Research on Artists

Report on a Working Conference at Princeton University
May 24-25, 2000

Prepared by Paul DiMaggio
Rapporteurs: Donnell Butler and Adrian Ready

Co-sponsored by the Columbia University Research Center on Arts and Culture, the National Endowment for the Arts Research Division, and the Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies. Supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Pew Charitable Trusts. **Please note:** This document represents a reconstruction of the presentations and discussions from notes taken on a laptop computer during the conference. Although we have tried to be as accurate as possible, the following is not an inclusive transcript of the meeting; in particular, it is important to note that this document contains no direct quotes: a*ll comments are paraphrased.*

Wednesday, May 24: 10 AM to 12 noon
Two Presentations on Sampling Hard-to-Reach Populations

Douglas Heckathorn (Sociology Department, Cornell University)
Respondent-Driven Sampling as a Means of Sampling Unknown Populations: Lessons from Research on Stigmatized Populations.

Professor Heckathorn described a method that he has developed for finding "hidden populations" and that he has used in research on HIV-positive IV drug users supported by the Center for Disease Control and the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

His approach focuses on two related problems. First, how do we find samples of populations when the populations themselves are unknown – when we have no master list of the population from which to sample? Second, how do we address this problem when it is complicated by the fact that members of the population are stigmatized and may wish to remain hidden? (Fortunately, most students of artists' populations have only to contend with the first of these two problems.)

Professor Heckathorn noted that three methods have dominated the study of hidden populations until recently. The first is called *location sampling* – The researcher, usually an ethnographer, maps an area to find those locations at which the population in question is likely to congregate, talking to people she or he finds there and using this information to draw in more respondents. This approach is limited to reaching those respondents who are present at these locations, and is most likely to reach the most active and gregarious of the latter. Members of the population who don't "make the scene" (or congregate in some area of which the researcher may be unaware) cannot be reached.

A second approach is *institutional sampling* – sampling people who are attached to associations (as members) or to formal organizations (as clients). This approach cannot reach members of the population who are not attached to formal organizations or who do not join associations. (It might work, well, for finding employed orchestra musicians, for example, but not visual artists, who are more likely to work alone.)

The third approach is called *chain-referral sampling.* In this approach (often called "snowball sampling") one starts with one or more population members and uses them to locate other eligible respondents. This approach suffers from the fact that the sample with which one ends depends on the people with whom one starts the snowball.

Professor Heckathorn calls his method as *respondent-driven sampling (RDS).* It begins with chain-referral sampling, but entails modifications and rigorous controls that enable the researcher to move from the starting population members to something very close to a random sample of the overall population (excepting only those members of the populations who are unreachable even through multiple ties from the starting members.)

RDS employs modest incentives to reward already-interviewed population members for recruiting other eligible interviewees. Each respondent receives a limited number of recruitment coupons (the number limited – along with the payoff – to avoid destructive competition among early responders to recruit new respondents) Numerous controls are instituted to ensure that new recruits have not been interviewed already (e.g., under a different name) and that they are authentic members of the population. When implemented correctly, the method produces an extremely robust recruitment effort that penetrates deeply through social networks into the core of the population. Research on the

results of respondent-driven sampling approaches demonstrate that you do not have to go many network "steps" away from the starting group in order to saturate the population.

Professor Heckathorn noted that this finding – a result of comparing samples derived from different "starting points" [for example, initial respondents from different geographic areas or with different racial backgrounds] to see how many referral steps it takes for the two samples to become sociodemographically similar --- is consistent with the *small-world literature* in social-network theory. This literature, which has given us the expression "six degrees of separation," demonstrates that almost anyone in a population can be reached through six or fewer network steps from any other population member.

Professor Heckathorn introduced the concept of homophily, which is central to understanding how respondent-driven sampling works. "Homophily" refers to the extent to which persons choose to interact with others with whom they share some trait or characteristic. In RDS, "homophily" refers to respondents' tendency to recruit people like themselves. Researchers have analyzed the recruitment process as a "Markov process" – a process in which each step is independent of all other steps but the one immediately before it. For Markov chains (used to model stochastic and semi-stochastic processes) without absorbing states, recruitment is a memoryless process, characterized by the law of large numbers for Markov Chains, which yields three theorems. *Theorem* 1: the equilibrium sample one draws is independent of the seeds from which one began. *Theorem 2*: The equilibrium at which the respondent group is a random sample of the reachable population is approached at a quick (geometric) rate (in Professor Heckathorn's studies within four to six "waves" or "steps"). *Theorem 3*: If all groups are homophilic in their recruitment choices, rates of recruitment will eventually converge to population norms. (The more homophilic they are, the fewer traits with respect they are homophilic, and the more highly correlated these traits are with one another, the longer it will take.)

