



Rural Cultural Wealth Research Priorities

February 2021

Acknowledgements

The paper benefited from contributions of several people. However, all errors and omissions in the document are the sole responsibility of the authors.

The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the views of the reviewers, the National Endowment for the Arts Office of Research & Analysis or the National Endowment for the Arts. The National Endowment for the Arts does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information included in this material and is not responsible for any consequences of its use. The Rural Cultural Wealth Research Lab is supported in part by an award from the National Endowment for the Arts (Award#: DCA 2017-04).

About RUPRI

RUPRI was created in 1990 by a bipartisan group of US Senators, seeking to develop an external, non-partisan policy research institution to address the rural differential impact of public policies and programs. Currently housed in the College of Public Health at the University of Iowa, RUPRI's research credibility and policy relevance derive from a collaborative research and policy analysis approach, which connects a select cadre of our nation's leading scholars and practitioners, wherever located, to build teams with a common commitment to research excellence and policy and practice relevance.

RUPRI provides unbiased analysis and information on the challenges, needs, and opportunities facing rural America. RUPRI's aim is to spur public dialogue and help policy makers understand the rural impacts of public policies and programs. RUPRI's reach is national and international, as one of the world's preeminent sources of expertise and perspective on policies impacting rural places and people. Read more at <http://www.rupri.org>.

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
About RUPRI.....	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Proposed Research Projects	3
2.1. Rural Cultural Wealth Social Accounting Matrix data development	3
2.2. Rural Cultural Wealth Indicator System data development	4
2.3. A Dynamic Rural Cultural Wealth SAM	4
2.4. Comparison of Rural and Urban Cultural and Creative Economies	5
2.5. An Analysis of the Financial Support for Rural Arts and Culture	6
2.6. Analysis of the Dynamics of Rural Creative Economies	6
2.7. Rural Arts and Culture and the Development of Entrepreneurial Skills	7
2.8. Creative Placemaking in Rural Areas.....	8
2.9. The Roles of Natural and Heritage Capital in Rural Wealth Creation	8
2.10. Cultural Mapping	9
2.11. Arts and Culture, Sense of Place, and Cohesion in Rural Communities.....	9
2.12. The Impacts of Local Arts and Culture Participation on Effective Local Governance	10
2.13. The Impacts of Local Arts and Culture on Regional Resilience	10
2.14. How do Rural Artists Establish Viable Livelihood Strategies?.....	11
3. Concluding comments	12
References	13

1. Introduction

The Rural Cultural Wealth Lab was established to explore the existing and potential roles of the arts and culture in rural America. The rural wealth creation framework (Rural Policy Research Institute 2017), is the foundation of much of RUPRI's policy analysis, and offers an organizing framework for the work of the lab.

This paper follows an extensive review of the research literature at the intersection of three broad areas—1) rural wealth creation and distribution 2) rural arts and culture, and 3) creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship. The primary goal of the literature review was to identify the most critical issues that are NOT fully understood about these concepts in rural settings. The key findings from the literature review are summarized by Johnson and Wornell (2018). The review is the foundation for one of the Rural Cultural Wealth Lab's most important products: a robust research agenda.

While the research in the areas of rural development, the arts and culture, and creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship is extensive, the literature review confirmed a relative dearth of relevant research in the intersection of these knowledge areas. This is critical because culture is largely place-based; it is related to the local history, climate and physical environment, knowledge, and economic and political institutions. At the same time, it is believed by many to be essential to the creation of wealth and prosperity. A lack of understanding of rural arts and culture limits the effectiveness of rural policy makers.

The review of literature revealed several important aspects of our evidence base in this area:

1. Most research on the arts and culture, focuses on urban culture, conditions and issues.
2. There is a bias in much of the rural-focused studies toward urban-centric definitions of the arts and culture.
3. There is a bias among policy makers that rural areas are essentially bereft of cultural assets and opportunities and that solutions, if possible, will resemble policies employed in urban contexts. It is likely that applications of urban models and prescriptions to rural areas will lead to disappointment and possibly worse (Petrov 2007).
4. There is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding the terminology and concepts used in the communication of research on the arts and culture. For example, the definitions of cultural goods and the cultural sector vary significantly from one study to the next making it difficult to compare findings and to draw conclusions.
5. Research on rural arts and culture, including conceptualizations, case studies, data development, and both qualitative and quantitative analysis is sorely lacking, but needed and justified.
6. There have been numerous conceptualization of the arts and culture sector, and the sector's relationship to the socio-economy of communities, regions and nations. These conceptualizations sometimes contradict each other, but more often they view the field from different perspectives, are partial, and do not connect with other views of the field. The Rural Cultural Wealth Lab has a goal of exploring the contradictions and potential linkages among these conceptual models and has developed descriptions of key models in the literature

(Johnson and Wornell 2018) and has developed a preliminary conceptualization that incorporates the best of the conceptual models reviewed (Johnson and Fannin 2018).

7. Research on the role of arts and culture in society is necessarily multidisciplinary, involving economics, sociology, psychology, geography, planning, political science, the humanities, and other sciences. It also benefits from the involvement of artists themselves.

Some aspects of rural culture are essentially lower density and smaller scale versions of urban culture. Others are distinctively different. Table 1 summarizes some of the hypothesized and empirically verified differences between urban and rural contexts. These differences are important to our understanding of the roles that the arts and culture play in comprehensive wealth creation and distribution in rural regions.

Table 1 below is based on Johnson and Wornell (2018). It summarizes some of the most relevant hypotheses discovered in the research literature. Some of these hypotheses have been tested, although often the context for these tests were other countries, or other political or economic conditions.

