.

Moriarty, Pia. *Immigrant Participatory Arts: An Insight into Community-Building in Silicon Valley*. Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley, 2004. Based on anthropological field research in the Silicon Valley area, "snowball" sampling, and attendance at community festivals. The study borrows heavily from Robert Putnam's ideas of social capital and considers traditional and community arts in immigrant communities as primary resources for building social capital. The study expands on Putnam's ideas of bridging and bonding social capital, in-group and out-group cultural activity. 56pp. Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley is no longer in existence but the monograph is available as a PDF. http://www.ci-sv.org/pdf/Immigrant_Arts_LR.pdf

National Endowment for the Arts. *Come as You Are: Informal Arts Participation in Urban and Rural Communities*. NEA Research Note #100. March, 2010. 20 pp. Based on data from the NEA'S Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) and the National Center for Charitable Statistics, the paper paints a broader picture of U.S. arts participation

than normally portrayed in past SPPAs, which have been criticized for their emphasis on attendance, specific genres and some specific venues (i.e. museums). The most recent note included broader categories of participation and includes creation and performance as activities. The additional data, while still problematic, offers a more comprehensive view of arts participation that begins to account for some forms of community and folk arts, popular culture, or avocational arts, even if they are all lumped together. The additional data also indicates that rural arts activity increases significantly if informal arts activity and venues are captured in the data.

Novak-Leonard, Jennifer and Alan S. Brown. *Beyond Attendance: A Multi-Modal Understanding of Arts Participation*. National Endowment for the Arts. Research Report #54. 104 pp. Based on the 2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA), this monograph takes further steps to broaden existing discussions of cultural participation beyond attendance metrics to include both spheres of participation and modes of participation. The monograph offers a “cultural ecology” framework that spans cultural literacy, passive/active cultural participation (including amateur creation), and professional artistic creation, and includes electronic media-based engagement. Not surprisingly, this expanded notion of the cultural ecology produces different data that highlights substantial participation in non-arts arenas as well as the digital realm. This is one of the first full-scale policy monographs to tackle the impact of digital media in the non-profit arts sector and to consider implications for data gathering, policy and support. Includes profiles and policy recommendations.

Rosenstein, Carole E. *How Cultural Heritage Organizations Serve Communities: Priorities, Strengths and Challenges*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2006. 8 pp. Uses National Center for Charitable Statistics data and descriptive statistics to demonstrate the expansive size and diversity of the heritage, folk and ethnic arts sector. Although the NCCS database has limited utility because it only includes organizations with budgets over \$25,000 per year, the report is still important and provides an example of how to use large databases and points to some of the drawbacks of such data and presents a forceful argument for broadening definitions of cultural participation beyond recognized “arts” events or passive attendance. A handful of other relevant work by Rosenstein is available on the Urban Institute website.
<http://www.urban.org/expert.cfm?ID=CaroleERosenstein>

Stern, Mark J., and Susan C. Seifert. [Gauging the Informal Arts Sector, Metropolitan Philadelphia 2004](#). Philadelphia: Social Impact of the Arts Project, University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 2005. Working Paper #2005-4. Presents part of the research from the Dynamics of Culture project supported by the Rockefeller Foundation. Many studies on the informal arts focus on community participation and context. This article actually looks at how individual artists engage in the informal arts sector, and relies on survey and focus group data. <http://www.ssw.upenn.edu/SIAP/> CAUTION: this article states draft and specifically asks for author permission before quoting or reproducing.

Stern, Mark J., Susan C. Seifert and Dominic Vitiello. "Migrants, Communities and Culture." Philadelphia: Social Impact of the Arts Project, University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 2008. From 2006-2008, SIAP collaborated with The Reinvestment Fund (with support from the Rockefeller Foundation) on a series of policy briefs examining arts-based strategies for community revitalization and development. This article describes the patterns and dynamics of cultural production and participation in some of Philadelphia's immigrant communities, with extensive discussion of the roles of informal social networks, cultural activity, and venue in community building. Data is drawn from three Philadelphia-based surveys conducted by SIAP (one focused on individual artists, another on specific Greater Philadelphia neighborhoods, and a third on cultural participation). This and other articles in the series move towards proposing a place or neighborhood-based model of creative economy development that counters Richard Florida's creative economy arguments. <http://www.ssw.upenn.edu/SIAP/>.

