

2017

The Social Effects of Culture

A Literature Review



M. Sharon Jeannotte
University of Ottawa
11/21/2017





The views expressed in this analysis are those of the author, and not those of the Centre on Governance or the University of Ottawa or the Ottawa Culture Research Group.

Acknowledgements:

This document was produced with the support of:

Ottawa Culture Research Group (OCRG)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
1.0 Introduction	6
2.0 Frameworks	8
2.1 Culture, sustainability and community development	9
2.2 Culture, wellbeing, and social cohesion	13
2.3 Culture, connectedness, and participation	20
2.4 Culture and citizenship	20
3.0 Methodologies	22
3.1 Surveys and indicators	23
3.2 Valuation-based approaches to social wellbeing	28
3.3 Evaluation-based approaches	30
4.0 Compilations of evidence and literature reviews	33
4.1 Culture, sustainability and community development	34
4.2 Culture, wellbeing and social cohesion	36
4.3 Culture, connectedness and participation	41
4.4 Culture and citizenship	47
4.5 Culture and health / education	48
4.6 Literature reviews of frameworks and methodologies	54
5.0 Advocacy documents	55
6.0 Critiques of frameworks and methodologies	58
References	62

Executive Summary

This literature review is intended as a background document on recent research on the social effects of culture. In it, the field of culture has been defined to include both the professional and amateur creative arts (visual, literary and performing), the industries and organizations that support them (broadcasting, film, publishing, sound recording, and digital media), and the curation and preservation activities that are often grouped under the label of “heritage” (museums, historic sites, archives, and libraries). The social field has been broadly surveyed and has included academic literature from across the various disciplines that normally constitute the “social” in modern societies, including health, education, social services, poverty reduction and social inclusion, aspects of the justice system, identity studies, and urban studies.

Only works published in English since 2000 have been included, and every effort has been made to provide hyperlinks to digital copies of this research. All links were functional as of late 2017, and as the short summaries in this document are meant to provide an introduction only, the interested reader is encouraged to access the full text for a complete description of the research. Finally, the focus has been kept as narrowly as possible on “social” effects of culture, and leaves out the large body of literature on economic effects of culture and on public attitudes toward culture – some of which touches on social aspects of culture, but not as a central concern.

This report has been structured to provide an overview of selected literature on the following:

- General frameworks for understanding and analyzing the social effects of culture
- Methodological approaches that have been utilized to examine social aspects of culture and to try to understand their effects
- Compilations of evidence and literature reviews on the social effects of culture
- Advocacy documents supporting the development of more robust indicators of the social effects of culture
- Critiques of frameworks and methodologies that have been used to examine the social effects of culture.

The general frameworks used to understand and analyze the social effects of culture fall into four broad categories, which frequently overlap:

- Holistic frameworks examining the relationship between culture, sustainability and community development
- Frameworks that link culture to the concepts of wellbeing and social cohesion
- Frameworks that examine culture’s role in promoting connectedness and participation

- Frameworks that examine culture's role in building citizenship capacity.

Frameworks that place culture within a sustainability or human development context are usually (but not always) place-based. They generally view culture as one of four interconnected domains – social, economic and environmental are the other three – that have an impact on the overall sustainability of a society or place. The concept of wellbeing is somewhat related to the concept of sustainability, but in the literature reviewed, it tends to be more closely related to social cohesion. While there are few frameworks that deal exclusively with culture as a factor in connectedness and participation, this domain is almost always included as part of the more holistic frameworks and is the subject of a large part of the research on the social effects of culture. It, along with frameworks that look at the role of culture in the formation of citizens, privileges the notion of inclusion as a societal asset.

One of the main criticisms of studies on the social impact or social effects of culture and the arts has been aimed at methodological weaknesses. Many studies have described outputs and, to a lesser extent, outcomes of engagement with culture and the arts, but few have been able to prove causation between participation in the arts and specific effects. Although frequently advocated as the “gold standard” of research, experimental designs of studies, with random selection of subjects and control groups, are seldom used in studies of the social effects of culture, except in the health care field where a few researchers have examined the impact of the participatory arts on the health of seniors. Instead, those studying the social effects of culture and the arts tend to rely on quantitative analysis of surveys and qualitative analysis of case studies to investigate this subject. Advocates of theory-based evaluation argue that culture is not amenable to being studied using experimental models because it operates in complex open systems that are often not generalizable to other contexts or environments. Therefore, research in this area must be closely tied to theory articulation and evaluation of outcomes in specific environments. Finally, an emerging methodological approach is attempting to assign monetary values to participation in various types of cultural activity based on subjective assessments of wellbeing by research subjects.

Despite the widespread view among policy makers and practitioners in the cultural field that there is little evidence with regard to the social effects of culture, there has actually been a deluge of recent literature citing the (usually positive) impacts of engagement with the arts and , to a lesser extent, heritage. This document groups this literature under the same headings as the section on frameworks (with the addition of sections on health and education, and frameworks and methodologies):

- Evidence about culture's effects on sustainability and community development
- Evidence about culture's effects on wellbeing and social cohesion
- Evidence about the social effects of participation in culture
- Evidence about culture's effects on citizenship

- Evidence about culture's effects on health and education
- Literature reviews of frameworks and methodologies

The largest body of research examines the effects of participation in culture, but a significant portion of this evidence also documents positive impacts on well-being and social cohesion, as well as the development of social capital. These types of impacts also feature prominently in the literature on culture's effects on health and education. Convincing evidence comes from several American studies that have examined the impact of arts participation on the health of older adults and on the cognitive skills children and young adults. There is also a growing body of evidence about the linkages between cultural activity and individual wellbeing (usually measured as happiness or life satisfaction), and the formation of social capital (usually in the form of volunteering and participation). Overall, evidence linking individual wellbeing to community and national wellbeing is still relatively sparse, although a few studies have examined possible associations between cultural engagement, social cohesion and community sustainability. One framework occasionally used to examine the social effects of culture relates to citizenship and the public good, but little empirical research has been done to link cultural engagement to democratic values, although a few studies have examined cultural participation and voting behaviour. As pointed out in more than one study, there are frequently weaknesses in data sources, as well as difficulties in proving causation between engagement with culture and positive social outcomes.

Many of the documents presenting evidence on the social effects of culture also contain a certain amount of advocacy on the subject, particularly if the evidence is positive. However, two recent documents included in this review utilize arguments that are based on over-arching frameworks that go beyond specific and isolated pieces of evidence.

This literature review also provides several critiques of research on the social effects of culture that focus on deficiencies in the philosophical and ideological aspects of the conceptual frameworks and on the methodologies used to investigate these social effects. Criticisms of the conceptual bases of research on the social effects of culture tend to be situated within ongoing debates about the value of culture. The social effects of culture are judged to be incidental to the central purposes of the arts and heritage preservation and, if taken to their logical conclusion, antithetical to them. They are also seen by some critics as being part of the neoliberal state's attempts to off-load its social responsibilities to civil society. Methodological critiques cover a range of issues, from unclear conceptual frameworks, lack of data and definitional imprecision, to poor research design and narrow, short-term research objectives.

In general, it may be said that the research community is making serious efforts to address the methodological shortcomings pointed out by the critics, but it seems to be no nearer to a consensus on the broader philosophical debates that surround efforts to measure the value of culture.

1.0 - Introduction

This literature review began as a response to a simple request from a member of the Ottawa Culture Research Group (OCRG) for a background document on recent research on the social effects of culture. The OCRG was seeking information and data to assist in the development of cultural indicators for the City of Ottawa, and had been somewhat successful in finding municipal-level data in the economic sphere in areas such as employment, industry inputs and outputs, and cultural infrastructure. However, municipal-level data about social aspects of culture proved to be much more difficult to find and to acquire. Part of the problem was in defining what was meant by “social impacts” or “social effects” of culture. Another part was the lack of a framework within which to situate the sparse data that could be found. This literature review was meant to be a start in addressing these problems.

It rapidly became obvious that there were no “simple requests” when it came to reviewing the social impacts or effects of culture. First, a vast amount of literature has been published on social aspects of culture over the past couple of decades. Much of this is often challenged as being insufficiently rigorous or too locally-based to be useful as a general guide to the subject area. Second, this literature ranges from a narrow focus on individual effects on a specific target group to collective effects at the national or even global level, making it challenging to provide an overview that addresses the entire field. Third, a significant portion of this literature is couched in the underlying context of debates about the value of culture. This opens the doors to yet another vast array of literature that would challenge even the most dedicated scholar, let alone municipal or locally-based cultural stakeholders who simply wish to understand what the social effects of their activities might be. While debates about the value of culture are necessary and important, they tend to deal with broader and more abstract issues than were at the root of this inquiry. Therefore, while they are referred to in some of the entries, for the most part they have been excluded.

In view of these problems and to provide a practitioner's guide to the issues, this report has been structured to provide an overview of selected literature on the following:

- General frameworks for understanding and analyzing the social effects of culture
- Methodological approaches that have been utilized to examine social aspects of culture and to try to understand their effects
- Compilations of evidence and literature reviews on the social effects of culture
- Advocacy documents supporting the development of more robust indicators of the social effects of culture
- Critiques of frameworks and methodologies that have been used to examine the social effects of culture.

In this review, the social field has been broadly surveyed and has included academic literature from across the various disciplines that normally constitute the “social” in modern societies, including health, education, social services, poverty reduction and social inclusion, aspects of the justice system, identity studies, and urban studies. As there has been a vast amount of literature published in recent years on the social effects of culture in certain of these areas, such as health and education, this review does not attempt to provide a complete listing. Instead, only a few of the larger and more comprehensive studies in this research area are included. Both the individual and collective impacts of culture, when incorporated into studies of these areas, have been included.

In this literature review, the field of culture has been defined to include both the professional and amateur creative arts (visual, literary and performing), the industries and organizations that support them (broadcasting, film, publishing, sound recording, and digital media), and the curation and preservation activities that are often grouped under the label of “heritage” (museums, historic sites, archives, and libraries). Only works published in English since 2000 have been included, and every effort has been made to provide hyperlinks to digital copies of this research. All links were functional as of late 2017, and as the short summaries in this document are meant to provide an introduction only, the interested reader is encouraged to access the full text for a complete description of the research. Finally, the focus has been kept as narrowly as possible on “social” effects of culture, and leaves out the large body of literature on economic effects of culture and on public attitudes toward culture – some of which touches on social aspects of culture, but not as a central concern.

2.0 - Frameworks

This section examines several of the general frameworks that have been used to understand and analyze the social effects of culture. They fall into four broad categories, which frequently overlap:

- Holistic frameworks examining the relationship between culture, sustainability and community development
- Frameworks that link culture to the concepts of wellbeing and social cohesion
- Frameworks that examine culture's role in promoting connectedness and participation
- Frameworks that examine culture's role in building citizenship capacity.

Frameworks that place culture within a sustainability or human development context are usually (but not always) place-based. They generally view culture as one of four interconnected domains – social, economic and environmental are the other three – that have an impact on the overall sustainability of a society or place. Some of these conceptual frameworks attempt to show the areas where social and cultural actions overlap or can work synergistically. Most often, these overlapping domains concern the creation of identity, social cohesion, community participation and engagement, and a sense of place. Education and the acquisition of knowledge are other frequently-included areas where culture has social effects.

The concept of wellbeing is somewhat related to the concept of sustainability, but in the literature reviewed, it tends to be more closely related to social cohesion. Social cohesion, as has been noted above, is also considered as part of a sustainable society, but has a life of its own in much public discourse as a short-hand term for societies that adopt non-coercive strategies for “hanging together”. The social effects of culture, in this stream of literature, are found primarily in the domains of participation, identity-formation, values formation, and the creation of social capital. When wellbeing is brought into the framework, these social effects can also contribute to good health, personal security, school effectiveness, social connections, and public “voice”.

While there are few frameworks that deal exclusively with the culture as a factor in connectedness and participation, this domain is almost always included as part of the more holistic frameworks and is the subject of a large part of the research on the social effects of culture. It, along with frameworks that look at the role of culture in the formation of citizens, privileges the notion of inclusion as a societal asset. Frameworks dealing with culture and citizenship tend to view civic participation as a beneficial outcome of culture's role in providing citizens with the tools to understand their society and to increase the effectiveness of their collective actions. Interestingly, the dimension of cultural rights, such as freedom of expression and protection of cultural identity, is usually omitted when these frameworks are applied to the social effects of culture,


although such rights are fundamental elements of inclusive citizenship and are extensively treated in the mainstream literature on cultural citizenship.

2.1 - Culture, sustainability and community development

CHCFE Consortium (2015, June). *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe – Executive Summary and Strategic Recommendations*. Krakow: International Cultural Centre. Online at

http://mck.krakow.pl/images/upload/projekty_badawcze/CHCFE_REPORT_ExecutiveSummary_v2.pdf

This study undertook to gather evidence about how cultural heritage improves the quality of life in every corner of Europe. It mapped the studies it found within a conceptual framework that took into account how both tangible and intangible heritage contributed to sustainability as measured in four domains: economic, social, cultural, and environmental. The visual depiction of this framework is:



The social domain includes social cohesion, community, participation, and continuity of social life, but overlaps with the cultural domain in the creation of identity and sense of place; and with the economic domain in the areas of education, knowledge and skills, place branding, contribution to the labour market, and regional competitiveness.

Dessein, J., K. Soini, G. Fairclough and L. Horlings (eds). (2015). *Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development – Conclusions from the Cost Action IS1007 – Investigating Cultural Sustainability*. Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Online at <https://jyx.iyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/50452>

This publication is the result of a four-year research network funded by the European Union, which sought to provide guidelines for policy makers for integrating culture as a key element of sustainable development. The network argued that “culture and society have to some degree an iterative and reciprocal relation, in which culture constructs society but society also shapes culture” (p. 25). The network developed three models for how culture affects sustainability:

- Culture **in** sustainable development – expands conventional sustainable development by adding culture as a “fourth pillar” alongside ecological, social and economic considerations
- Culture **for** sustainable development – moves culture into a framing, contextualizing, and mediating role that balances the other pillars and guides sustainable development
- Culture **as** sustainable development – sees culture as the overall foundation for sustainable development by recognizing that culture is at the root of all human decisions (pp. 28-29).

The publication discusses eight policy contexts in which culture contributes to sustainability. In the social context, these include policies dealing with social life, commons, and participation. These policies support the co-existence of different ways of life and values, make space for equal participation, highlight diversity and inclusion, and respect the rights of all citizen groups, including cultural rights. This set of socially-oriented cultural policies is intertwined and linked with other policies that negotiate memories and identity, a sense of place, creative practices, economic development, nature conservation, and sustainability awareness.

Duxbury, N, E. Gillette and K. Pepper (2007). *Exploring the Cultural Dimensions of Sustainability, Creative City News. Special Edition 4*. Online at https://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/Creative_City_News_E.pdf

This special edition of the Creative City newsletter explores evolving concepts around sustainable community development which feature culture as a significant component.