Table 1: Hypothesized differences between urban and rural arts and culture contexts and characteristics

Characteristics	Urban	Rural	Sources
Relationship between place and culture	Culture creates place (eg. architecture)	Place creates culture (eg. geography, agriculture and forestry)	Oberlin and Gieryn 2015
Cultural infrastructure	Architecture, historical districts	Natural features, cultural heritage, nature parks	McGranahan et al. 2011; Csurgó & Megyesi 2016; OECD 2009; NEA 2017
Investment in cultural infrastructure	Conservation of heritage assets Investment in complementary architecture	Tourism facilities, Conservation of natural and heritage assets, Investment in assets complementary to nature	Duxbury et al. 2008, LaPan & Barbieri 2014
Economic advantages	Agglomeration economies	Strategic differentiation	Selada, et al. 2012; van Heur 2010
Amenities	Urban, built amenities	Natural amenities, quality of life, indigenous artistic concentrations, indigenous cultural systems, less pollution, less congestion and crime, walkability	Balfour et al. 2016; McGranahan and Wojan 2007; McGranahan et al. 2011; Dozhdeva 2014
Tourism	Cultural, heritage, or art tourism	Cultural, heritage, ecotourism, natural tourism	OECD 2009
Tourism	Mass tourism	Niche tourism	OECD 2009
Social capital	Weak social bonding	Strong social bonding	Petrov 2007
Local social linkages	More	Less	Bell & Jayne 2010
Social networks	Global	Local	van Heur 2010
Civic leadership from arts orgs.	Less	More	Nichols et al. 2017; NEA 2017

Characteristics	Urban	Rural	Sources
Cultural clusters	Art districts: e.g. Broadway, French quarter, Hollywood	Wine regions, ski resorts, wilderness areas, Branson, college towns	Selada et al. 2012 Scott 1999, 2006, 2014; Bagwell 2008 Cooke & Lazzeretti 2008 Rosenfeld 2004
Cultural diversity	More diverse	Less diverse	Throsby 2010 Markusen & Gadwa 2010 Ottaviano & Peri 2006 Baycan-Levent 2010 Wojan et al. 2007b Gibson et al. 2010
Cost of living	Higher	Lower prices of land and housing	Balfour et al. 2016 Dozhdeva 2014
Cost of studio space	High	Low	Markusen & Gadwa 2010
Small art business venues	Largely away from home	Many rural artists work in home	Bell & Jayne 2010
Part-time employment	Less need, more opportunities	More need, less opportunities	Bennett 2010 Rendon & Markusen 2009
Culture-related data	Archival data generally available	Archival data often not digitized	Bowles 2008

In this paper we propose a preliminary set of research ideas. The highest priority research areas are those that address the biggest knowledge gaps, but also those that are needed to prepare for future research.

2. Proposed Research Projects

This section proposes a variety of high priority research projects that could be addressed by the Rural Cultural Wealth Lab or other researchers over the next 5 to 10 years. Two considerations influenced the choice of these projects. First the literature review made it clear that answers to some researchable questions are particularly critical given current issues. Second some research questions cannot be addressed until other more fundamental issues have been addressed. The most obvious example of this is the need for research projects to develop accurate and reliable data required by subsequent research projects. Another example is the need to conduct exploratory case studies before large cross-sectional analyses can be conducted. The actual ordering and timing of the projects will depend on the financial and human resources available.

The following is a brief description of each research project idea developed during the literature review.

2.1. Rural Cultural Wealth Social Accounting Matrix data development

Johnson and Fannin (2018) describe the rural cultural wealth conceptual framework, including a general description of an extended social accounting matrix (SAM) that features formal and informal components of cultural wealth. The paper also describes the types of data required to implement a

working model of the framework. The framework is designed to focus on cultural capital, cultural goods and services, and cultural infrastructure most relevant in rural communities and regions.

The highest research priority is to find reliable secondary data sources required to populate the Rural Cultural Wealth Social Accounting Matrix (RCW-SAM). Ideally these data would be available at a level of spatial resolution that would allow the development of RCW-SAM for nonmetropolitan counties, but it is acknowledged that this will require development of estimation procedures for some data.

A key part of the RCW-SAM is the Arts and Culture Production Satellite Account (ACPSA) produced by the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Bureau of Economic Development (Iyengar and Nichols 2013; Kern et al. 2015; and Cologer and Ortiz 2017). The ACPSA is now available at the state level. The data in the ACPSA must be aggregated to match the commodities and activities in the RCW-SAM.

Early drafts of the RCW-SAM will necessarily have many missing values. The process of populating the matrix with data will help identify the most critical data needs and inform future research.

This research project will provide answers to the following questions:

- How does the rural arts and culture sector link to the rest of the economy?
- How much does the arts and culture sector in rural regions contribute to the economy, and to the comprehensive wealth of residents?
- How large is the informal arts and culture sector in rural regions?
- What kinds of externalities (positive and negative) are generated when individuals produce and consume cultural goods and services.

2.2. Rural Cultural Wealth Indicator System data development

Johnson (2018) describes the indicator system that will be developed by the RCW lab. The indicators identified are prioritized according to 1) their criticality for rural people and places, and for the RCW lab research; and 2) the ease with which the indicators can be estimated for rural counties and regions. The lab will identify sources for these indicators, including the need for primary data collection. Efficient and reliable means of collecting these data at regular intervals must be developed.

This project must be closely coordinated with the Rural Cultural Wealth Social Accounting Matrix data development project to assure compatibility of the data, and their efficient collection.