Wali, Alaka, Rebecca Severson, and Mario Longoni. *Informal Arts: Finding Cohesion, Capacity and Other Cultural Benefits in Unexpected Places*. Chicago: Center for Arts Policy and Columbia College, 2002. Available in Executive Summary and Full Report in PDF format from the Columbia College Chicago, Office of Academic Research. This is the most exhaustive study cited in this bibliography, one of the earliest to champion the informal arts or sector and one of the most influential. Great attention to detail and to definitions. The folklore field may not agree with all of the rationale about definitions but there is much here to bolster the case for folk and traditional arts practice. This study should be more widely known to folklorists. A summary of it appeared in the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* a few years ago. http://www.colum.edu/Administrative_offices/Academic_Research/Research_Studies%2C_Reports%2C_and_Papers.php

Walker, Chris, and Stephanie Scott-Melnyk, with Kay Sherwood. *Reggae to Rachmaninoff: How and Why People Participate in Arts and Culture*. Washington DC: Urban Institute, November 2002. Commissioned by the Wallace Foundation. Evaluation of their Community Partnerships for Cultural Participation program (a community foundation support program). This study clearly points out the flaws of the NEA Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts. By conducting survey work that asks individuals how, where and why they participate in the arts (instead of focusing on pre-determined types of venues or genres), the study provides specific, definitive data that clearly portrays a much more complex and expansive picture of cultural participation. There are shorter policy briefs related to the study, available from the Urban Institute and The Wallace Foundation. <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?id=310595>

Cultural Participation, Engagement and Vitality: Relevant Books, Statements, Monographs and Articles Advocating Policy Perspectives

Note: These books or articles may draw upon field experience but use secondary sources. They are more polemical in nature and written to advance particular perspectives or case making of relevance to the folk and traditional arts.

Alvarez, Maribel. "Strike a Global Pose: Considerations for Working with Folk and Traditional Cultures in the 21st Century." A provocative essay outlining issues and ways in which the folklore field can engage with contemporary social and public concerns. *FFC Working Paper #3, 2008. See Open Folklore, <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/handle/2022/3850>.*

Arts and the Public Purpose. American Assembly. New York: Columbia University, 1997. Report from a policy forum that marked a sea change in arts practice, policy and funding in America. Instead of focusing on the supply and production of art activity in the U.S., the Assembly called for new thinking about the role and function of artmaking and practice as vital to the public life and well-being of American communities and democratic values. It also called for an expanded view of the arts to include the commercial, the nonprofit and "unincorporated" sectors (an umbrella term that generally included folk arts). This acknowledgment of the unincorporated sector opened the door for more discussion of folk cultural-related activity in current policy discussions. Portions of this are available in *The Politics of Culture*, edited by Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary and Glenn Wallach (Washington, DC: Center for Arts and Culture, 2000).

NEA's *American Canvas*, written during Jane Alexander's tenure as NEA Chair, appeared around this time, also calling for a renewed commitment to the public purpose of art. *Creative America: A Report to the President*, published by the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, calls for similar perspectives and actions. Portions of this are available in *The Politics of Culture*, edited by Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach (Washington, DC: Center for Arts and Culture, 2000).

Goldbard, Arlene, and Don Adams. *Creative Community: The Arts of Cultural Development.* Commissioned by the Rockefeller Foundation, 2001. Evaluation of the Partnerships Affirming Community Participation program. Interesting report that begins to outline theories and methodology of community arts practice and social justice. It references oral history work and acknowledges relationships to anthropological field methods but curiously omits folk arts altogether. Important and relevant nonetheless. A follow-up companion, *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*, was published in 2006 and can be ordered from New Village Press <http://www.newvillagepress.net/book/?GCOI=97660100514100>. Goldbard is an active and influential scholar/activist in the community arts field.

Graves, James Bau. *Cultural Democracy: The Arts, Community and the Public Purpose.* Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2005. One of the few full-length books by an ethnomusicologist/cultural worker employed in the non-profit sector. Graves has

worked in the nonprofit sector for many years. Given this background, the emphasis is primarily on music and performing arts, but he attempts to offer a framework of community-based and directed culture though his discussion sometimes falls into easy folk/fine art dichotomies. The discussion of the complexities of mediation and brokerage, however, are especially strong. Graves has worked in the nonprofit sector for many years and is now based at the Old Town School of Folk Music in Chicago.