These concepts view culture as part of a holistic model that incorporates culture into a community's overall well-being and long-term sustainability. Three models of sustainability are featured:

- Four-pillar model – interlinks cultural vitality with the dimensions of environmental responsibility, economic health, and social equity
- Four well-beings model – includes cultural, environmental, social, and economic dimensions in a holistic model of community well-being
- Medicine wheel model –an Aboriginal model that includes four segments or directions that can symbolize various interconnected aspects of life (for example, north (environmental), south (social), west (economic) and east (cultural)).

The newsletter also discusses the relationship between social and cultural capital in the context of sustainable community development, and examines several key aspects of community cultural development (for example, creating and maintaining public spaces that draw people together, building community identity and pride, and using arts and culture as a tool for regeneration and sustainability).

James, P. (2014). *Assessing cultural sustainability*. Barcelona: United Cities and Local Governments.

https://www.academia.edu/15885475/Assessing_Cultural_Sustainability_Agenda_21_for_Culture

This is the cities tool for measuring cultural impact cited by Partal and Dunphy (below). This paper argues that culture is a fundamental domain of social life but that there are no well-established tools for cultural impact assessments, as there are in the economic and environmental domains. It recommends a self-evaluation tool for cities based on a four-domain model that treats culture as a social domain equal to the other social domains of ecology, economy, and politics. In this model the cultural is defined as “a social domain that emphasizes the practices, discourses, and material expressions, which, over time, express the continuities and discontinuities of social meaning of a life held in common” (p. 6). It contributes to four domains of action: 1) cultural flourishing; 2) political engagement; 3) economic vitality; and 4) ecological resilience. Seven subdomains of culture are proposed and should be part of the impact analysis of each of these four domains of action: 1) identity and engagement; 2) creativity and recreation; 3) memory and projection; 4) beliefs and ideas; 5) gender and generations; 6) enquiry and learning; and 6) wellbeing and health.

Mercer, C. (2005). *Cultural Capital and Capabilities: Defining and measuring the cultural field*. Paper prepared for the Third Global Forum on Human Development: Cultural

Identity, democracy and global equity. Paris, 17-19 January 2005. Online at <http://www.kulturplan-oresund.dk/mercer.pdf>

This paper outlines four sets or clusters of indicators that form a matrix or analytical grid to help evaluate and assess cultural policies for human development. This grid would also be relevant for assessing cultural policies within macro policy agendas such as quality of life, sustainable development, and human rights. The four sets of measurement and their descriptions are;

1. Cultural vitality, diversity and conviviality – Measures of both the health and sustainability of the cultural economy and the ways in which the circulation and diversity of cultural resources and experiences can contribute to the quality of life.
2. Cultural access, participation and consumption – Measures of users/consumers/participants' opportunities for and constraints to active cultural engagement.
3. Culture, lifestyle and identity – Measures of the extent to which cultural resources and capital are used to constitute specific lifestyles and identities.
4. Culture, ethics, governance and conduct – Measures of the extent to which cultural resources and capital can contribute to and shape forms of behaviour by both individuals and collectivities (pp. 2-4).

The author proposes four conceptual approaches which can be used as a framework for selecting, developing, interpreting and applying these indicator sets. These approaches are:

1. The cultural ecology – definition of a cultural field that is attentive to the diversity and richness of elements that constitute a culture in the area under study, including the relationships among the elements.
2. Value production chain analysis – identification of the strengths and weaknesses at every stage of cultural production – creation, production, marketing and distribution – between the “supply side” and the “demand side” (applicable to both tangible and intangible outcomes).
3. Convivability and quality of life – identification of the ways in which elements of the cultural ecology contribute to quality of life
4. Value circulation analysis – identification of how people's values may be converted from one sphere to another (e.g. from the cultural sphere to the economic sphere, or from the ethical sphere to the commercial sphere). (pp. 5-20).

The author also notes in his conclusions that there is “a good deal of work of reconciliation to be done between available systems of ‘cultural Indication’ based on System of National Accounts type data and ‘bottom up’ work in cultural capital assessment at local and regional levels” (p. 30).

2.2 - Culture, wellbeing, and social cohesion

Gielen, P., S. Elkhuzen, Q. van den Hoogen, T. Lijster and H. Otte (2015). *Culture – The Substructure for a European Common – a research report*. Brussels: Flanders Arts Institute-Performing Arts. Online at <http://2016.vti.be/en/over-vti/publicaties/publication-culture-substructure-european-common>

This is a summary of a much larger study on the value of culture (written in Dutch) that was carried out in 2014. The research team developed a conceptual framework on the measurable effect of arts and culture on society, as well as an inventory of concrete research results.

The framework for measuring the value of culture is based upon culture's role in:

- Socialization – helping individuals become integrated in a social, political, and economic order
- Qualification – helping individuals evaluate what is important in a society
- Subjectification - teaching people how to take a self-reliant, independent, autonomous and critical position within the social order. In doing so, culture often introduces new or avant-garde ideas, new interpretations of older ideas, and new ways of expression (often referred to as creativity).

They refer to culture as “an all-encompassing human practice, with creative activities forming a substantial part of it in our fast-changing society” (p. 23). While the focus of the analysis is on European society and the rise of neoliberalism, the argument that cultural policy is the base of social life and democracy can be applied more broadly. In a section on “Measured and Measurable Values of Culture”, the research team examined evidence on the cognitive, health, experiential, economic, and social effects of culture. The social effects are primarily tied to culture's contribution to social cohesion, defined as “the bonds and connection between different entities, the smallest included, in a social system” (p. 62). They conclude that “participating in social-cultural work, amateur arts, cultural heritage and the arts contributes among other things to the forming of a community, strengthening the social fabric, emancipation and empowerment” (p. 62).

Gielen, P. (2015, 17 February). No Culture, no Europe. Opening Speech at *The art of valuing: between evident and evidence-based* Conference. Brussels: IETM - International network for contemporary performing arts. Online at <https://www.ietm.org/en/publications/the-art-of-valuing-opening-speeches>

In this speech, Gielen discusses an inventory of research on the value of culture that he and his colleagues at the Research Center for Arts in Society at Groningen University conducted. They identified five thematic areas in which evidence for the effectiveness of culture can be presented:

- Cognitive effects
- Health
- Experiential value (e.g. of visiting a museum or attending a concert)
- Economic effects
- Social effects

The main social effects of participation in culture were improvements in social cohesion and social integration (but only if the experience brings something new and different to people's lives). He also notes that measurement of the immediate effect (e.g. before-and-after experiments) cannot capture the impact of the longer-term effects on individuals and societies. He calls this social function "the sense-making aspects of culture" (p.5).

Jeannotte, M.S. (2000). Tango Romantica or Liaisons Dangereuses? Cultural Policies and Social Cohesion: Perspectives from Canadian Research, *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 7 (1), 97-113. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10286630009358135?tab=permissions&scroll=top>

This article provides an overview of the concept of social cohesion and how it was utilized within cultural policy in Canada in the late 1990s and early 2000s. It cites Canadian research on the dimensions of social cohesion and illustrates the types of cultural policy research that has been undertaken, both in Canada and internationally, to explore these dimensions. The following table, taken from the article, provides a framework and examples of these types of research.

Typology of cultural policy research in the domain of social cohesion

Spheres of activity	Formal	Substantial
Economic	Inclusion/Exclusion – Studies on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to cultural resources and information technologies 	Equality/Inequality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social audits of the arts and cultural industries
Political	Legitimacy/Illegitimacy – Studies on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of culture and the arts in improving the lives of youth, seniors, and the marginalized • Evolving governance structures 	Participation/passivity – Studies on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural consumption • Cultural participation • Volunteerism and culture
Socio-cultural	Recognition/rejection – Studies on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural diversity • Roles of cultural institutions and the media in mediating conflict, reflecting difference, building understanding 	Belonging/isolation – Studies on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple identities • Values • Diversity of content • Cultural sustainability

Jeannotte, M.S. (2005). Just Showing Up: Social and Cultural Capital in Everyday Life. In Accounting for Culture: Thinking Through Cultural Citizenship. Eds. C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M.S. Jeannotte and W. Straw. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, pp. 124-145. Online at <https://ruor.uottawa.ca/handle/10393/19613>

This chapter synthesizes knowledge about social and cultural capital and its relationship to citizenship. The chapter describes what we know about social and cultural capital and includes definitions, analytical approaches, and an overview of research findings and critiques of current approaches. It also discusses knowledge gaps with regard to social and cultural capital and the construction of citizens, and discusses the

implications for policy and decision-making. Analytical frameworks for the study of cultural capital can be grouped under a number of themes:

- *Theme 1: Personal Empowerment* (personal benefits derived from investments in cultural capital).
- *Theme 2: Cultural Participation* (linkages between cultural participation and altruistic behaviour, such as volunteering and civic engagement),
- *Theme 3: Cultural Development and Quality of Life* (linkages between cultural capital and economic and social development).
- *Theme 4: Cultural Sustainability* (ways in which cultural capital supports human development and maintains the cultural life and vitality of human civilization over time). (p. 127).

The chapter summarizes research under each of these themes, and also reviews several critiques of cultural capital research (including the Merli and Belfiore articles outlined below). The main knowledge gaps with regard to this research are summarized in the following questions:

- What is the relationship between social and cultural capital? How do social and cultural capital work to produce beneficial (or detrimental) effects? How important are these effects in producing positive public policy outcomes?
- What are the most important elements of social and cultural capital that cultural policy research should be examining?
- How can we best measure the effects of cultural capital?

The author concludes that "For a number of reasons (not the least of which is the increasingly urban nature of Canada), cities have become the primary site where many of the issues related to cultural and subcultural capital play out", adding that "For cultural policy as currently formulated, visions of dollar signs often spring to mind when the words "creative" and "cities" are used in the same sentence. However, the real meaning may lie in the more mundane and, paradoxically, more profound sphere of everyday life as lived by citizens in their communities" (p. 140).

Jeannotte, M.S. (2006). *From Concepts to Indicators: Examining Culture Through a Social Inclusion Lens*. Presentation at National Economic and Social Forum, Dublin, Ireland.

Online at

http://socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/sites/socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/files/from_concepts_indicators.pdf

This presentation focuses on:

- What is the value of culture?
- How does culture contribute to social inclusion and social cohesion?
- How do the concepts relate?
- What indicators are needed to measure the social effects of culture?
- How can these indicators be developed?

It examines culture through three lenses:

- “Culture H” – traditions, the repository of past meanings and symbols
- “Culture C” – the making of new meanings and symbols through discovery and creative effort
- “Culture S” – the set of symbolic tools from which individuals construct their “ways of living”.

It suggests that culture contributes value to society via four avenues:

- personal empowerment
- cultural participation
- cultural development and quality of life
- cultural sustainability

The indicators needed to measure this value are:

Personal empowerment	• Indicators of belonging and inclusion
Cultural participation	• Indicators of participation and motivation
Cultural development and quality of life	• Indicators of linkages to economic and social capital (e.g. trust, reciprocity, social connections, altruistic behaviour)
Cultural sustainability	

The presentation also outlines data and indicator pitfalls (such as unwieldy or vague frameworks and objectives; lack of data). On the subject of data, it discusses the need for large-scale surveys on social aspects of culture, such as Statistics Canada's proposed Survey of Leisure Activity and Motivation (which was never launched).

Jeannotte, M.S. (2008). *Shared spaces: Social and economic returns on investment in cultural infrastructure*. Appendix E of *Under Construction: The State of Cultural Infrastructure in Canada*. Vancouver: Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities, Simon Fraser University. Online at

This report provides an overview of general theories on the social and economic effects of cultural infrastructure, followed by a section on specific approaches to measuring social and economic returns on cultural infrastructure investment. Methodological issues are then discussed, and the main findings from the literature are summarized. Finally, the concluding section examines the research challenges as well as areas where further work should be undertaken in order to increase understanding of the social and economic returns on investments in cultural infrastructure.

The main theories covered are:

- Social cohesion theory
- Social inclusion theory
- Social well-being and quality of life theory
- Cultural citizenship theory
- Cultural sustainability theory
- Creative economy theory

Two main conceptual approaches are used to frame investments in cultural infrastructure: (1) the creative city/community approach and (2) the cultural planning approach. The author indicates that while it would be misleading to characterize the first approach as an economic orientation and the second as social, since the aims and outcomes tend to be mixed, a survey of the literature indicates that the former tends to be dominated by creative economy theory, while the latter usually utilizes arguments and evidence drawn from social cohesion, social inclusion, quality of life, cultural citizenship, and cultural sustainability theory.

- Creative city/community approach – focus on:
 - Creative clusters and the creative economy
 - Cultural infrastructure and the creative economy
- Cultural planning approach – focus on:
 - place-based development
 - community development

The report concludes with a general review of the methodological weaknesses of these approaches and suggests ways of addressing them, including:

- Increasing attention to development rather than growth
- Increasing attention to the relationships among local features of the cultural ecology
- Cultural asset and network analysis of selected neighbourhoods throughout Canada

- Mining of existing Census, employment, crime, participation, business, and other data for these neighbourhoods to create a baseline for longitudinal tracking
- Special surveys in these neighbourhoods to gauge residents' perceptions about cultural assets and their impact
- Longitudinal tracking of these neighbourhoods (over at least ten years) to determine the effect of changes in cultural assets.

Stern, M.J. and S.C. Seifert (2017, March). *The Social Wellbeing of New York City's Neighbourhoods: The Contribution of Culture and the Arts*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania-Social Impact of the Arts Project. Online at http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=siap_culture_nyc

This report presents a conceptual framework, data and methodology, and findings of a two-year study of culture and social wellbeing in New York City. It builds on a long-standing series of studies carried out in Philadelphia by the same team. The two key concepts guiding the study were the neighbourhood cultural ecology (geographically defined networks of resources) and social wellbeing, which was defined as a set of objective opportunities available to individuals and families that enhance their life chances.

The methodology employed consisted of:

- An inventory of cultural assets at the neighborhood level.
- Use of existing data to estimate a multi-dimensional model of social wellbeing at the same geography.
- Analysis of the relationship between culture and other dimensions of wellbeing, controlling for selected determinants of wellbeing.
- A series of interviews in selected neighborhoods to provide a ground-level view of these phenomena.

The core of the report focuses on the relationship between neighbourhood cultural ecology and the dimensions of social wellbeing, with particular attention to measures of health, personal security, and school effectiveness, social connection, political and cultural voice, and the availability of public spaces (e.g. parks and open spaces).

While the report found wide variations in the cultural ecology and wellbeing of New York neighbourhoods, it concluded that cultural resources are integral components of a neighborhood ecology that promotes social wellbeing.

2.3 - Culture, connectedness and participation

Creative Communities Network (2012, July). *Cultural Indicators: Measuring Impact on Culture*. Australia: CCN. Online at

https://www.lga.sa.gov.au/webdata/resources/files/Cultural_Indicators.pdf

This information paper;

- demonstrates the case for developing a Cultural Indicators Framework
- provides an overview of local, national and international current practice
- examines recent Community Indicator Frameworks applied within Local Government in Australia
- presents the national and international discourse and evidence relating to the use of cultural indicators
- makes recommendations for progress towards implementation.