- How can we measure the potential impacts of changes in the production and consumption of cultural goods and services in rural regions?
- How have the economic, social and cultural conditions in rural regions changed over time?

2.3. A Dynamic Rural Cultural Wealth SAM

The Rural Cultural Wealth Indicator System and the Rural Cultural Wealth Indicator System are static systems for reporting the status of the arts and culture for regions or states. The rural cultural wealth conceptual framework includes a dynamic extension to the SAM referred to as the Dynamic Rural Cultural Wealth SAM (DRCW-SAM).¹

¹ Examples of similar models include: The Policy Model for Multifunctional Agriculture and Rural Development (POMMARD) (Bryden et al. 2011), and TEEB (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity) AgriFood Evaluation Framework (TEEB 2018).

The DRCW-SAM will be built using system dynamics to allow the simulation of changes in the cultural wealth indicators under alternative assumptions about policy and external shocks. The generic model will be built which can be customized to any region with region-specific data.

This research project will answer the following questions:

- What changes can we expect in the rural arts and culture sector, in the levels of innovation and entrepreneurship, the comprehensive wealth of individuals, families and communities, when changes in policies, external economic conditions, and environmental conditions change?
- What policies would be most effective in achieving specific outcomes in rural communities?

2.4. Comparison of Rural and Urban Cultural and Creative Economies

This area of research would focus on the characteristics of the arts, cultural and creative economies in rural areas, and how these characteristics differ from urban areas. There are few studies of the characteristics of rural regions that lead to vibrant arts and culture sectors. There are even fewer studies that compare characteristics in rural and urban regions.

Van Heur (2010), hypothesizes that there are four important differences in the contexts of creative industries in large and small cities. First, small cities are largely unable to capture the agglomeration benefits available to large cities. Second, small cities find it difficult to become part of global economic networks. Third, small cities are frequently overlooked when people look for examples of creativity. And finally, small cities are unable to build on characteristics of innovation systems, globalization and individualism; instead their strengths are social cohesion and individualism (p. 191).

Wojan et al. (2007a) compare the effects of artistic milieu in metro and non-metro counties in the US. They find that higher levels of artists and other highly creative workers led to significant growth in non-metro firms, but an artistic milieu effect on metro firms could not be precisely detected. The size of the non-artist creative class has a positive impact on both population and employment in metro and non-metro counties but, the findings on the impact of the artistic milieu in metro areas were inconclusive.

A new data source, the Rural Establishment Innovation Survey (REIS), has revealed several statistically significant differences between rural and urban performing arts organizations (Nichols et al. 2017; Wojan and Nichols 2018). Analysis of this data indicates that locations of nature parks are more strongly associated with rural arts organizations than with urban arts organizations. Performing arts organizations are more common in rural counties with higher levels of natural amenities. The studies found that rural performing arts organizations attract non-local audiences at higher rates than their urban counterparts. They also found a positive correlation between the number of performing arts organizations and the proportion of businesses classified as substantive innovators and/or design-integrated establishments in rural counties.

A common conclusion among studies that have considered the differences between rural and urban, is that the natural environment, and traditional cultural practices are especially important in rural areas. Gadwa Nicodemus (2014) identified rural landscapes and unique cultural practices such as craft artisanship, and language, dance, and culinary traditions as important characteristics of effective placemaking in rural areas (p. 2).

Once completed, the Rural Cultural Wealth Indicator System could be used to identify rural-urban differences in variables of importance to cultural wealth, creativity, entrepreneurship and economic vitality.

Another product of this research could be to develop an arts and culture typology of rural communities. A Canadian study (Bunting and Mitchell 2001) identified five types of rural art communities: exurban consumption centers, distant production centers, distant consumption centers, aboriginal production centers, and aboriginal production/consumption centers.

This research will address the following questions:

- How do the rural cultural and creative economies differ from their urban counterparts?
- Are the informal components of wealth more, or less, important than in urban regions?
- What is the role of natural and heritage assets in cultural infrastructure?
- Are there patterns in successful rural arts and culture communities that could be expressed as a typology?

2.5. An Analysis of the Financial Support for Rural Arts and Culture

Financial support for the arts is a combination of market-based transactions (art sales, ticket sales, and entry fees), philanthropic support, and public-sector financing (municipal, regional, state and national). Non-market support is typically justified on the basis of public good arguments but because funding is based on non-market-based mechanisms of public and philanthropic bodies, funding for the arts does not directly depend on the preferences of the consumers. Alvarez (2005) argues that, “to the extent philanthropic and government support programs for the arts have been designed to this point without taking into consideration a large percentage of activities deemed meaningfully ‘artistic’ by those not associated with the artworld, new funding priorities, or art delivery strategies, may be in order” (p. 19). Gadwa Nicodemus (2013) agrees: “funding patterns have traditionally focused on preserving and presenting visual art and music based in the classical Western European canon...and serve predominately white and upper income audiences” (p. 5). This bias, if it exists, may be particularly acute in rural areas, especially if the preferences for arts and culture of rural residents differ from the primarily urban residents making funding decisions.

This research area could answer the following questions:

- What are the public good benefits of robust local arts and culture sectors?
- Does the external financial support for rural arts and culture have an urban-centric bias?
- How does financial support for rural arts and culture differ from urban arts and culture?
- Does external financial support for rural arts and culture match the needs and preferences of rural residents and tourists?
- Is the level of formality of arts and culture activities reflected in type of financial support received by rural artists and arts organizations?