Ivey, Bill. *Arts, Inc.: How Greed and Neglect Have Destroyed Our Cultural Rights*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008. Ivey, a folklorist and the former Chair of the National Endowment for the Arts, has given several speeches and written short articles over the years, many of which are summarized in this book. He addresses the state of the arts broadly writ (commercial, non profit, community-based) and recommends courses of action for confronting the messy hodge-podge that is the American arts system and its failure to safeguard what he calls our “expressive life, that is, the creative capital that is at once our nation’s heritage, a contemporary gateway to personal achievement and excellence, and the engine of our cultural commons.” (p.23) His “cultural bill of rights” explicitly includes the right to heritage as a defining expression of our individual and collective experiences and traditions.⁶ Richard Kurin, Smithsonian Institution Undersecretary for History, Art, and Culture, has written a book, *Reflections of a Cultural Broker* (1997) that is an interesting companion piece to Ivey’s book.

Leadbeater, Charles, and Paul Miller. *The Pro-Am Revolution*. London: Demos, 2004. 70 pp. This is the one non-US based publication I have included in the bibliography because it has been influential among foundation staff and policy researchers in the United States. Leadbeater and Miller examine the rise of Do-It-Yourself, peer to peer and open source phenomena in contemporary life, identifying a class of amateur working to professional standards and organizing in non-hierarchical networked communities. They contrast this activity with the 20th century focus on specialization and professionalization and explore social and cultural implications for public policy and life. They also look at historical antecedents for this behavior (guilds and the rise of learned societies as two examples) and discuss problems of measurement and evaluation. The work clearly relates to and enhances US-based policy work focused on informal arts and cultural participation. In relation to folk arts, the work also has implications for definitions of folk groups and communities. Like much scholarship focusing on DIY phenomena, however, there is little consideration of heritage. Demos is an independent progressive British think tank focusing on British current socio-political issues and British public policy. <http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/proameconomy>.

⁶ Jason Baird Jackson offers a recent excellent review of *Arts Inc.* on the *Journal of Folklife Research Reviews (JFRR)*, an open access arm of the *Journal of Folklore Research*. See <http://www.indiana.edu/~jofrr/review.php?id=715>.

Markusen, Ann. "Challenge, Change, and Space in Vernacular Cultural Practice." in Tim Edensor, Deborah Leslie, Steve Millington, and Norma Rantisi (eds.). *The Vernacular in Urban Cultural Regeneration*. London: Routledge, forthcoming. The article focuses on how space, region, insider/outsider challenges, and complex, dynamic community social structures shape vernacular practice. Markusen specifically examines dynamics of change and innovation in vernacular practice and the impact of borrowed, contested or dedicated space on vernacular cultural practice. She draws on some of her previous research, provides numerous examples, and concludes with some tentative comparative inferences and identifies areas for future research. The folk arts are a primary (though not exclusive) focal area of discussion. The article appears in a collection of papers from a 2009 international conference critiquing and examining Richard Florida's concepts of Creative Economy/City.

Markusen, Ann. "Organizational Complexity in the Regional Cultural Economy 2009." *Regional Studies*, forthcoming. Makes a case for a more inclusive definition of "cultural industries" to include informal, nonprofit and commercial sectors of arts production and consumption (regardless of income generation). She suggests a shift towards creative and cultural occupations and inclusion of the self-employed for a more accurate portrayal of a region's cultural ecology. She uses census and survey data from Los Angeles and San Francisco as examples, and calls for a more nuanced understanding of the relationships and overlaps among sectors for future funding, planning and policy.

Marshall, Caroline. *Envisioning Convergence: Cultural Conservation, Environmental Stewardship & Sustainable Livelihoods*. Available from *Open Folklore*, <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/handle/2022/3850>. The monograph is based on a 2003 convening of the Fund for Folk Culture, supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Center for Rural Policy at the University of Missouri, and others, focusing on the holistic approaches of its grantees, emphasizing cultural conservation, environmental stewardship, and sustainable development. Includes profiles and cultural policy recommendations.

Peters, Moni and Joni Cherbo. "The Missing Sector: The Unincorporated Arts." *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 28:2 (1998): 115-28. An early investigation of the informal or unincorporated arts sector.