With regard to the social impact of culture, it suggests a five-domain framework for evaluation: 1) creativity; 2) human values; 3) connectedness; 4) participation; 5) sustainability (p. 16) The detailed literature review and indicators project planning guide make this a useful resource for those just getting started in the field.

2.4 - Culture and citizenship

Stanley, D. (2006). Introduction: the Social Effects of Culture, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 31 (1), pp. 7-15. Online at <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1744/1856>

This article outlines the results of 2004 workshop held by the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Canada Council for the Arts, which discussed the various dimensions of a possible research initiative to study the social effects of culture. (This initiative was not pursued at the time but was revived in 2015.) The participants identified six social effects of culture, arts, and heritage:

- Enhancing understanding and capacity for action;
- Creating and retaining identity;
- Modifying values and preferences for collective choice;
- Building social cohesion;
- Contributing to community development;
- Fostering civic participation. (p. 8)

These elements were considered central elements of *cultural citizenship*, which contributes to the right of citizens to shape their society and to influence the creation and interpretation of meaning in that society.

Stanley, D. (2005). *Recondita armonia: A reflection on the function of culture in building citizenship capacity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available for purchase online at <https://book.coe.int/usd/en/cultural-policies/3701-recondita-armonia-a-reflection-on-the-function-of-culture-in-building-citizenship-capacity-policy-note-no10.html>

This study, prepared for the Council of Europe as part of the European Year of Citizenship in 2005, is a preliminary examination of how culture can enhance the understanding of citizens and increase their capacity for effective collective action. The study bases its exploration of culture's social effects on the notion that culture acts as a set of symbolic and conceptual tools that help citizens interpret the reality around them and develop strategies to deal with life's contingencies. It suggests that "providing citizens with new conceptual tools to equip them to better understand their world ... is the social role of culture understood as the creative arts" (p. 1). It follows, therefore, that "Access to and participation in the arts, that is, access to new conceptual tools, is an important part of citizenship in a democracy" (p. 2). It further suggests that "Giving citizens sufficient conceptual stability and self-confidence to appropriate change without becoming confused and feeling threatened is the role of heritage" (p. 2). Access to and participation in heritage, therefore, is also an important part of citizenship capacity in a democracy.

As well as describing and examining how these conceptual tools produce the social effects that lead to enhanced citizenship capacity, the study also examines quantitative evidence, case studies, and cultural interventions documenting these effects. It also assesses implications for cultural policy and presents ideas for the collection of indicators on the social effects of culture.

3.0 - Methodologies

One of the main criticisms of studies on the social impact or social effects of culture and the arts has been aimed at methodological weaknesses. Many studies have described outputs and, to a lesser extent, outcomes of engagement with culture and the arts, but few have been able to prove causation between participation in the arts and specific effects. In only a few instances have researchers made methodologies the primary focus of their investigations, and several of these are included in this section. Additional information on methodological approaches can be found in the section on evidence below, but in this literature the results, rather than the methodology, is prioritized.

Although frequently advocated as the “gold standard” of research, experimental designs of studies, with random selection of subjects and control groups, are seldom used in studies of the social effects of culture, except in the health care field where a few researchers have examined the impact of the participatory arts on the health of seniors. Instead, those studying the social effects of culture and the arts tend to rely on quantitative analysis of surveys and qualitative analysis of case studies to investigate this subject. Some of this work is tied to the development of indicators of cultural value to justify public investment in the field, while other streams of research seek to understand the impact of cultural experiences on individuals' wellbeing. The former often attempts to take a longitudinal view, analyzing and manipulating data from recurring large, usually national-level surveys. The latter is frequently one-off, examining the impact of cultural activity in a specific setting or on a specific cohort. Small-scale surveys are not uncommon in the cultural world to determine how audiences or residents of a community perceive various cultural activities or institutions, but these are not included in this section unless they attempt to link the results to social outcomes.

An emerging methodological approach is attempting to assign monetary values to participation in various types of cultural activity based on subjective assessments of wellbeing by research subjects. This approach is frequently tied to evaluations of public investment in culture and the arts, and sometimes is criticized as an attempt to instrumentalize the arts in order to justify such investment. However, valuation approaches are also being utilized to try to understand how much culture and the arts contribute to population wellbeing, which (as described above) has become a major conceptual framework for understanding the social effects of culture.

Finally, within the field of evaluation, there have been attempts to address critiques about lack of rigour and lack of causal attribution in case studies of the social impact of the arts. Advocates of theory-based evaluation argue that culture is not amenable to being studied using experimental models because it operates in complex open systems that are often not generalizable to other contexts or environments. Therefore, research in this area must be closely tied to theory articulation and evaluation of outcomes in specific environments. Various maps of evaluation and impact studies with regard to

culture and the arts have also started to appear. These tend to take a broad view, but often provide links to useful resources in the field.

This section provides examples of each of these methodological approaches.

3.1 - Surveys and indicators

Grossi, E., P.L. Sacco, G.T. Blessi and R. Cerutti (2011). The Impact of Culture on the Individual Subjective Well-Being of the Italian Population: An Exploratory Study, *Applied Research Quality of Life*, Vol. 6: 387-410. Online at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11482-010-9135-1>

This study employs a relatively new analytical tool – Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) – to explore the relationship between cultural access and individual psychological well-being (the Psychological General Well-Being Index – PGWBI). The particular ANN utilized is an artificial “organism” called TWIST, which has been designed to sort out the most relevant variables for the purpose of prediction or classification. TWIST was found to be useful in detecting the underlying relationships among the many wellbeing variables that were part of the study, and was superior to linear techniques in dealing with the full dynamic interactions that contribute to cultural choices and behaviours. A detailed appendix to the article describes this methodology in full.

The data for the study were derived from a cross-sectional, randomized survey of 1500 Italian residents. The survey instrument included questions that assessed the psychological well-being of respondents in six domains: anxiety, depressed mood, positive well-being, self-control, general health, and vitality. Fifteen variables related to cultural access were added to the questionnaire, as well as activities related to sport participation and local community development, and respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of participation in each activity.

Preliminary univariate analysis revealed that health status and cultural consumption were the dominating factors affecting cultural well-being. The subsequent ANN analysis selected 31 key well-being variables from the sample, and seven of these involved cultural participation in cinema, theatre, classical music, painting exhibitions, novel reading, poetry reading, and sport practice (which served as a joint predictor of well-being along with the other six variables). On the basis of this analysis, culture (including the sport variable) ranked third as a determinant of psychological well-being, after absence of disease and income. It was more relevant than age, education, gender, or employment. The researchers concluded that “The links between cultural access and human and social development are therefore much more substantial than one could expect at first sight, and are rooted in the very foundations of the rationality norms that govern non-instrumental behaviors” (p. 405).

Huysmans, F. and M. Oomes (2013). Measuring the public library's societal value: A methodological research program, *IFLA Journal*, Vol. 39 (2), 168-177. Online at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0340035213486412>

In this article the authors describe a research program in the Netherlands intended to develop outcome measurements to show the societal value of investments in libraries. The research program was divided into two phases. The first phase consisted of a literature review, a qualitative study, and the verification of the elements of a quantitative survey. The results of the first two steps of Phase 1 were intended to shape the third step by identifying the domains on which the survey questionnaire would focus. Phase 2 of the research program was to be the development and testing of the framework developed in Phase 1 with a survey to take place sometime after 2014.

The model developed in Phase 1 consists of five domains of possible impact: cultural, social, educational, economic, and affective. These domains encompass both individual and community outcome dimensions, but the model does not describe the mechanisms through which impact comes about. It is also noted that since affective outcomes flow both directly from library use and indirectly through one or other of the other four domains, it is situated at another level of the model.

The model includes the following social impacts of library use:

- Promote connectedness between people and groups
- Stimulate participation and inclusion
- Build social capital and social cohesion
- Promote a sense of belonging to and ownership of society
- Stimulate/support community engagement/improvement activity
- Involvement in democratic process (p. 175).

Unfortunately, no English language reports or articles were found on the outcome of the survey element of this research program.

Kim, S. and H. Kim (2009). Does Cultural Capital Matter? Cultural Divide and Quality of Life, *Social Indicators Research*. Vol. 93: 295-313. Online at <http://ajou.ac.kr/~seoyong/paper/2009-Does%20Cultural%20Capital%20Matter-offline%20version.pdf>

The authors outline a methodology for measuring the cause and effect of cultural capital utilizing survey data from a structured face-to-face questionnaire that was administered to a sample of 6,300 Korean households. The concept of cultural capital is measured in three ways:

- Frequency – number of cultural experiences which respondents had for eight cultural activities during the last year (literature activities, painting exhibits, classical music performances, traditional art performances, plays, dance performances, movies, and music concerts or entertainment shows)
- Diversity – number of different types of cultural activities engaged in by respondents from among the eight cultural activities described above
- Spending – monthly average expenditure on cultural activities.

Subjective well-being was composed of affective happiness and cognitive life satisfaction and was measured by four-point scale survey questions.

The researchers found that those with more cultural experiences had higher life satisfaction and happiness than those with fewer cultural experiences. They also found that those with more frequent and diverse cultural experiences and who spent more money on them showed more happiness and life satisfaction than those with fewer, less diverse experiences. Frequency of cultural activities correlated most strongly with life satisfaction, while diversity of cultural experience correlated strongly with happiness levels. These results were regressed with other factors such as sex, income, education, and health, and while the cultural factors then had less explanatory power, they were still statistically significant. However, income determined cultural experience frequencies, while education determined diversity of and expenditure on cultural activities.

Laaksonen, A. (2005, January). *Measuring Cultural Exclusion through Participation in Cultural Life*. Presentation at Third Global Forum on Human Development: Defining and Measuring Cultural Exclusion. Online at <http://www.gsdrc.org/document-library/measuring-cultural-exclusion-through-participation-in-cultural-life/>

The author argues that in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) access to culture is one of the essential elements. The cultural rights approach proposes various ways of assessing cultural inclusion:

- Indicators of cultural participation should accommodate good governance values and individuals' and communities' own, self-defined cultural priorities.
- Observers should define minimum standards for the basic cultural entitlements which states must respect regardless of available resources. These standards include the protection of cultural heritage, freedom to use minority languages, diversity of educational programmes and protection of artists.
- Measurements can be partly based on states' ratification of international legislation relating to the protection of, and participation in, cultural life.

- There are various categories of measurements of access to cultural life. Indicators include the use of languages, the dissemination and conservation of culture and the protection of cultural property.
- Within the urban context, policymakers should encourage participation and a sense of place and belonging in the city space. The involvement of civil society is key to the promotion of tolerance and equal participation in the urban space.
- Cultural liberties are essential to sustainable diversity in cultural life. Five core elements – linguistic pluralism, mother tongue education, culturally diverse curricula, religious freedoms and multiple identities – are defined as measurable components of cultural liberty.

The presentation outlines several case studies that have attempted to measure and address issues of cultural exclusion, including the Interarts Foundation's research on cultural rights in the city, which resulted in the development of a Charter recognizing the cultural dimension of urban space and promoting participation, a sense of place, affiliation and belonging, and social cohesion and inclusion. This was based on a 60-item survey of residents that allowed them to rank different rights in order to guarantee a full cultural life.

Lee, S, J.E. Chung and N. Park (2016). Linking Cultural Capital With Subjective Well-Being and Social Support: The Role of Communication Networks, *Social Science Computer Review*. Vol. 34 (2), 172-196. Online at

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0894439315577347>

This study examines the different ways in which different forms of cultural capital correlate with college students' subjective perceptions of well-being and social support. Cultural capital was measured by participation in off-line and online contexts. A survey was administered to a sample of about 500 undergraduate students. Hierarchical regression analysis was performed with regard to overall life satisfaction, mental health, and perceived social support. Overall results suggested that "Being involved in cultural pursuits similar to peers and thus being able to communicate and socialize with them seem important in college students' context" (p. 188). However, some forms of cultural participation (e.g. online highbrow culture) were negatively associated with social support, while there was also a negative association between off-line popular cultural participation and mental health.

Michalos, A.C. and Kahlke, P.M. (2008). Impact of Arts-Related Activities on the Perceived Quality of Life, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 89, 193-258. Online at

<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11205-007-9236-x.pdf>

This article describes the results of a study to measure the quality of life in 2,000 households in five British Columbia communities. A questionnaire listed 66 kinds of arts-

activities, and respondents' assessment of the quality of their lives was measured using seven different scales. Using both bivariate and multivariate statistical techniques, the authors examined associations between the time invested in and satisfaction obtained from these activities on the one hand and the seven different measures of the overall quality of people's lives on the other. They also examined all associations in the presence of other features of respondents' lives, e.g. demographics, motives, participation in non-arts-related activities and satisfaction obtained from a variety of domains of life, like family relations, friendships, housing and a sense of meaning in life.

Considering engagement in activities measured in average number of hours per week, for the total sample of 1027 respondents, only 16.5% of the variables measuring arts activities and variables indicating the satisfaction obtained from those activities had significant correlations with the quality of life variables. Overall, they concluded that arts-related activities contributed relatively little to the seven life-assessment scales used to measure quality of life (compared to such things as good health or financial security). The authors speculate that their variables or the methodologies employed may not have been adequate to assess the impact of arts-related activities on quality of life.

UNESCO (n.d.) *Culture for Development Indicators – Social Participation*. Paris: UNESCO. Online at

http://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/cdis/social_participation_dimension.pdf

In this methodological manual, UNESCO asserts that:

Culture plays a central role in sustaining and enhancing individuals' and communities' quality of life and wellbeing. Cultural practices, assets and expressions are also key vehicles for the creation, transmission and reinterpretation of values, aptitudes and convictions through which individuals and communities express the meanings they give to their lives and their own development. Those values, aptitudes and convictions shape the nature and quality of social relationships, have a direct impact on a sense of integration, empowerment, trust, tolerance of diversity and cooperation and orient individual and collective action. (p. 84)

The participation measures used are:

- Percentage of the population who have participated at least once in a going out cultural activity in the last 12 months
- Percentage of the population who have participated at least once in an identity-building cultural activity in the last 12 months
- Degree of tolerance within a society towards people from different cultural backgrounds
- Degree of interpersonal trust

- Median score of perceived freedom of self-determination (the percentage of people who think that they have control over their lives and can live the life they choose, according to their own values and beliefs)

The manual also provides examples, guidance on data sources, calculation methods, and interpretation of results.

3.2 - Valuation-based approaches to social wellbeing

Armbrecht, J. (2014). Developing a scale for measuring the perceived value of cultural institutions, *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 23 (4), 252-272. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09548963.2014.912041>

This study utilizes a survey methodology to test a scale measuring the value of cultural institutions that consists of six factors:

- Perceived contribution to economic development
- Perceived contribution to a positive image (of a place)
- Perceived contribution to identity
- Perceived contribution to social network
- Perceived contribution to skills and knowledge
- Perceived contribution to mental and physical health (pp. 257-258).