2.6. Analysis of the Dynamics of Rural Creative Economies

In the creative class literature (Hall 2000; Florida 2002; Selada’s et al. 2012) creative people are attracted to large metropolitan areas. There is ample evidence that employers do cluster and these clusters attract workers (Stern and Seifert 2010). There is also evidence that clusters of potential workers attract employers. Given the small markets, small labor forces, and distances to overcome, rural

areas struggle to achieve critical scale and resulting clusters. Yet other studies (Dozhdeva 2014; McGranahan et al. 2011; Rosenfeld 2004) have concluded that creative people are attracted to small cities and rural communities. Research has identified natural amenities as one of the rural attractions (McGranahan et al. 2011), but the relationship between rural amenities and artists is not well understood.

This area of research would study these relationships between place characteristics, creative employers and creative workers in detail. It will start with a series of case studies designed to identify a range of issues.

This research will answer the following questions:

- Are creative employers attracted to creative workers, or the reverse, or do both processes occur?
- How do the features that attract employers and workers differ between rural and urban places?
- Do rural features attract a different type of creative people than urban features?
- How can we employ the arts with other rural advantages to promote beneficial rural transformation? (Balfour et al. 2017, p. 3)?
- What are the temporal relationships between cultural engagement, civic vitality, and neighborhood regeneration (Stern and Seifert 2008, p. 5)?

2.7. Rural Arts and Culture and the Development of Entrepreneurial Skills

Most studies of growth in the creative sectors of economies look for evidence of in-migration of creative workers and creative employers (Scott 1999; McGranahan and Wojan 2007a; McGranahan et al. 2011; Argent et al. 2013). In contrast, entrepreneurship research typically studies the development of entrepreneurial skills and success within individuals. In this research project we are interested in learning more about intersection of art, art entrepreneurship, non-art entrepreneurship in the rural context. This research will be concerned with the expansion of rural entrepreneurship rather than the importation of entrepreneurs. Little research has been reported in this very specific area.

Wojan and McGranahan (2007) found indirect evidence “...for the association between creative capital and manufacturing entrepreneurship, where that entrepreneurship is measured by new plant formation and advanced technology use” (p. 143). This research does not reveal the nature of the relationship between creativity and broad entrepreneurship.

Sacco and Ferilli (2006) describe a proactive cultural district model. The model describes local policies and efforts that can lead to a culture-based vitality in communities. Among these strategies is support for endogenous entrepreneurship. The model does not describe how endogenous entrepreneurship can be promoted, or what relationship this entrepreneurship has to the districts’ arts and culture.

Essig (2015) offers several conceptualizations of arts entrepreneurship in the US arts and culture sector and concludes that art entrepreneurship is a process of discovery and creation rather than management. The basic theme is that entrepreneurial artists find or create a relationship between means and desired ends, where the means include personal traits such as alertness, creativity, and specialized knowledge, combined with financial capital and support from social networks, and desired ends include creation of cultural capital and aesthetic products as well as a livelihood. Our research interest is in understanding if and how this means-end process might become a model for non-artists.

This research project will answer the following questions:

- What processes leads to growth in endogenous entrepreneurs?
- What role do the arts and art entrepreneurs play in modeling the process for non-artists in the community?

2.8. Creative Placemaking in Rural Areas

There is now a significant amount of experience with creative placemaking (Anwar-McHenry 2009; Markusen and Gadwa 2010; Markusen and Gadwa Nicodemus 2014; NEA 2011; Schupbach 2012; Gadwa Nicodemus 2013, 2014; Webb 2014; Bennett 2014; Stern and Seifert 2014; Morley and Winkler 2014; Csurgó and Megyesi 2016; Arroyo 2017). When the Rural Cultural Wealth Lab has completed its Rural Cultural Wealth Social Accounting Matrix and a Rural Cultural Wealth Indicator System, a thorough assessment of the impacts of these programs on cultural and financial wealth will be possible.

There is also evidence that the resulting prosperity achieved through greater creativity, and growth of the creative economy is often concentrated rather and distributed among residents.

This analysis would answer the following questions:

- What factors affect the success or failure of creative placemaking programs?
- How do successful creative placemaking programs differ in rural and urban areas?
- Who benefits from creative placemaking, and are there losers?
- What conditions must be present to ensure a broad distribution of benefits from creativity led economic development?

2.9. The Roles of Natural and Heritage Capital in Rural Wealth Creation

Cross-sectional research clearly demonstrates that natural capital is an important factor in the process of arts and culture-based economic development in rural areas (McGranahan et al. 2011; Gadwa Nicodemus 2014). Some, but certainly not all, of this development is related to tourism. Csurgó and Megyesi, (2016) stress the importance of heritage and symbolic dimensions of place-making in rural communities. However, the processes through which these factors operate are not fully understood.

Natural capital and heritage cultural capital are relatively static factors in an otherwise very dynamic socio-economic system. Research is needed to better understand how these types of capital impact change, resilience, and distribution of benefits from the arts and culture. This research will involve intensive case studies in high and low performing regions to discover the details of these processes.

This research will answer the following questions:

- Are creative artists attracted to places rich in natural and heritage capital?
- Does natural and heritage capital inspire and lead people to become creative?
- How do migrating artists affect the culture, and social structure of their new homes?
- How does natural capital and heritage capital affect the resilience and stability of rural regions?
- How can rural cultural and heritage tourism be managed to avoid damaging the cultural and heritage capital of the region?