Stern, Mark J. and Susan C. Seifert. "Irrational Organizations: Why Community-based Organizations are Really Social Movements." *Social Impact of the Arts Project*, University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work. <http://www.ssw.upenn.edu/SIAP/> Working Paper #12. 12 pp. An interesting, quirky paper that acknowledges the varied motivations for community-based cultural activity, and the various ways small cultural organizations grow. One size does not fit all, bigger is not always better, and there is no one measure or model for success.

Useful Websites for US-Focused Cultural Policy Reports and Information

<http://www.artsusa.org/animatingdemocracy/> Animating Democracy, a program of Americans for the Arts' Institute for Community Development and the Arts, fosters arts and cultural activity that encourages and enhances civic engagement and dialogue. Through original research, publications, convenings, and special initiatives, Animating Democracy works to build a learning community of artists, scholars, and cultural organizations dedicated to strengthening the role of artists and cultural organizations in civic life. Their website includes substantial reports and monographs focusing on arts-based civic engagement and dialogue. The perspectives and organizations featured are primarily rooted in the community arts movement, though there is overlap with the folk and traditional arts.

www.artsjournal.com. *ArtsJournal* is a web-based daily news digest that aggregates international arts and culture news, culling from newspapers, magazines, websites, etc. The site was founded in 1999 by arts journalist Doug MacLennan and has steadily grown in readership and information. It features blogs by several writers focusing on different aspects of "the creative industries," as well as occasional time-limited group debate blogs. In 2010 *ArtsJournal* featured a group debate on Bill Ivey's notion of "expressive life" as a conceptual framework for policy. For the most part, the emphasis is skewed towards the institutionalized arts world (classical music, dance, theater, visual arts, and the work of large institutions) but it remains a good place to assess current topics and issues in the arts universe. It is also one of the few places that makes international arts news readily and regularly accessible.

www.communityarts.net. See <http://www.openfolklore.org/> or <http://wayback.archive-it.org/2077/20100906194747/http://www.communityarts.net/>. The Community Arts Network (CAN) closed in 2010 but was captured by *Open Folklore*. It is now a static but fully searchable website.

<http://www.artsusa.org>. Go to Arts Watch, a site operated by the Americans for the Arts, and subscribe. When the Center for Arts and Cultural Policy closed down a few years ago, Americans for the Arts agreed to take over their weekly newsletter, which provides a quick scan of basic issues in the arts from various national and international newspapers. Personally, I find this is a much more useful site than that of the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. On the website, also check out the National Arts Policy Database.

<http://www.americansforthearts.org/NAPD/modules/resourceManager/publicsearch.aspx>

www.census.gov. A personal favorite. The website for the Bureau of the Census is voluminous. You can spend hours and days here. There are amazing documents, briefs, useful and arcane information. Much of it can be used to augment case-making for the folk and traditional arts, particularly in relation to changing demographics. The data can be parsed in any number of ways (e.g., rural, urban, city-specific, ethnicity, age, religion, income). While you are there, also investigate the American Community Survey.

Another excellent website containing relevant statistical data is The Pew Research Center (www.pewresearch.org).

www.folkculture.org. See <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/handle/2022/3850>. The Fund for Folk Culture suspended operation in 2009. Several of their publications, a few of which have been cited earlier here, have migrated to the *Open Folklore* website.

www.giarts.org. The website for Grantmakers in the Arts, an organization of private and public funding agencies engaged in arts grantmaking. They produce a *Reader* (part newsletter, part magazine) three times a year, filled with articles, reviews, and editorials on various issues. Most of the *Readers* are now available online and give a good picture of current funding trends and thinking. Many policy-oriented pieces of relevance to cultural engagement, social justice, and general funding trends are published there. The site also contains other commissioned reports, including periodic updates and analyses of private funding statistics for the arts.

www.nea.gov (the National Endowment for the Arts and funders in general). Several reports are available on the NEA website and selected foundation websites. Some foundations have been very active in commissioning research over the years and have tried to develop quasi-portal websites that provide links to a range of research. A couple worth noting for their inclusion of published reports include: the Wallace Foundation <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KNOWLEDGECENTER/Pages/default.aspx> and The James Irvine Foundation (www.irvine.org).