The researcher conducted principal component analysis of respondents' responses to a series of questions related to these factors. The intent was to measure subjective individual perceptions of the types of value contributed by cultural institutions. It was concluded that the scale may be useful as a tool to investigate how various socioeconomic groups value culture. Comparative studies between different cultural institutions might also be possible using the model.

Crossick, G. and P. Kaszynska (2016, March). *Understanding the value of arts & culture – The AHRC Cultural Value Project*. Swindon, U.K.: Arts and Humanities Research Council. Online at <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/research/fundedthemesandprogrammes/culturalvalueproject/>

This project was established in 2012 to:

- Identify the various components of cultural value across a variety of contexts and within a unified approach
- Identify and develop methodologies that might be used to assess those dimensions of cultural value (p. 12).

It included a wide range of cultural practice and activity: the subsidized cultural sector, the commercial sector, and amateur and participatory arts and culture (noting the

need for more consideration of the role of digital technologies as an avenue of participation and engagement). Cultural value was defined as the worth attributed to people's engaging and participating in these areas.

The report concludes that it is "imperative to reposition first-hand, individual experience of arts and culture at the heart of enquiry into cultural value" and that "Far too often the way people experience culture takes second place to its impact on phenomena such as the economy, cities or health" (p. 7). Consequently, its "social" focus is directed through this lens in its discussion of:

- The ability of arts and cultural engagement to shape reflective individuals and engaged citizens
- The ability of the arts and culture to support healthier and more balanced communities,

It notes the extensive literature on the contribution of arts and culture to improving health and wellbeing, cognitive abilities, confidence, motivation, problem-solving and communications skills. It also reviews the methodologies and evidence in support of these measurements of cultural value and suggests:

- Wider application of evaluation as a tool within the cultural sector
- More use of qualitative methodologies in the study of cultural value
- More rigorous case-study research.

It also reviews a wide range of social science research methodologies used to evaluate the effects of arts and culture engagement, such as ethnography, network analysis, and arts-based and hermeneutic methods.

Fujiwara, D., I Kudrna, and P. Dolan. (2014, April). *Quantifying and Valuing the Wellbeing Impacts of Culture and Sport*. London: Department for Culture, Media & Sport. Online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/quantifying-and-valuing-the-wellbeing-impacts-of-culture-and-sport>

This study aimed to:

- Identify the impacts of culture and sport engagement on individuals' wellbeing;
- Estimate monetary values for those wellbeing impacts using the Wellbeing Valuation Approach (p. 6).

The Wellbeing Valuation Approach uses people's self-reports, rather than relying on preferences. In this study the dataset used to measure wellbeing was Wave 2 of the UK Understanding Society Survey (2010-11). The dataset used to estimate monetary values was the British Household Panel Survey. Multivariate regression analysis was used to control for as many determinants of a given outcome as possible (e.g. household income, health status, employment status). Detailed equations are provided. Cultural activities found to be positively and significantly associated with life satisfaction were

engagement in the arts, attending the arts, participation in dance and crafts, attending musical events and plays, and visiting libraries. Cultural activities found to be negatively and significantly associated with life satisfaction were performing music (p. 23). The value of arts engagement was found to be associated with higher wellbeing valued at £1,084 per person per year. Library engagement was found to be associated with higher wellbeing valued at £1,359 per person per year (p. 9).

3.3 - Evaluation-based approaches

Galloway, S. (2009, June). Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts, *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 18 (2), 125-148. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09548960902826143>

This article asks the question: “what types of research approach are best suited to investigating the social effects of the arts?” (p. 126). It suggests that the key problem is causal attribution, as many critics of social impact studies in the arts point to the failure to “prove” causation between participation in the arts and particular effects. The author argues that these critiques stem from the dominant experimental model used in the natural sciences, which has limited application in the open systems of the social world. Attempts to apply this model open themselves up to criticisms on three fronts: that they are not generalizable to other populations; that they over claim the extent to which the arts may be responsible for observed effects; and that they do not take sufficient account of the complexity of the environment in which arts activity occurs.

The author argues that theory-based evaluation (TBE) may be an effective way of addressing these three types of criticisms. TBE is based on a “generative” view of causation, which “views change as attributable to the internal characteristics of objects and explained through the interaction between context, and mechanism or process” (p. 131). It focuses on particular contexts – geographic, historical, or institutional – in which change occurs and views human beings as agents of social change, rather than passive objects being acted upon within closed systems. They require that the researchers articulate the theory or theories by which the intervention is intended to work before the research takes place, so that theory guides (and is tested in) the collection and analysis of data. In TBE, unintended consequences may be as important as intended ones. The TBE approach favours the accumulation of knowledge from a body of primary studies as a way of building knowledge about how and why change occurs in complex community interventions. Strong theory assists evaluators in examining how differences in context affect outcomes.

The author presents four studies in the UK that utilized TBE to study the arts in the context of social inclusion, criminal justice, mental health, and the health of three target groups. They are analyzed with regard to theory development, theory articulation (how the arts

activity contributed to the intended outcome), and how evidence was developed and marshalled. In all three areas, the stakeholder group had to be satisfied that the intervention “worked”.

Jermyn, H. (2004, July). *Research report 35 – The art of inclusion (Executive Summary)*.

London: Arts Council England. Online at

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160204123854/http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/the-art-of-inclusion>

This report presents the findings of a three-year research project to explore social inclusion in the arts. In addition to the report, 15 detailed case studies are available online. The objectives of the research were to:

- Gather evidence that could be used to inform policy and advocacy initiatives
- Develop and test appropriate methodologies for evaluating arts initiatives with aims related to social inclusion
- Evaluate three different models of initiating and delivering projects
- Identify the characteristics of successful initiatives and approaches that did not work and the reasons for this
- Develop measures of success that could be used to evaluate a broad range of initiatives.

Twenty-eight arts organizations participated in the research, and fifteen projects were developed into case studies. The work explored three different models of social inclusion work – community-led, work with low income communities, and partnerships brokered by the Arts Council between funded organizations and organizations with experience working with low-income groups.

Methods employed were a literature review, interviews with arts staff and participants, observation of projects, and analysis of evaluations. The research report outlines good practices for artists delivering projects, those planning and coordinating projects, and those partnering in projects. It also discusses several barriers to sustainability of projects.

Partal, A. and K. Dunphy (2016). *Cultural impact assessment: a systematic literature review of current methods and practice around the world, Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. Online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2015.1077600>

This paper presents the results of a systematic literature review on applications of cultural impact assessment (CIA) internationally. Findings indicate that CIA has largely been practiced since 2002 to understand the impact of development processes on indigenous communities. While interest in CIA was also apparent in areas of public policy, particularly local government, little evidence was found of the practice actually established. Only two developed tools for measuring cultural impact were found, one each for indigenous contexts and cities. (The tool for cities is the James report (2014)

discussed above.) Recommendations for strengthening CIA practice include establishing agreed definitions of culture and cultural impact, and validated tools, including measurement frameworks and indicators.

Shishkova, V. (2015). *General Mapping of Types of Impact Research in the Performing Arts Sector (2005-15)*. Brussels: IETM - International network for contemporary performing arts. Online at <https://www.ietm.org/en/publications/mapping-of-types-of-impact-research-in-the-performing-arts-sector-2005-2015> .

The purpose of this report, commissioned by the International network for Contemporary Performing Arts, is intended to map research on the social and cultural impact of the performing arts sector. It focuses mainly on grassroots surveys and evaluations, rather than on academic literature. The report references 50 documents on the social impacts of the arts including literature reviews, specific research, and larger narratives on conceptual or measurement issues (e.g. on how to measure the value of culture).

The specific research is a compilation of 21 case studies on the social impact of the performing arts from Australia, Bulgaria, Hong Kong, Hungary, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Canada. This includes data and the methodologies used in these studies.

4.0 - Compilations of evidence and literature reviews

Despite the widespread view among policy makers and practitioners in the cultural field that there is little evidence with regard to the social effects of culture, there has actually been a deluge of recent literature citing the (usually positive) impacts of engagement with the arts and , to a lesser extent, heritage. This section provides examples of some of this literature, which has been grouped under the same headings as the section on frameworks (with the addition of sections on health and education and on frameworks and methodologies):

- Evidence about culture's effects on sustainability and community development
- Evidence about culture's effects on wellbeing and social cohesion
- Evidence about the social effects of participation in culture
- Evidence about culture's effects on citizenship
- Evidence about culture's effects on health and education
- Literature reviews of frameworks and methodologies

This grouping is somewhat arbitrary, since a great deal of the literature addresses more than one area of impact. The largest body of research examines the effects of participation in culture, but a significant portion of this evidence also documents positive impacts on well-being and social cohesion, as well as the development of social capital. These types of impacts also feature prominently in the literature on culture's effects on health and education.

Perhaps the most convincing evidence comes from several American studies that have examined the impact of arts participation on the health of older adults and on the cognitive skills children and young adults. There is also a growing body of evidence about the linkages between cultural activity and individual wellbeing (usually measured as happiness or life satisfaction), and the formation of social capital (usually in the form of volunteering and participation).

Evidence gaps persist with regard to both scale and time vis-à-vis the social effects of culture. Overall, evidence linking individual wellbeing to community and national wellbeing is still relatively sparse, although a few studies have examined possible associations between cultural engagement, social cohesion and community sustainability. Several meta-evidence reviews, as well as a few of the studies on participation, have attempted to separate short-term, immediate benefits from longer-term ones, and to understand the paths and mechanisms through which cultural acts to produce social effects.

One framework occasionally used to examine the social effects of culture relates to citizenship and the public good, but little empirical research has been done to link

cultural engagement to democratic values, although a few studies have examined cultural participation and voting behaviour.

As pointed out in more than one study, there are frequently weaknesses in data sources, as well as difficulties in proving causation between engagement with culture and positive social outcomes. Some of these weaknesses are being addressed by statistical analyses of various large databases, but even here, it is frequently difficult to determine the significance of the cultural variables if other potentially-relevant variables have not been included in the survey.

4.1 - Culture, sustainability and community development

Arts Council England (2004, May). *The impact of the arts – some research evidence*. London: Arts Council England. Online at

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160204123953/http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/the-impact-of-the-arts-some-research-evidence>

This report provides an overview of evidence on the impact of the arts on social inclusion and regeneration of places. The social inclusion category included evidence with regard to:

- Employment - the size of the cultural labour force, employment created through Arts Council England funding, and the contribution of the arts to employability through skills development
- Education – outcomes for learners and outcomes for schools
- Health – outcomes for patients, outcomes for staff, outcomes for patient-staff relationships, outcomes for hospitals, and outcomes for the general population
- Crime – outcomes of arts interventions in custodial and community sentencing, impacts on crime prevention, and outcomes with regard to literacy skills of prisoners.

The report also examines the role of social capital in the sustainable development of communities, citing studies that link arts participation to increased community engagement and volunteering.

Large evidentiary databases are being assembled in some parts of the world, particularly the United Kingdom and the United States, on both the individual and community effects of engagement in culture. A few experimentally-based and longitudinal studies on the impact of cultural activity on health outcomes have also been found.

Guetzkow, J. (2002). *How the Arts Impact Communities: An introduction to the literature on arts impact studies*. Working Paper Series 20. Princeton: Centre for Arts and Culture Policy Studies, Princeton University. Online at

<https://www.princeton.edu/~artspol/workpap20.html>

This literature review and critical analysis provides an overview of various claims about the impact of the arts on communities. It critically examines a range of causal mechanisms through which positive outcomes might arise. These mechanisms (direct involvement, audience participation, and the presence of artists and arts organizations) are studied as to their impacts on either individuals or communities. Social impact is considered primarily a community effect insofar as these mechanisms build social capital, bring together people who might not otherwise have contact, promote cultural diversity and reduce crime and delinquency. The paper also raises a number of theoretical and methodological issues, including such problems as defining “the arts” and “impact”, proving causation, lack of comparison with other programs or policies, and lack of adequate data.

Mills, D. and P. Brown (2004). *Art and Wellbeing – A guide to connections between Community Cultural Development and Health, Ecologically Sustainable Development, Public Housing and Place, Rural Revitalization, Community Strengthening, Active Citizenship, Social Inclusion and Cultural Diversity*. Sydney: Australia Council for the Arts. Formerly online at <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/33524092> (no longer accessible)

This guide assembles case study material to demonstrate the connections between community cultural development and government wellbeing initiatives in the following areas:

- Health – social, environmental, and clinical policies
- Ecologically sustainable development
- Public housing and place – in major cities
- Rural revitalization
- Community strengthening – government initiatives aimed at increasing a community’s capacity to resolve social, economic, or environmental issues
- Active citizenship – involvement of citizens and communities in government processes
- Social inclusion and cultural diversity – strategies to overcome barriers based on gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, mental health, or disability (p. 11).

The guide adopts a concept of wellbeing “which builds on a social and environmental view of health, and recognises the inter-relatedness of environmental responsibility, social equity, economic viability and cultural development” (p. 4). This approach also recognizes that active citizenship or participatory democracy is a building block for

sustainability and wellbeing. Community cultural development in this context provides a means of recognizing and incorporating a community's culture and values into broader social and economic strategies.

Community cultural development can utilize either instrumental approaches (implementation of policy using the arts) or transformational approaches (using creative activity "to help determine policy, negotiate shared understanding and map out solutions") (p. 9). This guide found that arts organizations were particularly effective in creating both bonding and bridging social capital.

4.2 - Culture, wellbeing, and social cohesion

Canadian Index of Wellbeing (2010, 15 June). *Caught in the Time Crunch: Time Use, Leisure and Culture in Canada*. Waterloo: University of Waterloo. Online at https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/sites/ca.canadian-index-wellbeing/files/uploads/files/Caught_in_the_Time_Crunch.sflb_.pdf

This report utilizes the General Social Survey on Time Use from 1992, 1998 and 2005 to trace the amounts of time spent on leisure and cultural pursuits by Canadians. It found a significant drop in leisure time over those years. Using the Canadian Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating from 1997, 2000, and 2004, it also found a drop in volunteering for culture and recreation organizations. It concluded that these trends bode poorly for the wellbeing of individuals, community, and society (p. 24).

CASE (The Culture and Sport Evidence Program). (2010, July). *Understanding the drivers, impact and value of engagement in culture and sport -- An over-arching summary of the research*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Online at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/71231/CASE-supersummaryFINAL-19-July2010.pdf

The CASE programme is a joint strategic research programme led by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and several arms-length bodies: Arts Council England, English Heritage, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and Sport England. The aim of CASE is to use interdisciplinary research methods and analysis to inform the development of policy in culture and sport. The CASE research database is now the foremost repository of empirical studies on culture and sport engagement in the world with over 5000 studies. These studies examine the factors that predict engagement and the impact of policy on engagement,

Overall, the CASE programme outlines the value of engagement in culture and sport, both in terms of the short-term individual value of engagement – specifically the improvement in subjective well-being generated by engagement in culture and sport – and the longer-term benefits to society as summarized in the table below.