2.10. Cultural Mapping

Cultural mapping is advocated by several arts and culture researchers (Evans and Foord 2008; Duxbury et al. 2015; Dessein et al. 2015). Cultural mapping identifies the location and features of cultural facilities, population profiles, audience utilization rates of participating arts and culture venues, and built and natural features of place that may be relevant to culture. Cultural mapping allows static assessment of assets, as well as the dynamics of cultural asset investment, restoration, decline and consumption. More sophisticated applications of cultural mapping utilize geographic information systems to capture, store, and display cultural assets. The mapping process can be a participatory activity of community residents providing an opportunity for residents to express their values. It also provides an opportunity for residents to make otherwise implicit local knowledge explicit (Dessein et al. 2015).

A cultural mapping project will require investment in research skills, new research methodologies, and technology. It will require an interdisciplinary team. The products of this research will include spatially specific data not available elsewhere, an opportunity to engage residents of rural places, an opportunity for artists and non-artists to collaborate, and an opportunity to undertake citizen science and participatory research.

This project will answer the following questions:

- What unknown or under-appreciated cultural assets exist in rural regions?
- Can participatory research reveal rural residents' valuation of cultural assets and cultural goods and services?
- How do rural residents perceive the relative importance of various cultural assets?
- Can cultural mapping change residents' sense of place?
- Can cultural mapping change residents' level of social cohesion?

2.11. Arts and Culture, Sense of Place, and Cohesion in Rural Communities

Many theorists have hypothesized a relationship between the existence of robust arts and culture sectors in rural areas, and a healthy sense of place and greater community cohesion (Anwar-McHenry 2009, 2011a, 2011b; Azmat et al. 2015; Balfour, et al. 2016; Dozhdeva 2014; Mayes 2010; van Heur 2010). The empirical evidence, however, is meager and does not established causality. Anwar McHenry (2011a) surveyed a rural community in Western Australia and applied simple regression analysis to measure the relationship between community satisfaction and a variety of community variables. Community satisfaction was positively related to respondents reported value of the arts and their self-rated life satisfaction. In another paper Anwar McHenry (2011b) reported anecdotal evidence that the arts "have a crucial role in self-confidence, culture, and identity and thus, sense of place" (p. 248).

This study will answer the following questions:

- Does a vibrant arts and culture sector in rural communities create and strengthen a sense of place among residents?
- Is the sense of place and community in rural places strengthened by regular interactions in public spaces? (Balfour et al. 2017).
- Is the sense of place directly related to the local arts and culture itself or is it related to the subject of the art?

- Is this sense of place widely held?
- How does this art- and culture-related sense of place affect the level of social cohesion in rural communities?
- Does in-migration of artists weaken, strengthen or otherwise change sense of place and cohesion in rural communities?
- Is the sense of place and community in rural places weakened by information and communication technology? (Balfour et al. 2017).
- Does the art- and culture-related sense of place support local innovation, entrepreneurship and local economic dynamics?

2.12. The Impacts of Local Arts and Culture Participation on Effective Local Governance

It is hypothesized that cultural capital plays a special role in communities. The hypothesis is that, in addition to its direct contribution to comprehensive wealth, the processes of planning for, investment in, and conservation of built, human, natural and other capitals requires sound collective action, and robust cultural capital is necessary to assure sound governance. Several researchers have hypothesized that higher rates of participation in local arts and cultural activities (Stern and Seifert 2014; Theodori et al. 2015; Balfour et al. 2016; List et al. 2016) facilitates more effective local governance. There is evidence that residents involved in arts and cultural activities are more likely than their peers to be involved in community development activities. What is not known is if, and how, this involvement leads to significant changes in the community and whether artistic creativity leads to social innovation in rural communities.

This research would begin with case studies to identify the pathways from art and culture participation, to community involvement, to community governance, and ultimately to outcomes for the communities.

This research will answer the following questions:

- What is the precise role of culture in the governance of rural communities?
- Does arts and culture participation lead to higher levels of participation in governance in rural communities?
- Does arts and culture participation lead to more diversity in governance processes and outcomes in rural communities?
- What is the role of social capital (networks, trust, cohesion, etc.) in local governance?
- Does lower population density, remoteness, a history of population decline, and other characteristics of rural communities affect the impact of local arts and culture participation in local governance?
- Is cultural capital a complement, a substitute or a supplement to other types of capital employed in local governance?
- Do higher levels of participation in local governance change the outcomes for rural communities?

2.13. The Impacts of Local Arts and Culture on Regional Resilience

In an era of turbulent political, social and environmental conditions, regional resilience is a goal of many places. Theorists have hypothesized that cultural capital plays a key role in resiliency (James 2014;

Badham 2010). Research by Daskon (2010), Anwar-McHenry (2011b), and Wojan (2014) finds that rural communities with vibrant arts and culture sectors are often more resilient in the face of various types of challenges. The source of this resilience is not fully understood.

This research will answer the following questions:

- Are rural communities with vibrant arts and culture sectors more resilient?
- What role do local arts and culture play in establishing a community's sense of self-reference or identity, and how does this affect the response to crisis?
- Do rural communities with vibrant arts and culture sectors respond to challenges more creatively?
- Does arts and culture play similar roles in the resilience of rural and urban communities?

2.14. How do Rural Artists Establish Viable Livelihood Strategies?

The low population density, smaller markets, less-diverse economies, and remoteness that is typical of rural regions, changes and reduces the options for rural artists. Artists frequently must have non-art income to assure financial security but the employment and business options in rural areas are limited.