<http://www.openfolklore.org/>. *Open Folklore* is a collaboration of the American Folklore Society (AFS) and the Indiana University Bloomington Libraries. The site, which went online in 2010, is a pioneering digital scholarly resource which makes a greater number and variety of useful resources, both published and unpublished, available for the field of folklore studies and the communities with which folklore scholars partner. Materials include hard-to-find “gray literature” and websites in addition to books and journals. The site is receiving much deserved attention and accolades—it is charting the future of scholarly publication in the digital, open source age.

Many of the Fund for Folk Culture’s publications (including *Envisioning Convergence*, *Traditional Arts and Economic Development*, and its *Working Paper* series) are available on *Open Folklore* and have been described elsewhere in the bibliography. <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/handle/2022/3850>.

In addition, *Open Folklore* has preserved the Community Arts Network (CAN) website, which was forced to close down in 2010. The Community Arts Network (CAN) was a program of Art in the Public Interest (API), a nonprofit organization based in North Carolina. Their website, which served as a portal for the field of community arts and offered a wonderful compendium of articles, interviews and resources about

community arts practice, theory and beyond, was captured/preserved by *Open Folklore*. The CAN website is now a static but fully searchable website. Theater, dance and community performance dominate the discussion on the site. Only a few articles specifically reference the folk and traditional arts (including ones by Bau Graves and Maribel Alvarez), but most are germane. The CAN site, which was regularly updated and widely used, features work by Maria Jackson, Caron Atlas, Tom Borrup, Maryo Ewell, Bill Cleveland, Jan Cohen-Cruz, Roberto Bedoya and many others. It functioned as a combination of a regularly updated weekly newsletter, aggregator of information, and archive that was the go-to site for community arts. It is particularly useful as a model for the folk arts. In the past decade, the field of community arts has been extremely active building a field of practice and pedagogy for their work.

<http://wayback.archive-it.org/2077/20100906194747/http://www.communityarts.net/>

www.wolfbrown.com The site contains info about their various reports, but people might wish to investigate how to sign up for their twice monthly newsletter. It is a short brief, where staff members pick interesting reads of various kinds—some quite good.

Other, Miscellaneous

Individual cultural policy researchers. If folklorists are familiar with the cultural policy literature, certain names keep popping up. Google Maria Jackson (Urban Institute), Alaka Wali (Field Museum), Ann Markusen (University of Minnesota) or Mark Stern (University of Pennsylvania). You will find other articles and studies that may not be included in this bibliography. All three have done various papers/monographs of substantial interest to our field. Arlene Goldbard also has a blog that may be of interest to some (<http://arlenegoldbard.com/>). [Createquity](#), a blog run by Ian David Moss that debuted in 2007, has periodic posts of interest to cultural participation research. In particular, the site includes a section—“Arts Policy Library”—which contains thoughtful review pieces by diverse writers, including recent reviews essays of *Arts, Inc.* and *The Informal Arts*. Also of interest on the blog is a 2011 article by Crystal Wallis, [Get a folk\(life\): How Folklore Research Helped an Arts Agency](#), focusing on the uses of folklore field survey techniques for organizational and strategic planning and community building.

Individual folk arts organizational websites. Check out specific organization websites. Some include papers, statements, profiles and manifestos and they all have specific strengths. In particular, check out Alliance for California Traditional Arts (ACTA), City Lore, Western Folklife Center and the motherlode, the Philadelphia Folklore Project. For years, PFP has been unabashed and articulate about advancing a folkloric/political perspective about their cultural work and they have a good paper/web trail. Some individual folklorists or ethnomusicologists have developed their own blogs that offer relevant perspectives. See Jeff Titon (ethnomusicology professor at Brown University),

<http://sustainablemusic.blogspot.com/> as an example of a scholar engaged in public discourse.⁷

Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society. Not a website but important to mention, *JAMLS* is one of the most important academic journals for people interested in current domestic and international cultural policy ideas and discussion. It is international in emphasis, but includes US articles in every issue. You will need access to JSTOR or a university library to read it. Several of the authors listed in this bibliography have published in this journal.

⁷ See Nicole Saylor, "Website Review." *Journal of American Folklore* 124:491 (2011): 122-24 for a more comprehensive review of folklore related blogs that broadly address issues of folklore in relation to cultural participation and community vitality.