Benefits generated by engagement in culture and sport

Individual engager	Community	National
Achievement Continuity with the past Creativity Diversion Enjoyment Escape Expression Health Income Inspiration Knowledge of culture Self-esteem Self-identity Skills/competency Solace/consolation	Bequest value Community cohesion Community identity Creativity Employment Existence value Innovation Option to use Productivity Reduced crime Shared experience Social capital	Citizenship International reputation National pride

The study team also used subjective well-being (SWB) measures to value the short-term private gain associated with engagement. The approach involves two steps. First, survey data is used to estimate how a person's SWB changes when they engage in culture and sport. Second, this change in SWB is valued monetarily using the 'income compensation approach'. The analysis estimates the increase in SWB generated by an increase in income. This effect is then used to estimate the change in income that would generate the same change in SWB associated with engagement in culture and sport. The findings demonstrated that engagement in culture and sport has a positive effect on SWB. For example, it was found that attending a concert once a week generated SWB that was the equivalent of an over £8,000 increase in annual household income.

Fujiwara, D. and G. MacKerron (2015, January). Cultural activities, artforms and wellbeing. London: Arts Council England. Online at <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/cultural-activities-artforms-and%20wellbeing-0>

Using *Mappiness* – an iPhone application available in the United Kingdom that permits individuals to record their wellbeing scores via their phone – and written by two economists, this study examines the relationship between cultural engagement and wellbeing. Individuals who have downloaded the *Mappiness* app receive randomly timed “dings” on their phone to request that they complete a short survey that asks them to rate their happiness and relaxation with the activities that they are engaged in

at that moment. The app also transmits the satellite positioning (GPS) location of the individual and the precise time at which the survey was completed. The cultural activities included in this report are:

- Being at theatre, dance, or concert
- Being at an exhibition, museum, or library
- Listening to music
- Reading
- Doing hobbies, arts, or crafts
- Singing or performing

All cultural activities were found to be significantly associated with happiness and relaxation. Those most associated with happiness were ranked in terms of coefficient size as follows:

1. Theatre, dance, concerts
2. Singing, performing
3. Exhibitions, museums, libraries
4. Hobbies, arts, crafts
5. Listening to music
6. Reading

Those most associated with relaxation were ranked in terms of coefficient size as follows:

1. Exhibitions, museums, libraries
2. Hobbies, arts, crafts
3. Theatre, dance, concerts
4. Singing, performing
5. Reading
6. Listening to music

These results were statistically significant after controlling for other factors.

Jeannotte, M.S. (2003). Singing Alone? The Contribution of Cultural Capital to Social Cohesion and Sustainable Communities, *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 9 (1), 35-49. Online at

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1028663032000089507>

In this article, the author focuses on the linkages between personal investments in culture and the propensity to volunteer, using data from the Canadian General Social Survey 1998. The analysis cites research on social capital by Putnam and on cultural capital by Bourdieu as the conceptual framework and situates this work within a social ecology framework that views social spaces as dynamic systems or networks within which individuals are constantly subjected to experiences and take actions that modify these spaces or fields. These interactions have both individual and collective impacts. The author argues that different types of cultural participation have an impact on the quality of social capital.

The analysis of the 1998 GSS data indicated that:

- Those who engaged in various types of cultural consumption (ranging from attending musical performances to reading magazines) were more likely to volunteer than those who did not (34% as compared to 20%)
- Those who participated in culture actively (such as singing in a choir or playing a musical instrument) were also more likely to volunteer than those who did not
- The volunteer rate increased with volume of cultural participation (with those who participated at more than 20 events per year having a volunteer rate of almost 66%, as compared to about 13% for those who attended only one to four events a year).

The author suggests that there is a very important feedback loop between cultural capital and civil society / social capital that has not been adequately explored in a holistic way.

McCarthy, K.F., E.H. Ondaatje, L. Zakaras, and A. Brooks (2004). *Gifts of the Muse – Reframing the Debate About the Benefits of the Arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Online at

https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG218.pdf

This report is a very comprehensive review of the benefits of the arts, including evidence for instrumental benefits, conceptual theories from multiple disciplines, literature on intrinsic benefits, and literature on participation in the arts.

Evidence of instrumental benefits falls within the following categories:

- Cognitive – learning skills and academic performance
- Attitudinal and behavioural – development of attitudes such as self-discipline, behaviours such as school attendance, and pro-social attitudes such as social bonds
- Health – improved physical and mental health, and reduced stress and anxiety
- Social – promotion of social interactions within communities, community identity, social capital, and development of organizational capacities, such as volunteering
- Economic – direct, indirect, and public goods benefits

In general, the report concluded that much of empirical research on instrumental benefits has both conceptual and methodological limitations.

Evidence of intrinsic benefits falls into three categories:

- Private (of value mainly to the individual) – captivation and pleasure derived from artistic works

- Semi-public – expanded capacity for empathy, cognitive growth (new perspectives on the world)
- Public – creation of social bonds, expression of communal meanings

The report also includes a section on policy implications and recommendations based on this evidence review and a detailed appendix of the theoretical literature on learning and behavioural change at the individual level, and social and economic change at the community level.

National Economic and Social Forum (2007, January). *The Arts, Cultural Inclusion and Social Cohesion – NESF Report 35*. Dublin: NESF. Online at <http://edepositireland.ie/handle/2262/71433>

This report documents an Irish project that examined evidence and practices with regard to how the arts contribute to cultural inclusion and social cohesion, with the aim of making recommendations on how this could be further enhanced. The questions explored were:

- What is meant by arts participation and cultural inclusion?
- Why does participation in the arts and cultural inclusion matter? In particular, how does it contribute to social cohesiveness?
- What are the main barriers to cultural inclusion through participation in the arts?
- What policies and measures have been put in place in Ireland to address, either directly or indirectly, the issues of participation in the arts and cultural inclusion?
- Drawing on existing Irish practice and lessons, if any, from elsewhere what changes can be recommended to improve the contribution of the arts to cultural inclusion and social cohesion?

The report examines both private and collective benefits of arts participation and provides statistics on participation at arts events and reading behaviour, broken down by occupational class, household income, education, and age, as well as statistics on voluntary arts activity and participation in library activities. It also reviews evidence on barriers to participation in the arts, including family commitments, time, cost, transport, disabilities, literacy, access to information technologies, social/ psychological factors, organizational barriers, communication barriers, and ethnic/racial issues. It concludes that “the arts contribute to and strengthen social capital” which is “associated with higher economic growth, greater social equality, and increased levels of well-being and life satisfaction” (p. 107). However, it found wide variations in arts participation related to educational level, socio-economic status, area, and age.

The balance of the report reviews key legislation, policies and programs in Ireland that promote cultural and social inclusion, and makes a number of strategic recommendations that would increase the potential of the arts to enhance social capital and create a more inclusive and cohesive society (p. 114).

Torjman, S. (2004, April). *Culture and Recreation: Links to Well-Being*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Online at <http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/472ENG.pdf>

This publication reviews evidence in support of the contribution of culture and recreation in four areas:

- Health and wellbeing
- Skills development
- Social capital
- Economic impact

It notes that these benefits are continually at risk due to the fact that culture and recreation tend to be among the first targets of government funding cuts.

4.3 - Culture, connectedness and participation

Alberta Foundation for the Arts (2014). *Arts Impact Alberta 2014: Ripple Effects from the Arts*. Edmonton: Alberta Foundation for the Arts and Alberta Government. Online at <https://www.affta.ab.ca/news/arts-impact-alberta-2014>

This report analyzes data from 670 non-profits arts organizations that received funding from the Alberta Foundation for the Arts (AFA) between 2006 and 2013. It developed indicators on public engagement in the arts, volunteerism in Alberta's arts organizations, economic impact of the arts in Alberta, and employment in AFA-funded arts organizations. In terms of social impacts, it found that:

1. The majority (85 per cent) of adult Albertans attend at least one arts event per year, and just over half participate directly in an art form in their home or community.
2. Nonprofit arts organizations in Alberta present an average of 24,000 events per year throughout the province.
3. Each year, about 50,000 Albertans, the equivalent of an entire medium sized city such as Medicine Hat or St. Albert, volunteer for arts organizations.
4. These volunteers give an average of 34 hours of their time to the nonprofit arts organization of their choice, and collectively work the equivalent of an estimated 1,075 full-time jobs.
5. The total employment generated by the sector is estimated at 3,008 full-time equivalent jobs (including jobs generated in other sectors).

Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown (2014). *Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review*. Manchester: Arts Council England. Online at

[http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences.pdf](http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Understanding%20the%20Value%20and%20Impacts%20of%20Cultural%20Experiences.pdf)

This report explores the theoretical literature on the value cultural experiences to individuals, to cultural organizations and to consumers. While not primarily about the social impact of culture, the report's section on individual impacts of arts and culture includes indicators of social connectedness, sense of belonging, shared experience, social bridging, and social bonding. These indicators tend to reflect the extended and cumulative impacts of cultural engagement, rather than immediate experienced impacts, and therefore shape behaviours that have a broader societal impact

The authors pose several critical questions about these extended (social) impacts:

- What is an effective 'dose' of culture? Can a two-minute video clip provide as much impact as a four-hour opera or is the duration an important factor?
- If impacts deteriorate in the absence of additional cultural experiences, how often must one experience impacts to build up cumulative impacts?
- How do the impacts of various art forms differ from one another?
- How do the experiences of various cultural events interact with each other? Is the relationship always symbiotic or can they also detract from each other?

The report notes the dearth of research on the cumulative impacts of cultural experiences on individuals and their families.

Community Foundations of Canada (2015) *Vital Signs – Arts & Belonging*. Online at <http://communityfoundations.ca/artsandbelonging/>

Using a variety of data sources, this report provides national-level indicators of the linkages between participation in the arts and a sense of belonging or being part of a collective. For example, it reports that Canadians who rate arts, culture, and leisure in their city or town as "excellent" are 2.8 times more likely to report a "very strong" sense of belonging to their city or town, compared to those who rate arts as "poor" (p. 5). It also cites evidence indicating the positive social benefits for artists, seniors, youth, newcomers, audiences, Indigenous peoples, francophone minority populations, and communities (both urban and rural) of arts participation.

Hill, K. (2008, March). *Social Effects of the Arts: Exploratory Statistical Evidence*, *Statistical Insights on the Arts*, Vol. 6 (4). Online at <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/social-effects-culture-exploratory-statistical-evidence>

This exploratory report examines the relationship between four cultural activities (reading books, attending live performances, visiting art galleries, and attending movie theatres) and various social effects. It also conducts a brief literature review of the subject. The potential social effects of culture identified in the literature review were:

- Volunteering and donating
- Neighbourhood connections
- Sense of belonging
- Social activities
- Labour force participation
- Quality of life

Cross tabulations with these social effects were carried out for each of the cultural activities. The data were drawn from Canada's General Social Survey of 2005, which had a sample size of about 20,000. Unfortunately, the survey design was split so that only half of the respondents answered questions about cultural activities, and the other half answered questions about social networking and trust. Therefore, it was not possible to cross-tabulate the cultural responses with these factors. However, the factors that were cross-tabulated included volunteering, donating, neighbourhood connections, sense of belonging, enjoyment of social activities, economic participation, and quality of life. These are presented in some detail in the body of the report.

Overall, the report reveals some statistical evidence of a relationship between certain cultural activities and positive social engagement. This is particularly the case for art gallery visitors and book readers. However, the relationship was not as strong for performing arts attendees, and was not statistically significant for movie theatre attendance.

McDonnell, B. and D. Shellard (2006, July). *Social Impact Study of UK Theatre*. London: Arts Council England. Online at

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160204123109/http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/social-impact-study-of-uk-theatre>

This research assesses theatre's social impact, within a framework which builds on the creative aims and analyses of theatre practitioners. It draws on examples of good practice and highlights the values and practical steps which underlie it. The findings are based on a questionnaire, which was sent to 448 members of the Independent Theatre Council, as well as an intensive examination – based on interviews and documents – of ten selected companies. Four of these companies were visited and were the subject of case studies.

The study identified ten factors which contribute to the positive social impact of theatre. These were: artistic excellence, cultural partnerships, access, participatory creative process, giving public voice to marginalized experiences, ethical practices, evaluation, training, partner funding, and good governance.

Highlights of the findings were:

- Almost nine out of ten (88%) of practitioners surveyed considered that theatre had a personal impact on participants
- More than eight out of ten (82%) of practitioners surveyed considered that theatre resulted in group impacts
- Two thirds (65%) of practitioners surveyed assessed theatre as having civic impacts
- More than four out of ten (42%) of practitioners surveyed believed that theatre has hard impacts (such as increased employment or contributions to the local economy)
- Social impacts were found across a rich spectrum of activity, spanning both process-led and performance-centred work
- Stable funding was critical to social impact
- Further work was needed to define more clearly the types of impact identified through the survey.

National Endowment for the Arts (2005). *The Arts and Civic Engagement: Involved in Arts, Involved in Life*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/publications/arts-and-civic-engagement-involved-arts-involved-life-0>

This American study, based on data from the 2002 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, found that arts participation overwhelmingly correlated with positive individual and civic behaviours. The Survey, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, interviewed over 17,000 adults. There were almost 5,000 young adults (18-24) in the sample. Among the key results were the following:

- Readers and arts participants are twice as likely as non-participants to volunteer in their communities (p. 4)
- Volunteerism in young adults has declined slightly (p. 6).

The study also found that arts participation among younger adults is falling, along with most forms of civic and social engagement (comparing 1982 to 1992).

National Endowment for the Arts (2009, October). *Art-Goers in Their Communities: Patterns of Civic and Social Engagement*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/publications/art-goers-their-communities-patterns-civic-and-social-engagement>

This study presents data from the 2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts and builds on the research outlined in the 2005 report (above). The 2008 Survey included additional questions on civic activities, including attending community meetings and voting in presidential elections. Among the key findings:

- American adults who attend museums, galleries, or live arts performance are more likely to vote, volunteer, or take part in community events.
- The volunteer rate for performing arts attendees was 57%, more than 35 percentage points higher than that of adults who did not attend arts performances.
- The volunteer rate for art museum visitors was 58%, more than double that of adults who did not visit art museums.
- For literary readers, the 43% volunteer rate was higher by 22 points than for non-literary readers.
- The share of performing arts attendees and museum-goers participating in community events was more than 50%, a rate three times higher than that reported for non-attenders.
- Voting was also more prevalent among arts-goers, with almost 73% of literary readers voting in the prior presidential election, compared to 63% among the general population.
- Americans who create or perform art are also more civically active than the general population, with more than 50% volunteering and attending community meetings, compared to the 32% volunteer rate and the 23% attendance rate among the general population.
- Among choir singers, more than 65% did volunteer work and 60% attended community meetings.
- Attendance at traditional arts events continues to fall among the young adult population (18 to 34 years of age), dropping to 35% in 2008, down nine points from 1982.