This research will answer the following questions:

- Does limited employment opportunities in rural areas lead to more entrepreneurial ventures?
- Do lack of employment and business opportunities discourage artists from migrating to, or staying in, rural communities?
- What kinds of feasible livelihood strategies include art production in rural areas?
- What local characteristics, including cultural infrastructure, facilitate or encourage art-centered livelihood strategies in rural areas?
- How can we combine rural arts with other rural advantages to promote beneficial rural transformation? (Balfour et al. 2016, p. 3)
- Is the sense of place and community in rural places strengthened by regular interactions in public spaces (Balfour et al. 2016)?
- Is the sense of place and community in rural places weakened by urbanization, long-distance commuting to work, globalization, and information and communication technology (Balfour et al. 2017)?
- Has sense of place in rural areas been weakened by out-migration?
- How does sense of place differ between urban and rural places?
- Can we measure the link between cultural participation and neighborhood change (Stern and Seifert 2008)?
- What types of data are needed to assess the relative effectiveness of culture in promoting community revitalization (Stern and Seifert 2008)?
- What are the temporal relationship between cultural engagement, civic vitality, and community regeneration (Stern and Seifert 2008, p. 5)?
- How are the arts and culture financed in rural areas?
- How do the roles of formal and informal activities differ in rural and urban areas?
- What are the unique characteristics of small cities and rural communities that creative people find most attractive (Dozhdeva 2014; McGranahan et al. 2011)?

- What meaningful indicators can we identify and collect to conduct basic and applied research on rural arts and culture?
- How can rural cultural and heritage tourism be managed to avoid damaging the cultural and heritage capital of the region?
- What is the relationship between retirement communities and artistic havens—demand for art, attraction to the same amenities, or rising interest in art among retirees (Wojan et al. 2007b)?

3. Concluding comments

Our review of the research literature exposed a lack of attention to arts and culture in rural areas, especially in the United States. Much of the research literature reviewed is conceptual, or anecdotal. Empirical findings are often suggestive, but not generalizable, because of small sample size, use of questionable data, or because the data is old or for atypical cases.

The comprehensive wealth framework offers a basis for identifying and organizing relevant data, developing theory-based hypotheses, and interpreting the results of analysis. Combined with the literature, the framework helps us identify the highest priority research areas.

This document describes a long list of potential research project that if successfully completed, could address some of the questions we have about rural arts and culture, innovation and entrepreneurship. It advances the goals of the Rural Cultural Wealth Lab by providing a preliminary road map to better a understanding of the role that arts and culture can play in improving the quality of life of rural residents, and ensuring rural people and places are contributing fully to the prosperity and sustainability of our nation.

References

- Alvarez, M. (2005). There's nothing informal about it: Participatory arts within the cultural ecology of Silicon Valley. *Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley*
- Anwar-McHenry, J. (2009). A place for the arts in rural revitalisation and the social wellbeing of Australian rural communities. *Rural Society*, 19(1), 60-70.
- Anwar-McHenry, J. (2011a). 'Art will save the city', but what about country towns? The role of the arts in rural towns of Western Australia's Mid West region. In J. Martin and T. Budge (Eds.), *The Sustainability of Australia's Country Towns: Renewal, Renaissance, Resistance*. Ballarat: VURRN Press, 327-350.
- Anwar-McHenry, J. (2011b). Rural empowerment through the arts: The role of the arts in civic and social participation in the Mid West region of Western Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(3), 245-253.
- Arroyo, K. (2017). Creative Policymaking: Taking the Lessons of Creative Placemaking to Scales. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts* 6(2): 58-72.
<http://artivate.hida.asu.edu/index.php/artivate/article/view/154/65>. Accessed October 25, 2017.
- Azmat, F., Fujimoto, Y., & Rentchler, R. (2015). Exploring cultural inclusion: Perspectives from a community arts organization. *Australian Journal of Management*, 40(2): 375-396.
- Badham, M. (2010). The Menace of Measurement: A discussion about arts indicators. Paper commissioned by the Saskatchewan Arts Alliance.
https://www.academia.edu/1366194/The_Menace_of_Measurement_A_discussion_about_arts_indicators. Accessed October 25, 2017.
- Balfour, B., Fortunato, M., & Alter, T. (2016). The creative fire: An interactional framework for rural arts-based development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 11:1-11.
- Bagwell, S. (2008). Creative clusters and city growth. *Creative Industries Journal*, 1(1), 31-46.
- Baycan-Levent, T. (2010). Diversity and creativity as seedbeds for urban and regional dynamics. *European Planning Studies*, 18(4), 565-594.
- Bell, D., & Jayne, M., (2010). The creative countryside: policy and practice in the UK rural cultural economy. *J. Rural Stud.* 26, 209-218.
- Bennett, D. (2010). Creative migration: A Western Australian case study of creative artists. *Australian Geographer*, 41(1): 117-128.
- Bennett, J. (2014). Creative placemaking in community planning and development: An introduction to ArtPlace America. *Community Development Investment Review*, 10(2), 77-84.
- Bryden, John M., Sophia Efstratoglou, Tibor Ferenczi, Karlheinz Knickel, Thomas G. Johnson, Karen Refsgaard and Kenneth J Thomson (eds.). 2011. *Towards Sustainable Rural Regions in Europe: Exploring Inter-Relationships Between Rural Policies, Farming, Environment, Demographics, Regional Economies and Quality of Life Using System Dynamics*. New York: Routledge Publishers. 360 pp.
- Bunting, T. E., & Mitchell, C. J. (2001). Artists in rural locales: market access, landscape appeal and economic exigency. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 45(2), 268-284.