Regression analysis was performed to compare volunteering and civic engagement rates with other independent variables, such as education and gender. It was found that performing arts attendees are 3.8 times to volunteer than non-attendees, regardless of education, gender, and other demographic traits. Only education rivals performing arts attendance as a predictor of such involvement.

Nichols, B. (2007, June). *Volunteers with Arts or Cultural Organizations: a 2005 Profile. Research Note #95.* Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/95.pdf>

This report is based on data from a supplement to the September 2005 U.S. Current Population Survey, which has a sample of 60,000 households. The volunteering period covered was September 2004 to September 2005. Among the key findings:

- In 2005, 65.4 million people volunteered in the U.S., but only 1 million people, or 1.6% volunteered with arts and cultural groups (defined as media and communications firms, visual arts and ceramics groups, museums, zoos and aquariums, performing arts organizations, and historical and literary societies).

- A further 7.1 million people provided free artistic services to other types of organizations, such as churches or youth groups.
- Arts and culture volunteers are older than volunteers with other organizations, with a median age of 51, as compared to a median age of 44 for all volunteers.
- Of the 1 million arts and cultural volunteers, 60% are women.
- Whites comprise 87% of all arts and cultural volunteers. Asians make up 6% of arts and cultural volunteers, while African Americans account for only 5.4% and Hispanics only 4%.
- Almost 62% of arts volunteers have college degrees, compared to 44% of all volunteers.
- The median number of volunteer hours by arts and cultural volunteers was 70, compared to an average of 50 hours for all volunteers. This was the highest among all volunteers except for those volunteering with public safety organizations (96 hours).
- Arts and cultural volunteers were most likely to provide music, performance, or other types of artistic services (37%), followed by fundraising (35%), managerial assistance (28%), and general labour and office services (21% each).
- Over 20% of arts and cultural volunteers were asked to help by a relative, friend or co-worker, as compared to only 14% of all volunteers, suggesting that arts and cultural organizations may rely more heavily on social networking to attract volunteers.

Polzella, D.J. and J.S. Forbis (2016, 23 June). *Relationships between different types and modes of arts-related experiences, motivation and civic engagement*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at

<https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Research-Art-Works-Dayton3.pdf>

This is a follow-up to an earlier study (Polzella and Forbis (2013) *Pro-social and economic indications of participation in the arts*) that set out to determine the relationship between participation in the arts and pro-social civic engagement, as well as motivations for participation in the arts. The earlier study found that individuals who attended a greater number of music performances over the course of the year had a greater likelihood of voting, volunteering or making charitable donations, and participating in community activities.

To address limitations in the earlier study, the researchers set out to determine whether they could replicate it using a different sample of individuals, and generalize the findings to electronic media and to non-traditional musical performances. They also re-examined motivations for experiencing arts-related events. This was done by analyzing data from the Public Participation in the Arts Supplement to the 2012 Current Population Survey and the 2012 General Social Survey Arts Supplement.

The major findings of the new study were:

- Previous findings were confirmed with regard to the pro-social behaviours of individuals who attend traditional live musical performances (i.e. voting, making charitable donations, volunteering and attending community meetings).
- Individuals who attended other live arts-related events were also more likely to engage in pro-social behaviour.
- The link between exposure to the arts and pro-social behaviour is based primarily on the social characteristics of these encounters (e.g. shared group identity, familiarity with performers, customs or rituals).
- Individuals who were exposed to the arts through the internet were also more likely to engage in pro-social behaviour.
- Reasons for attending did not operate independently of each other and should not be considered in isolation (pp. 3-4).

The appendices of the study also contain useful information on the variables considered from the two surveys and the methodologies used to analyze the data.

4.4 - Culture and citizenship

Hertie School of Governance (2016, December). *Cultural Participation and Inclusive Societies –A thematic report based on the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Online at <https://edoc.coe.int/en/culture-and-democracy/7285-pdf-cultural-participation-and-inclusive-societies-a-thematic-report-based-on-the-indicator-framework-on-culture-and-democracy.html>

This report draws on data collected within the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy and other sources to explore the links that exist between a population's cultural participation and the characteristics of an open, inclusive society, such as tolerance and trust. Within the impact frameworks outlined above, this report examined impacts related to cultural citizenship. It found that "Cultural participation more generally and specific forms of cultural activity, especially artistic expression, online creativity and passive participation are indeed strongly associated with trust, tolerance and related dimensions of an inclusive society" (p. 29).

Miringoff, M-L. and S. Opdycke (2005). *Arts, Culture, and the Social Health of the Nation 2005*. Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Institute for Innovation in Social Policy. Online at <http://iisp.vassar.edu/artsculture.pdf>

Based on the U.S. National Social Survey 2004, this report analyzes evidence on the importance of arts and culture to Americans, as well as adults' and children's participation in arts and culture. From the perspective of social impact, the authors found that:

- 78% of Americans believe that attending arts events helps them to see things from other people's perspectives.
- Americans rate as highly important in their lives: reading (87%), creative work (86%), and listening to music (83%).
- Participation in arts and culture declined in all six of the cultural activities that the researchers monitored between 2002 and 2004.
- In comparing behaviour by income level, adults earning under \$35,000 per year were significantly less likely to participate in arts and cultural activities (20 percentage point differences for attendance at art shows, museums, and live performances).

4.5 - Culture and health/education

Arts Council England (2014). *The Value of Arts and Culture to People and Society – An evidence review*. London: Arts Council England. Online at http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Value_arts_culture_evidence_review.pdf

This report begins with the point that culture and the arts have intrinsic as well as instrumental value (i.e. not just because they can be used to achieve ends outside themselves). It notes that intrinsic effects of arts and culture spill over into the instrumental area because they help to create social bonds and cultivate good citizens.

The evidence review examines the impact of culture and the arts in several areas:

- Economy – national and local economies, artists, creative and cultural industries, savings to the public purse
- Health and well-being – ageing populations
- Society – social inclusion and citizenship, crime
- Education – educational attainment, school curriculum, employment outcomes, “soft” outcomes and socio-cognitive development

In the social sphere, it cites evidence that those who attended a cultural place or event were more likely to report good health and better subjective wellbeing compared to those who did not. There was also much evidence about the therapeutic benefits of such participation for those suffering from various health conditions. Evidence was also cited to show that students who engage in the arts in school are more likely to volunteer and to be employed as adults. Participation in structured arts activities led to improved cognitive abilities in some studies and to improvements in literacy in others. Students from low income families who took part in arts activities in

school were shown to be three times more likely to get a degree than those who did not.

The report found a notable absence of research in such areas as longitudinal studies of the health benefits of arts participation and comparative studies of the effects of arts participation as opposed to sport participation. There were also gaps in research on the effects of arts and cultural participation on crime recidivism rates, and on the environment and sustainability.

Catterall, J.S., S.A. Dumais and G. Hampden-Thompson (2012, March). *The Arts and Achievement in At-Risk Youth: Findings from Four Longitudinal Studies*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Arts-At-Risk-Youth.pdf>

This study utilized databases from four longitudinal studies of American youth:

- National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (1987-2000)
- Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-1999 (1998-2007)
- Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (2002-2012)
- National Longitudinal Survey of Youth of 1997 (1997-ongoing)

Because the cohorts in each database were followed over time, this study addresses some of the weaknesses of small group case studies of the effects of arts participation on youth. It focuses on children and youth from lower socioeconomic (SES) backgrounds to determine the impact of arts exposure on academic achievement, extracurricular activities, civic engagement, and career aspirations. The arts activities included course-taking in music, dance, theatre and visual arts, out-of-school art lessons, and membership, participation or leadership in arts organizations and activities.

Examples of some of the findings include:

- 71% of youth with low SES backgrounds and arts-rich experiences attended some sort of college after high school as compared to 48% of those in the same category with low levels of arts experiences.
- Low SES high school students who earned few or no arts credits were five times more likely not to graduate than low SES students who earned many arts credits.
- Low SES students who had intensive arts experiences in high school were three times more likely than those lacking such experiences to earn a bachelor's degree.
- Low SES young adults who had arts-rich experiences in high school were more likely than low SES young adults to have volunteered recently.
- Young adults from low SES backgrounds who had arts-rich experiences were more likely to vote or participate in a political campaign than those who had low arts experiences.

While all the results of the study were statistically significant, the authors caution that they show only positive correlations and not necessarily causation. Like many other researchers, they note the need to control for all the possibly relevant variables, such as influences of family, home, school and neighbourhood, or gender, race and ethnicity, which were not always included in the databases,

Cohen, G.D. (2006). Research on Creativity and Aging: The Positive Impact of the Arts on Health and Illness, *Generations*, Vol. XXX (1), 7-15. Online at <http://www.peopleandstories.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/RESEARCH-ON-CREATIVITY-AND-AGING.pdf>

This article describes the results of the Creativity and Aging Study, conducted at the George Washington University Center on Health, Aging & Humanities. This was the first formal study, using an experimental design, including a control group, which examined the influence of participatory arts programs provided by professional artists on the general health, mental health, and social activities of older people. The study found that after one year, the intervention group reported better health, fewer falls, and greater improvements with regard to depression, loneliness, and overall morale. These results indicated that community-based arts programs run by professional artists can have a positive impact on maintaining the independence of older people.

Hill, K. (2013, January 30). The Arts and Individual Well-Being in Canada: Connections between Cultural Activities and Health, Volunteering, Satisfaction with Life, and Other Social Indicators in 2010. *Statistical Insights on the Arts*, Vol. 11 (2). Report funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Canada Council for the Arts and the Ontario Arts Council. Online at <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/arts-and-individual-well-being-canada>

Using cross-tabulations from Statistics Canada's General Social Survey of 2010, this study found a strong connection between cultural activities and eight indicators of health and wellbeing. Specifically, the key findings were that:

- Art gallery visits are associated with better health and higher volunteer rates
- Theatre attendance is associated with better health, volunteering, and strong satisfaction with life
- Classical music attendance is associated with higher volunteer rates and strong satisfaction with life
- Pop music attendance is associated with better health, volunteering, and strong satisfaction with life
- Attendance at cultural festivals is associated with better health, volunteering, and strong satisfaction with life
- Reading books is associated with better health, volunteering, and strong satisfaction with life (p. 1).

The study's author cautions that while there is a statistically significant correlation between these variables, it is difficult to prove a cause and effect relationship in the absence of other, possibly relevant variables, that were not included in the General Social Survey.

Hill, K. (2014, June). *Making a Holistic Case for the Arts: Canadian Evidence regarding the Relationship between the Arts and the Quality of Life, Well-being, Health, Education, Society, and the Economy*. Report for the Canadian Public Arts Funders Network. Ottawa: Hill Strategies. Online at <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/making-holistic-case-arts>

The report provides summaries of research in support of the social effects enumerated in the title. It notes that research on arts and health, arts and education, the economy, and quality of community life are relatively numerous, but that there is less research on impacts on society and identity. Other gaps include lack of Canadian information on the benefits of arts education, research on the arts and well-being of adults, and studies linking personal and public outcomes. It also mentioned the need for more research on arts engagement beyond attendance.

Rajan, K.B and R.S. Rajan (2017, September). *Staying Engaged: Health Patterns of Older Americans Who Participate in the Arts*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/StayingEngaged_0917_0.pdf

This report responds to a frequent methodological criticism of research on the social effects of the arts – namely the lack of longitudinal studies. It examines data from the U.S. Health and Retirement Study, a national survey of adults over 55 years of age who are tracked over time. The report has three aims:

- To describe how participation in various arts activities correlated with health outcomes in a 2014 sample (when a special cultural supplement was added to the survey)
- To describe how changes in health measured prior to 2014 are associated with arts participation in 2014
- To generate hypotheses that can be used to test these associations in future prospective and randomized studies (p. 1).

The findings were that:

- In 2014, older adults who both created art and attended arts events or institutions had higher levels of cognitive functioning, lower rates of limitations to daily physical functioning, and lower rates of hypertension relative to older adults who did neither type of activity.
- In 2014, older adults who only attended arts events or institutions still had higher cognitive functioning, lower rates of hypertension, and lower rates of limitations

to daily physical functioning than older adults who neither created art nor attended arts events.

- Among older adults who both created art and attended arts events or institutions in 2014, levels of cognitive functioning had decreased at a slower rate from 2002 to 2014.
- Among older adults who both created art and attended arts events or institutions in 2014, rates of hypertension and limitations to daily physical functioning had grown more slowly from 2002 to 2014 (p. 3).

Creative arts activities included visual art-making, dancing, singing or playing a musical instrument, acting, making photography, graphic design or film, and writing stories, poetry or plays. Attending arts events included art museums, galleries, arts or crafts fairs, live performances, and movies.

Taylor, P., L. Davies, P. Wells, J. Gilbertson, and W. Tayleur (2015, March). A Review of the Social Impacts of Culture and Sport. London: Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE) Programme. Online at [http://www.artsandhealth.ie/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/A review of the Social Impacts of Culture and Sport-2015.pdf](http://www.artsandhealth.ie/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/A_review_of_the_Social_Impacts_of_Culture_and_Sport-2015.pdf)

This report reviews the current evidence base on the social impacts of sport and culture. In the realm of culture it reviews evidence with regard to the arts, heritage, and museums, libraries, and archives.

The literature reviewed focuses on four types of social impacts: improved health, reduced crime, increased social capital, and improved education outcomes. In addition, literature on subjective wellbeing was examined, and other social impacts, such as attitudinal change and civic engagement were included under the category of “multiple social impacts”. It highlighted a number of methodological issues, such as the lack of understanding about mechanisms through which beneficial outcomes take place and about the impacts of different types, frequencies, and intensities of exposure. The report provides logic models through which exposure to arts, heritage, museums, libraries, and archives might lead to positive social outcomes.

In the arts domain, the report found evidence of positive impacts on health, particularly with regard to the health benefits of music for both the general population and stroke victims. In the area of crime, there is evidence of beneficial impacts on intermediate outcomes, such as improvements in communication skills and self-concepts among offenders, but much less evidence with regard to crime prevention. The best evidence found by the study team related to social capital, indicating that cultural participation can contribute to social relationships, networks, communication skills, self-esteem and trust. Positive evidence was also found linking arts participation to intermediate

educational outcomes, such as improvements in self-concepts and relationships, but there was less evidence with regard to educational attainment.

In the heritage domain, much less evidence was found with regard to social impacts. The literature reviewed suggested potentially mixed effects of heritage on social capital (bonding capital, bridging capital, linking capital and volunteering). A review of heritage project evaluations and studies identified examples of improved social inclusion and social cohesion, personal skill development and improved self concepts for volunteers, but the quality of the evidence could not be assessed.

Very little empirical evidence was found for the social impact of the museums, libraries and archives domain, and most of what was found pertained to social capital, particularly volunteering. Surprisingly, little convincing evidence was found with regard to the relationship between museums, libraries, and archives and educational outcomes. A few studies of the sector's impact on community identity, education, health and social capital have been conducted, but the current evidence base was judged to be weak.