- Cologer, E. & Ortiz, M. (2017). Arts and Cultural Production Satellite Account: State Employment and Compensation in 2014. Bureau of Economic Analysis. <https://bea.gov/scb/pdf/2017/09-September/0917-arts-and-cultural-production-account.pdf>. Accessed 9/27/2017.
- Cooke, P. and Lazzeretti, L. (2008). Creative cities: An introduction. In: Cooke, P. & Lazzeretti, L. (eds.). Creative Cities, Cultural Clusters and Local Economic Development, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Csurgó, B., & Megyesi, B. (2016). The Role of Small Towns in Local Place Making. *European Countryside*, 8(4), 427-443.
- Daskon, C. (2010). Cultural Resilience - The Roles of Cultural Traditions in Sustaining Rural Livelihoods: A Case Study from Rural Kandyan Villages in Central Sri Lanka. *Sustainability*, 2, 1080-1100.
- Dessein, J., Soini, K., Fairclough, G. and Horlings, L. (eds) (2015). Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development. Conclusions from the COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability. University of Jyväskylä, Finland. <https://www.culturalsustainability.eu/conclusions.pdf>. Accessed November 3, 2017.
- Dozhdeva, V. (2014). Culture and creativity as instruments for local development. A study of practices in smaller European cities. Master's Thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Duxbury, N., Garrett-Petts, W. & McLennan, D. (2015). Cultural mapping as cultural inquiry: Introduction to an emerging field of practice. In Cultural mapping as cultural inquiry, eds. N. Duxbury, Garrett-Petts, W. & McLennan, D. Routledge, 1-42.
- Duxbury, N.; Gillette, E.; Stewart, S. & McPhail, K. (2008). Under construction: The state of cultural infrastructure in Canada. Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/M_Jeannotte/publication/291333000_Under_Construction_The_State_of_Cultural_Infrastructure_in_Canada_Volume_2/links/56a93e5808ae7f592f0d6e9d/Under-Construction-The-State-of-Cultural-Infrastructure-in-Canada-Volume-2.pdf. Accessed February 3, 2018.
- Essig, L. (2015). Means and ends: A theory framework for understanding entrepreneurship in the US arts and culture sector. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 45(4): 227-246.
- Essig, L. (2016). Networking and Entrepreneurial Success: A Review of Literature. Pave Program in Arts Entrepreneurship, Arizona State University. https://herbergerinstitute.asu.edu/sites/default/files/networking_lit_review-formatted_5_12_16.pdf. Accessed March 8, 2018.
- Evans, G., & Foord, J., 2008. Cultural mapping and sustainable communities: planning for the arts revisited. *Cult. Trends* 17 (2), 65-96.
- Florida, R. (2002). The rise of the creative class. *The Washington Monthly*, 34(5): 15-25.
- Gadwa Nicodemus, A. G. (2013). Fuzzy vibrancy: Creative placemaking as ascendant US cultural policy. *Cultural Trends*, 22(3-4), 213-222.
- Gadwa Nicodemus, A. (2014). Small is beautiful: Creative placemaking in rural communities. *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 25.

- Gibson, C. (2010). Guest Editorial—Creative Geographies: tales from the ‘margins’. *Australian Geographer*, 41(1): 1-10.
- Hall, P. (2000). Creative cities and economic development. *Urban studies*, 37(4), 639-649.
- Iyengar, S. and Nichols, B. (2013). NEA Guide to the U.S. Arts and Cultural Production Satellite Account. National Endowment for the Arts. https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/nea_guide_white_paper.pdf. Accessed February 1, 2018.
- James P. (2014). Assessing cultural sustainability. Agenda 21 for culture - Committee on culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG). https://www.academia.edu/15885475/Assessing_Cultural_Sustainability_Agenda_21_for_Culture. Accessed October 12, 2017.
- Johnson, T.G. (2018). Conceptual Models of Arts and Culture: A Literature Review. Rural Policy Research Institute. Forthcoming.
- Johnson, T.G. and Fannin, J.M. (2018). A Conceptual Framework for Rural Cultural Wealth. Rural Policy Research Institute. Forthcoming.
- Johnson, T. G. and Wornell, E. (2018). A Review of Rural Arts and Culture Research: Creativity, Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Comprehensive Rural Wealth. Rural Policy Research Institute. Forthcoming.
- Kern, P. V., Wasshausen, D. B., & Zemanek, S. L. (2015). Arts and cultural production satellite account, 1998-2012.
- LaPan, C., & Barbieri, C. (2014). The role of agritourism in heritage preservation. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(8), 666-673.
- List, R.; Kononykhina, O. & Leong Cohen, J. (2016). Cultural Participation and Inclusive Societies: A Thematic report based on the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy. Council of Europe. https://www.hertie-school.org/fileadmin/2_Research/2_Research_directory/Research_projects/Indicator_Framework_on_Culture_and_Democracy_IFCD/_PREMS_071117_GBR_2528_Cultural_Participation_and_Inclusive_Societies_WEB_A5.pdf. Accessed February 1, 2018.
- Markusen, A. & Gadwa, A. (2010). Creative Placemaking. White paper for The Mayors’ Institute on City Design, a leadership initiative of the National Endowment for the Arts in partnership with the United States Conference of Mayors and American Architectural Foundation. https://www.terrain.org/columns/29/CreativePlacemaking_NEA.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2017.
- Markusen, A., & Gadwa Nicodemus, A. G. (2014). Creative placemaking: how to do it well. *Community Development Investment Review*, 10(2), 035-042.
- Mayes, R. (2010). Postcards from somewhere: ‘marginal’ cultural production, creativity and community. *Australian Geographer*, 41(1): 11-23.
- McGranahan, D. & Wojan, T. (2007). Recasting the creative class to examine growth processes in rural and urban counties. *Regional Studies*. 41(2): 197-216.