Tsegaya, S., I.D. Moss, K. Ingersoll, R. Ratzkin, S. Wynne, and B. Yi (2016, December 19). *Everything We Know About Whether and How the Arts Improve Lives*. Createquity.com. Online at http://createquity.com/2016/12/everything-we-know-about-whether-and-how-the-arts-improve-lives/?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ARM%2016-1%20EN&utm_source=Envoke%20-%20HSR%20EN&utm_content=Arts%20education%2C%20theatre%2C%20social%20benefits%3A%20Arts%20Res

This online article critically examines evidence with regard to the impact of arts participation in four areas: physical and mental health; education and personal development; economic development; and social cohesion. It found the strongest evidence in the areas of education and personal development and physical and mental health, particularly with regard to music participation. While causal relationships and mechanisms were not clear, the authors concluded that:

- Participatory arts activities help to maintain the health and quality of life of older adults.
- Art therapies contribute to positive clinical outcomes such as reduction in anxiety, stress and pain for patients.
- Arts participation in early childhood promotes social and emotional development.
- Student participation in structured arts activities enhances cognitive abilities and social skills (although evidence that it improves academic attainment is sparse).

The authors did not find as much convincing evidence with regard to the arts and social cohesion – a term which they used to describe studies of social capital, social

wellbeing, social inclusion, and arts for social change. They found several studies of the relationship between arts participation and voting, volunteering, or attending community meetings. However, these studies did not test for the possibility of another set of behaviours or values that might be driving both arts engagement and civic behaviour.

Like many other researchers who have examined the meta-evidence, they emphasize the need for more longitudinal studies and randomized control trials to determine whether the positive effects were attributable to arts participation and persisted over time.

4.6 – Literature reviews of frameworks and methodologies

Department of Canadian Heritage (2016, February). *Social Impacts and Benefits of Arts and Culture: A Literature Review*. Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage. Online at <http://pilot.open.canada.ca/ckan/en/dataset/660bd52a-c514-5b97-825e-e09e18289066>

This report provides an overview of key theories that have contributed to existing frameworks for measuring the social impact of the art and culture. These include the work of Pierre Bourdieu, Robert Putnam, Jane Jenson, and Richard Florida. It also examines frameworks that have been used by various governments to attempt to measure these social impacts, including the Canadian Framework for Culture Statistics; the Cultural Indicators for New Zealand framework; the framework for Vital Signs: Cultural Indicators for Australia; and the National Indicator Set developed by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport in the United Kingdom to help local authorities measure the impact of cultural investment. The report also reviews many studies, reports, and articles that have contributed to the literature on measuring and evaluating the social impacts of culture and provides a useful glossary of terminology used in these studies. While it found widespread agreement in the literature on the multiple and positive benefits of culture and the arts on society, it found no consensus on how to measure these benefits.

5.0 - Advocacy documents

Many of the documents presenting evidence on the social effects of culture also contain a certain amount of advocacy on the subject, particularly if the evidence is positive. However, this section includes arguments that are based on over-arching frameworks that go beyond specific and isolated pieces of evidence.

The first – a report drafted by an All-Party Parliamentary Group in the United Kingdom – urges a closer look at culture's role within an emerging framework that focuses on what are called "the social determinants" of health. This framework maintains that ill health is the result of social inequality and that access to cultural activity plays a key role in overcoming such inequality. This advocacy document is bolstered by a painstaking review of existing evidence in support of this thesis.

The second document bases its advocacy on the United Nations' Post-2015 Development Agenda and suggests that the UN develop cultural indicators to measure progress on its Post-2015 Development Goals, many of which deal with poverty-reduction, education, urban development, and sustainable development.

All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing Inquiry Report (2017, July). *Creative Health: the Arts for Health and Wellbeing*. London: Parliament of the United Kingdom. Online at <http://www.artshealthandwellbeing.org.uk/appg-inquiry/>

The All-Party Parliamentary Group was formed in 2014 to "improve awareness of the benefits that the arts can bring to health and wellbeing, and to stimulate progress towards making these benefits a reality across the country" (p. 4). It conducted meetings across the country and commissioned research on the interactions between the arts, health, and wellbeing across the life course.

The guiding framework for the inquiry and research was based on findings with regard to the social determinants of health, a concept which argues that health inequalities are the result of social inequalities and that strategies to tackle these inequalities should be distributed proportionally across the social gradient (i.e. that those at the lower end of the social hierarchy should be provided greater access than those at the higher end). The report also argues that the arts have not been well-researched as one of the social determinants of health and wellbeing. It marshals both quantitative and qualitative evidence with regard to the social value of the arts in "preventing illness and infirmity from developing in the first place and worsening in the longer term" (p.10). This includes evidence on the role of the arts in:

- Fostering cognitive and socio-emotional skills in children
- Overcoming anxiety, depression, and stress among working age adults
- Fostering health aging and social participation among the elderly

- Offering physical, psychological, spiritual, and social support for those approaching the end of life.

The report makes ten specific recommendations as “catalysts for the change of thinking and practice that can open the way for the potential of the arts in health to be realised” (p.154).

Gardner, S., J. Pascual, C. Vallerand, M. Giovinazzo, S. Fischer, P. Rorvik, K. Kovanen, S. Sipilä and P. Kistenmacher (2015, February 12). *Recognizing the role of culture to strengthen the UN Post-2015 Development Agenda*. UCLG: Culture 21 – Agenda for Culture. Online at <http://www.agenda21culture.net/advocacy/culture-as-a-goal-in-post-2015>

This document, drafted by a coalition of international cultural organizations working through United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), argues that cultural indicators should be recognized in the United Nations' Post-2015 Development Agenda. It states that “Culture effectively contributes to policies, strategies and programs targeting inclusive social and economic development, environmental sustainability, harmony, peace and security”. It suggests that the UN develop a set of cultural indicators to measure progress under the UN's Post-2015 Development Goals. In the social sphere, these include:

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere:

- Proportion of men and women with access, within 20 minutes walking distance, to basic cultural services and resources (libraries, community centers, arts centers, museums, local heritage preservation centers, etc.) as a means of empowerment and human development
- Access to selected cultural community infrastructures (museums, libraries, media resource centers, exhibition centers dedicated to the performing arts) relative to the distribution of the country's population in administrative divisions immediately below State level.

Goal 4 – Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all

- Percentage of instructional hours dedicated to arts education
- Percentage of staff in primary and secondary education with specific training in artistic or cultural disciplines
- Percentage of primary and secondary public schools which have a library
- Percentage of the population having participated at least once in a going-out cultural activity in the last 12 months
- Global Cultural Participation Index (a UNESCO initiative).

Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

- Percentage of national and local urban development plans which have integrated a specific cultural impact assessment
- Number and distribution of identified cultural and natural heritage items
- Number of natural and cultural heritage assets under threat
- Number of public libraries per 1,000 inhabitants
- Percentage of budget devoted to the preservation of cultural and natural resources
- Index of development of a multidimensional framework for heritage sustainability
- Share of cities having integrated urban policies that protect and safeguard cultural and natural heritage
- Proportion of urban land allocated to public open spaces (streets, squares, gardens, parks, etc.) over the total urban land
- Proportion of urban land allocated to public sheltered facilities (libraries, museums, etc.) over the total urban land.

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

- Existence of a comprehensive law and legal regime that ensures the right of access to information from public bodies
- Legal regimes which ensure compliance with international standards of freedom of expression, association and assembly
- Percentage of libraries that regularly provide specific training sessions on media and information literacy competencies.

6.0 - Critiques of frameworks and methodologies

Critiques of work on the social effects of culture focus on various aspects of this research, but the two most prominent are deficiencies in the philosophical and ideological aspects of conceptual frameworks and methodologies used to investigate these social effects.

Criticisms of the conceptual bases of research on the social effects of culture tend to be situated within ongoing debates about the value of culture. The social effects of culture are judged to be incidental to the central purposes of the arts and heritage preservation and, if taken to their logical conclusion, antithetical to them. They are also seen by some critics as being part of the neoliberal state's attempts to off-load its social responsibilities to civil society.

Methodological critiques cover a range of issues, from unclear conceptual frameworks, lack of data and definitional imprecision, to poor research design and narrow, short-term research objectives.

In general, it may be said that the research community is making serious efforts to address the methodological shortcomings pointed out by the critics, but it seems to be no nearer to a consensus on the broader philosophical debates that surround efforts to measure the value of culture.

Belfiore, E. (2002). Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion: Does it really work? A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 8 (1), 91-106. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/102866302900324658>

This article critiques both economic and social justifications for arts and culture investments as mostly unproven and often based on shaky data and methodologies. Both are rooted in instrumental theories of culture that require "value for money" arguments to defend public funding in the areas of arts and culture. The author suggests that "an evaluation method that really placed outcomes at its heart should rather focus on long-term monitoring of the participants and the effects of the arts on their lives" (p. 98). As well, issues of quality (excellence versus participation) continue to dog arts funders in particular, seeming to suggest a need for new definitions of "quality". This issue arises as well in the area of museums and heritage, where the "inclusive" museum, which aims to deliver positive social outcomes to disadvantaged groups, may lead to conflicts with responsibilities to conserve, interpret, and present the collection. The author argues that social inclusion as an instrumental cultural policy is not sustainable and could in the long-term lead to the provision of art within social policies.

Belfiore, E. and O. Bennett (2006). *Rethinking the Social Impact of the Arts: a critical-historical review*. Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick. Research Paper No.9. Online at

[https://www.academia.edu/257449/Rethinking the Social Impacts of the Arts?auto=download](https://www.academia.edu/257449/Rethinking_the_Social_Impacts_of_the_Arts?auto=download)

This paper is a critical discussion of the debate over the social impact of the arts. It takes an historical approach to the subject, citing a number of philosophical positions articulated for centuries in the Western intellectual canon. It describes several previous “traditions” of thinking about the impact of the arts, including the negative tradition, the positive tradition, and the autonomy tradition. The authors note that most of the arguments in support of the social impact of the arts are drawn from the positive tradition, have become detached from the other intellectual traditions, and have become rooted in simplistic claims. They argue for a more nuanced way of discussing cultural value in the 21st century.

Cultural Ministers Council – Statistics Working Group (2004). *Social Impacts of Participation in the Arts and Cultural Activities – Stage Two Report – Evidence, Issues and Recommendations*. Sydney: University of Western Sydney. Online at
[http://www.arts.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/23627/Social Impacts of the Arts.pdf](http://www.arts.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/23627/Social_Impacts_of_the_Arts.pdf)

The aim of this project is to identify, collate and evaluate existing applied research on the social impacts of participation in arts and cultural activity. This report draws upon the 104 papers and reports that were amassed in Stage 1 to explain the complexities involved, indicate research gaps and methodological shortcomings, and identify the types of research models useful to arts and cultural policy and program development.

In terms of shortcomings, the project found that the complexity of issues and multiple definitions of key terms meant that there was no single widely accepted model for the investigation of the social impacts of participation in arts and cultural activities. Overall, it found:

- Absence of clear intentions with regard to the social objectives of policies
- Poor design of studies
- A focus on outputs rather than longer term outcomes or impacts
- Lack of consensus around definition of terms
- Insufficient evaluation expertise in the arts field
- Insufficient attention to the mechanisms which underpin any impact and hence to effective policy design for the activation of these mechanisms (p. 10).

The types of research that would be useful in building a better evidence base on the social impacts of culture and the arts include:

- Experimental studies using random selection, control groups, pre- and post-testing of groups, conducted over a sufficiently long period (two to four years) to enable assessment of impacts
- Correlational studies using quantitative and statistical analysis to study linkages among variables
- Surveys and time series to yield quantitative data on large populations
- Qualitative approaches, such as case studies, which focus on smaller, selected populations.

The report suggests that evaluation toolkits, using a variety of approaches, might be needed to assess the social impact of arts and culture participation in various situations.

Cultural Policy Collective (2004). *Beyond Social Inclusion – Towards Cultural Democracy*. Scotland: Cultural Policy Collective. Online at https://archive.org/stream/media_Towards_Cultural_Democracy/Towards_Cultural_Democracy_djvu.txt

This report critiques what it calls “the dubious politics” of social inclusion policy, which it suggests “has been a policy designed to accompany, rather than counteract, the collapse of full employment and the abandonment of universalist welfare provision over the last three decades” (p. 5). It argues that it promotes equality of opportunity, rather than equality, and emphasizes an individual’s social obligations rather than his or her rights as citizens. In the area of culture and the arts, it suggests, social inclusion programs have been largely characterized by tokenism and have been used to disguise unequal power relations.

The alternative approach that is proposed is that of cultural democracy, which specifically focuses on the role of public institutions in addressing inequality, cultural domination, non-recognition, and disrespect. Libraries are one of the key sites of cultural democracy, it suggests, as they not only provide free access to knowledge, but also can serve as multi-purpose cultural centres. Public broadcasting and community media are also described as other potential sites of cultural democracy. Cultural institutions in general are urged to “work collectively with other to offer forms of political resistance” (p. 41).

Merli, P. (2002). *Evaluating the Social Impact of Participation in Arts Activities – A critical review of François Matarasso’s Use or Ornament?*, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 8 (1), 107-118. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10286630290032477>

This article critiques François Matarasso's 1997 research report, entitled *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*, a work that was highly influential in British cultural policy circles in the 1990s. Merli's first criticism of this research is that it is focused solely on participatory arts programs and ignores the professional

arts. Her second criticism is that the survey questionnaire that was sent to 513 participants in 60 participatory arts projects was unrelated to the hypotheses set out by Matarasso with regard to the social impact of the arts. She also finds fault with the wording of many of the questions, which she felt were leading and elicited only subjective answers. The third criticism is that the research has no control groups, no longitudinal dimension (before and after testing), and is not representative of the wider population. In general, she finds that much research on the social impact of participation in the arts lacks strong theoretical grounding and fails to capitalize on contributions from other fields of research, such as psychological and sociological theories of creativity and empirical studies in cognitive psychology on the effect of arts on individuals.