McGranahan, D., Wojan, T. & Lambert, D. (2011). The rural growth trifecta: outdoor amenities, creative class and entrepreneurial context. *J. Econ. Geogr.* 11, 529-557.

Morley, E., & Winkler, M. K. (2014). Assessing a set of indicators for creative placemaking: Reflections from the field. *Community Development Investment Review*, 10(2), 49-55.

<https://www.frbsf.org/community-development/files/assessing-a-set-of-indicators-for-creative-placemaking-reflections-from-the-field.pdf>. Accessed January 31, 2018.

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). (2011). Are you Ready for the Country? *NEA Art* 2011(2). <https://www.arts.gov/NEARTS/2011v2-are-you-ready-country>. Accessed January 28, 2018.

National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). (2017). Arts Data Profile: Rural Arts, Design, and Innovation, Research Brief #1: Rural versus Urban Arts-and-Cultural Organizations: Some Defining Characteristics. <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Brief-1-RuralVsUrbanOrganizationsAccess.pdf>. Accessed February 14, 2018.

Nichols, B., Iyengar, S., Moore Shaffer, P. & Grantham, E. (2017). Rural Arts, Design, and Innovation in America: Research Findings from the Rural Establishment Innovation Survey. National Endowment for the Arts.

Oberlin, K. C., & Gieryn, T. F. (2015). Place and culture-making: Geographic clumping in the emergence of artistic schools. *Poetics*, 50, 20-43.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2009). *The Impact of Culture on Tourism*. ISBN- 978-92-64-05648-0

Ottaviano, G. I., & Peri, G. (2006). The economic value of cultural diversity: evidence from US cities. *Journal of Economic geography*, 6(1), 9-44.

Petrov, A. N. (2007). A Look beyond Metropolis: Exploring Creative Class in the Canadian Periphery. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, 30(3): 451-474.

Rendon, M. R., & Markusen, A. (2009). *Native Artists: Livelihoods, Resources, Spaces, Gifts*. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Rosenfeld, S. (2004). Art and design as competitive advantage: A creative enterprise cluster in the Western United States. *European Planning Studies*, 12(6), 891-904.

Rural Policy Research Institute. (2017). *The Comprehensive Rural Wealth Framework*.

Schubach, J. (2012). Defining creative placemaking: A talk with Ann Markusen and Anne Gadwa Nicodemus. National Endowment for the Arts. 3: 3-7. <https://www.arts.gov/NEARTS/2012v3-arts-and-culture-core/defining-creative-placemaking>. Accessed October 2, 2017.

Scott, A. J. (1999). The cultural economy: Geography and the creative field. *Media Culture Society* 21: 807-817.

Scott, A. J. (2006). Entrepreneurship, innovation and industrial development: geography and the creative field revisited. *Small business economics*, 26(1), 1-24.

Scott, A. J. (2014). *On Hollywood: The place, the industry*. Princeton University Press.

Selada, C., da Cunha, I., & Tomaz, E. (2012). Creative-based strategies in small and medium-sized cities: key dimensions of analysis. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 31(4): 43-51.

Stern, M. & Seifert, S. (2008). *From Creative Economy to Creative Society*. Philadelphia: The Reinvestment Fund.

Stern, M. J., & Seifert, S. C. (2010). Cultural clusters: The implications of cultural assets agglomeration for neighborhood revitalization. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(3), 262-279.

Stern, M. & Seifert, S. (2014). *Communities, Culture, and Capabilities: Preliminary results of a four-city study*. Paper prepared for the Human Development and Capabilities Association conference in Athens, Greece, September.

TEEB. (2018). *TEEB for Agriculture & Food: Scientific and Economic Foundations*. Geneva: United Nations Environment. http://teebweb.org/agrifood/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Foundations_vJun8.pdf. Accessed June 20, 2018.

Theodori, Gene L., Hudec, Cheryl L., & Drumm, Charlotte. (2015). *An Investigation of Arts-Based Rural Community Development*. Working paper submitted to, The National Endowment for the Arts.

Throsby, D. (2010). *The economics of cultural policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Heur, B. (2010). Small cities and the geographical bias of creative industries research and policy. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure & Events*. Vol.2, No.2, pp.189-192.

Webb, D. (2014). Placemaking and social equity: Expanding the framework of creative placemaking. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1): 35-48.

Wojan, T. R. (2014). What Happened to the "Creative Class' Job Growth Engine" During the Recession and Recovery? *Amber Waves*, October.

<http://pdfmyurl.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ers.usda.gov%2Famber-waves%2F2014%2Foctober%2Fwhat-happened-to-the-creative-class-job-growth-engine-during-the-recession-and-recovery%2F%23.Wm8y7SN6Mbk.pdfmyurl>. Accessed January 28, 2018.

Wojan, T. R., Lambert, D. M., & McGranahan, D. A. (2007a). Emoting with their feet: Bohemian attraction to creative milieu. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 7(6), 711-736.

Wojan, T. R., Lambert, D. M., & McGranahan, D. A. (2007b). The emergence of rural artistic havens: A first look. *Agricultural and resource economics review*, 36(1), 53-70.

Wojan, T. R., & McGranahan, D. A. (2007). Ambient returns: creative capital's contribution to local manufacturing competitiveness. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, 36(1), 133-148.

Wojan, T. R., & Nichols, B. (2018). Design, innovation, and rural creative places: Are the arts the cherry on top, or the secret sauce?. *PLoS One*, 13(2), e0192962.