References – Works cited in alphabetical order

- Alberta Foundation for the Arts (2014). *Arts Impact Alberta 2014: Ripple Effects from the Arts*. Edmonton: Alberta Foundation for the Arts and Alberta Government. Online at <https://www.affta.ab.ca/news/arts-impact-alberta-2014>
- All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing Inquiry Report (2017, July). *Creative Health: the Arts for Health and Wellbeing*. London: Parliament of the United Kingdom. Online at <http://www.artshealthandwellbeing.org.uk/appg-inquiry/>
- Ambrecht, J. (2014). Developing a scale for measuring the perceived value of cultural institutions, *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 23 (4), 252-272. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09548963.2014.912041>
- Arts Council England (2004, May). *The impact of the arts – some research evidence*. London: Arts Council England. Online at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160204123953/http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/the-impact-of-the-arts-some-research-evidence>
- Arts Council England (2014). *The Value of Arts and Culture to People and Society – An evidence review*. London: Arts Council England. Online at http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Value_arts_culture_evidence_review.pdf
- Belfiore, E. (2002). Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion: Does it really work? A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 8 (1), 91-106. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/102866302900324658>
- Belfiore, E. and O. Bennett (2006). *Rethinking the Social Impact of the Arts: a critical-historical review*. Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick. Research Paper No.9. Online at https://www.academia.edu/257449/Rethinking_the_Social_Impacts_of_the_Arts?auto=download
- Canadian Index of Wellbeing (2010, 15 June). *Caught in the Time Crunch: Time Use, Leisure and Culture in Canada*. Waterloo: University of Waterloo. Online at https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/sites/ca.canadian-index-wellbeing/files/uploads/files/Caught_in_the_Time_Crunch.sflb_.pdf

- Carnwath, J.D. and A.S. Brown (2014). *Understanding the Value and Impacts of Cultural Experiences – A Literature Review*. Manchester: Arts Council England. Online at http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Understanding_the_Value_and_Impacts_of_Cultural_Experiences.pdf
- CASE (The Culture and Sport Evidence Program). (2010, July). *Understanding the drivers, impact and value of engagement in culture and sport -- An over-arching summary of the research*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Online at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/71231/CASE-supersummaryFINAL-19-July2010.pdf
- Catterall, J.S., S.A. Dumais and G. Hampden-Thompson (2012, March). *The Arts and Achievement in At-Risk Youth: Findings from Four Longitudinal Studies*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Arts-At-Risk-Youth.pdf>
- CHCFE Consortium (2015, June). *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe – Executive Summary and Strategic Recommendations*. Krakow: International Cultural Centre. Online at http://mck.krakow.pl/images/upload/projekty_badawcze/CHCFE_REPORT_ExecutiveSummary_v2.pdf
- Cohen, G.D. (2006). Research on Creativity and Aging: The Positive Impact of the Arts on Health and Illness, *Generations*, Vol. XXX (1), 7-15. Online at <http://www.peopleandstories.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/RESEARCH-ON-CREATIVITY-AND-AGING.pdf>
- Community Foundations of Canada (2015) *Vital Signs – Arts & Belonging*. Online at <http://communityfoundations.ca/artsandbelonging/>
- Creative Communities Network (2012, July). *Cultural Indicators: Measuring Impact on Culture*. Australia: CCN. Online at https://www.lga.sa.gov.au/webdata/resources/files/Cultural_Indicators.pdf
- Crossick, G. and P. Kaszynska (2016, March). *Understanding the value of arts & culture – The AHRC Cultural Value Project*. Swindon, U.K.: Arts and Humanities Research Council. Online at <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/research/fundedthemesandprogrammes/culturalvalueproject/>
- Cultural Ministers Council – Statistics Working Group (2004). *Social Impacts of Participation in the Arts and Cultural Activities – Stage Two Report – Evidence, Issues and Recommendations*. Sydney: University of Western Sydney. Online at

http://www.arts.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/23627/Social_Impacts_of_the_Arts.pdf

Cultural Policy Collective (2004). *Beyond Social Inclusion – Towards Cultural Democracy*. Scotland: Cultural Policy Collective. Online at https://archive.org/stream/media_Towards_Cultural_Democracy/Towards_Cultural_Democracy_djvu.txt

Department of Canadian Heritage (2016, February). *Social Impacts and Benefits of Arts and Culture: A Literature Review*. Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage. Online at <http://pilot.open.canada.ca/ckan/en/dataset/660bd52a-c514-5b97-825e-e09e18289066>

Dessein, J., K. Soini, G. Fairclough and L. Horlings (eds). (2015). *Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development – Conclusions from the Cost Action IS1007 – Investigating Cultural Sustainability*. Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Online at <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/50452>

Duxbury, N, E. Gillette and K. Pepper (2007). Exploring the Cultural Dimensions of Sustainability, *Creative City News*. Special Edition 4. Online at https://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/Creative_City_News_E.pdf

Fujiwara, D., L Kudrna, and P. Dolan. (2014, April). *Quantifying and Valuing the Wellbeing Impacts of Culture and Sport*. London: Department for Culture, Media & Sport. Online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/quantifying-and-valuing-the-wellbeing-impacts-of-culture-and-sport>

Fujiwara, D. and G. MacKerron (2015, January). Cultural activities, artforms and wellbeing. London: Arts Council England. Online at <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/cultural-activities-artforms-and%20wellbeing-0>

Gardner, S., J. Pascual, C. Vallerand, M. Giovinazzo, S. Fischer, P. Rorvik, K. Kovanen, S. Sipilä and P. Kistenmacher (2015, February 12). *Recognizing the role of culture to strengthen the UN Post-2015 Development Agenda*. UCLG: Culture 21 – Agenda for Culture. Online at <http://www.agenda21culture.net/advocacy/culture-as-a-goal-in-post-2015>

Galloway, S. (2009, June). Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts, *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 18 (2), 125-148. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09548960902826143>

Gielen, P., S. Elkhuzen, Q. van den Hoogen, T. Lijster and H. Otte (2015). *Culture – The Substructure for a European Common – a research report*. Brussels: Flanders Arts

- Institute-Performing Arts. Online at <http://2016.vti.be/en/over-vti/publicaties/publication-culture-substructure-european-common>
- Gielen, P. (2015, 17 February). No Culture, no Europe. Opening Speech at *The art of valuing: between evident and evidence-based Conference*. Brussels: IETM - International network for contemporary performing arts. Online at <https://www.ietm.org/en/publications/the-art-of-valuing-opening-speeches>
- Grossi, E., P.L. Sacco, G.T. Blessi and R. Cerutti (2011). The Impact of Culture on the Individual Subjective Well-Being of the Italian Population: An Exploratory Study, *Applied Research Quality of Life*, Vol. 6: 387-410. Online at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11482-010-9135-1>
- Guetzkow, J. (2002). *How the Arts Impact Communities: An introduction to the literature on arts impact studies*. Working Paper Series 20. Princeton: Centre for Arts and Culture Policy Studies, Princeton University. Online at <https://www.princeton.edu/~artspol/workpap20.html>
- Hertie School of Governance (2016, December). *Cultural Participation and Inclusive Societies –A thematic report based on the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Online at <https://edoc.coe.int/en/culture-and-democracy/7285-pdf-cultural-participation-and-inclusive-societies-a-thematic-report-based-on-the-indicator-framework-on-culture-and-democracy.html>
- Hill, K. (2008, March). Social Effects of the Arts: Exploratory Statistical Evidence, *Statistical Insights on the Arts*, Vol. 6 (4). Online at <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/social-effects-culture-exploratory-statistical-evidence>
- Hill, K. (2013, January 30). The Arts and Individual Well-Being in Canada: Connections between Cultural Activities and Health, Volunteering, Satisfaction with Life, and Other Social Indicators in 2010. *Statistical Insights on the Arts*, Vol. 11 (2). Report funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Canada Council for the Arts and the Ontario Arts Council. Online at <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/arts-and-individual-well-being-canada>
- Hill, K. (2014, June). *Making a Holistic Case for the Arts: Canadian Evidence regarding the Relationship between the Arts and the Quality of Life, Well-being, Health, Education, Society, and the Economy*. Report for the Canadian Public Arts Funders Network. Ottawa: Hill Strategies. Online at <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/making-holistic-case-arts>

- Huysmans, F. and M. Oomes (2013). Measuring the public library's societal value: A methodological research program, *IFLA Journal*, Vol. 39 (2), 168-177. Online at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0340035213486412>
- James, P. (2014). *Assessing cultural sustainability*. Barcelona: United Cities and Local Governments. https://www.academia.edu/15885475/Assessing_Cultural_Sustainability_Agenda_21_for_Culture
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2000). Tango Romantica or Liaisons Dangereuses? Cultural Policies and Social Cohesion: Perspectives from Canadian Research, *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 7 (1), 97-113. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10286630009358135?tab=permissions&scroll=top>
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2003). Singing Alone? The Contribution of Cultural Capital to Social Cohesion and Sustainable Communities, *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 9 (1), 35-49. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1028663032000089507>
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2005). Just Showing Up: Social and Cultural Capital in Everyday Life. In *Accounting for Culture: Thinking Through Cultural Citizenship*. Eds. C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M.S. Jeannotte and W. Straw. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, pp. 124-145. Online at <https://ruor.uottawa.ca/handle/10393/19613>
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2006). *From Concepts to Indicators: Examining Culture Through a Social Inclusion Lens*. Presentation at National Economic and Social Forum, Dublin, Ireland. Online at http://socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/sites/socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/files/from_concepts_indicators.pdf
- Jeannotte, M.S. (2008). *Shared spaces: Social and economic returns on investment in cultural infrastructure*. Appendix E of *Under Construction: The State of Cultural Infrastructure in Canada*. Vancouver: Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities, Simon Fraser University. Online at http://socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/sites/socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/files/shared_spaces.pdf
- Jermyn, H. (2004, July). *Research report 35 – The art of inclusion (Executive Summary)*. London: Arts Council England. Online at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160204123854/http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/the-art-of-inclusion>

- Kim, S. and H. Kim (2009). Does Cultural Capital Matter? Cultural Divide and Quality of Life, *Social Indicators Research*. Vol. 93: 295-313. Online at <http://ajou.ac.kr/~seoyong/paper/2009-Does%20Cultural%20Capital%20Matter-offline%20version.pdf>
- Laaksonen, A. (2005, January). *Measuring Cultural Exclusion through Participation in Cultural Life*. Presentation at Third Global Forum on Human Development: Defining and Measuring Cultural Exclusion. Online at <http://www.gsdrc.org/document-library/measuring-cultural-exclusion-through-participation-in-cultural-life/>
- Lee, S, J.E. Chung and N. Park (2016). Linking Cultural Capital With Subjective Well-Being and Social Support: The Role of Communication Networks, *Social Science Computer Review*. Vol. 34 (2), 172-196. Online at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0894439315577347>
- McCarthy, K.F., E.H. Ondaatje, L. Zakaras, and A. Brooks (2004). *Gifts of the Muse – Reframing the Debate About the Benefits of the Arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Online at https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG218.pdf
- McDonnell, B. and D. Shellard (2006, July). *Social Impact Study of UK Theatre*. London: Arts Council England. Online at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160204123109/http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/social-impact-study-of-uk-theatre>
- Mercer, C. (2005). *Cultural Capital and Capabilities: Defining and measuring the cultural field*. Paper prepared for the Third Global Forum on Human Development: Cultural Identity, democracy and global equity. Paris, 17-19 January 2005. Online at <http://www.kulturplan-oresund.dk/mercerc.pdf>
- Merli, P. (2002). Evaluating the Social Impact of Participation in Arts Activities – A critical review of François Matarasso's *Use or Ornament?*, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 8 (1), 107-118. Online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10286630290032477>
- Michalos, A.C. and Kahlke, P.M. (2008). Impact of Arts-Related Activities on the Perceived Quality of Life, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 89, 193-258. Online at <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11205-007-9236-x.pdf>
- Mills, D. and P. Brown (2004). *Art and Wellbeing – A guide to connections between Community Cultural Development and Health, Ecologically Sustainable*

- Development, Public Housing and Place, Rural Revitalization, Community Strengthening, Active Citizenship, Social Inclusion and Cultural Diversity*. Sydney: Australia Council for the Arts. Formerly online at <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/33524092> (no longer accessible)
- Miringoff, M-L. and S. Opdycke (2005). *Arts, Culture, and the Social Health of the Nation 2005*. Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Institute for Innovation in Social Policy. Online at <http://iisp.vassar.edu/artsculture.pdf>
- National Economic and Social Forum (2007, January). *The Arts, Cultural Inclusion and Social Cohesion – NESF Report 35*. Dublin: NESF. Online at <http://edepositireland.ie/handle/2262/71433>
- National Endowment for the Arts (2005). *The Arts and Civic Engagement: Involved in Arts, Involved in Life*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/publications/arts-and-civic-engagement-involved-arts-involved-life-0>
- National Endowment for the Arts (2009, October). *Art-Goers in Their Communities: Patterns of Civic and Social Engagement*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/publications/art-goers-their-communities-patterns-civic-and-social-engagement>
- Nichols, B. (2007, June). *Volunteers with Arts or Cultural Organizations: a 2005 Profile*. Research Note #95. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/95.pdf>
- Partal, A. and K. Dunphy (2016). Cultural impact assessment: a systematic literature review of current methods and practice around the world, *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. Online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2015.1077600>
- Polzella, D.J. and J.S. Forbis (2016, 23 June). *Relationships between different types and modes of arts-related experiences, motivation and civic engagement*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Research-Art-Works-Dayton3.pdf>
- Rajan, K.B and R.S. Rajan (2017, September). *Staying Engaged: Health Patterns of Older Americans Who Participate in the Arts*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts. Online at https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/StayingEngaged_0917_0.pdf
- Shishkova, V. (2015). *General Mapping of Types of Impact Research in the Performing Arts Sector (2005-15)*. Brussels: IETM - International network for contemporary

- performing arts. Online at <https://www.ietm.org/en/publications/mapping-of-types-of-impact-research-in-the-performing-arts-sector-2005-2015> .
- Stanley, D. (2006). Introduction: the Social Effects of Culture, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 31 (1), pp. 7-15. Online at <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1744/1856>
- Stanley, D. (2005). *Recondita armonia: A reflection on the function of culture in building citizenship capacity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available for purchase online at <https://book.coe.int/usd/en/cultural-policies/3701-recondita-armonia-a-reflection-on-the-function-of-culture-in-building-citizenship-capacity-policy-note-no10.html>
- Stern, M.J. and S.C. Seifert (2017, March). *The Social Wellbeing of New York City's Neighbourhoods: The Contribution of Culture and the Arts*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania-Social Impact of the Arts Project. Online at http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=siap_culture_nyc
- Taylor, P., L. Davies, P. Wells, J. Gilbertson, and W. Tayleur (2015, March). *A Review of the Social Impacts of Culture and Sport*. London: Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE) Programme. Online at http://www.artsandhealth.ie/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/A_review_of_the_Social_Impacts_of_Culture_and_Sport-2015.pdf
- Torjman, S. (2004, April). *Culture and Recreation: Links to Well-Being*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Online at <http://www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/472ENG.pdf>
- Tsegaya, S., I.D. Moss, K. Ingersoll, R. Ratzkin, S. Wynne, and B. Yi (2016, December 19). *Everything We Know About Whether and How the Arts Improve Lives*. Createquity.com. Online at http://createquity.com/2016/12/everything-we-know-about-whether-and-how-the-arts-improve-lives/?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ARM%2016-1%20EN&utm_source=Envoke%20-%20HSR%20EN&utm_content=Arts%20education%2C%20theatre%2C%20social%20benefits%3A%20Arts%20Res
- UNESCO (n.d.) *Culture for Development Indicators – Social Participation*. Paris: UNESCO. Online at http://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/cdis/social_participation_dimension.pdf