In many cases, tendencies towards homophily will vary among groups. Professor Heckathorn's method requires one to measure the tendency towards homophily with respect to different respondent characteristics and to use this information to weight the sample to compensate for any biases that this may introduce.

In order to implement RDS, one must collect data (they use marked coupons) that permit you to document referral networks (i.e., to know who recruited each respondent to the study). (Because of their populations' vulnerability and wish for privacy, they did not require that respondents give real names; instead they used biometric methods to establish the identities of the persons they interviewed.) Each respondent must also provide information about the size of his or her social network; that network's composition with respect to personal attributes with respect to which recruitment may exhibit homophily; and his or her relationship to the person who recruited him or her to the study.

Analyses of data gathered in this way can be used to identify natural breakpoints in continuous variables (e.g., income) that influence recruitment patterns. It might also be used to identify the salience of criteria that population members use to define one another (for example, which of eight criteria for identifying artists described in Dr. Karttunen's paper are most socially significant).

Respondent driven sampling can complement ethnography. Ethnographic research is difficult with stigmatized populations because it requires a lengthy period of living with population members and is often limited by homophily: That is, gaining the trust of one segment of a population (for example, a youth gang) may make it difficult to

gain the trust of another (e.g., a different gang). Respondent-driven sampling can provide a means of getting a diverse group of persons for in-depth interviews and short-term observation, drawing respondents from later waves in the recruitment effort.

Practical steps involve using "steering incentives": bonuses to recruiters, higher for certain hard-to-reach subsets of the population's members (using stratified recruitment coupons). Professor Heckathorn warns against setting incentives too high, lest respondents compete too vigorously for new recruits. One can also use a saturation method, continuing to recruit new interviewees until no more are available. (In his studies of IV drug users in both the U.S. and Russia, this approach has yielded numbers many times more respondents than the population sizes estimated by local authorities.)

Professor Heckathorn summarized the advantages of respondent-driven sampling:

1. It permits you to start with the most energetic helpful people, but prevents overrecruiting people with characteristics similar to theirs.
2. It is efficient because it requires no prior ethnographic research.
3. It makes is possible to reach people who are residentially unstable, without regular home addresses
4. It provides information not just about sample characteristics, but also about the network structure of the population.
5. It is fully compatible with other sampling methods: for example, it can be used in combination with Professor McPherson's *hypernetwork sampling* approach.

Professor Heckathorn also summarized its limitations

1. It cannot reach members of a population who are completely isolated – i.e., who have no contacts, direct or indirect, to the starting respondents.
2. Statistical power decreases as homophily increases. The higher the level of homophily, the longer it takes to reach equilibrium and the higher are the standard errors. (In his experience, few populations are homophilous enough that this is a problem.)

Professor Heckathorn has developed software to manage the recruitment processes, manage the data, and produce necessary calculations, including the number of waves required to reach equilibrium and the appropriate sample weights. He has also modified IRIS software to prevent subject duplications through impersonations (by recruiters or interviewees responding to financial incentives).

Discussion[1]*:*

Mr. McPherson asked to what extent equilibrium calculations are sensitive to the assumption that network contacts are transitive? *Mr. Heckathorn* replied that xenophobes always recruit other xenophobes (in this case, the process isn't entirely memoryless but is rather a second-order Markov chain). Modeling the process this way increases the number of steps required to reach equilibrium. Also one can partition groups and run separate recruitment processes if there are signs of memory-dependent or xenophobic recruitment processes. This is an empirical issue that depends on the population.

Mr. Bielby asked about practical and theoretical implications of how you define the population. *Mr. Heckathorn* recommended that the recruitment field be broader than the population definition so that one can recruit homophilous clusters. Researchers may undertake analyses only those respondents who fit one's narrower definition of the population.

[1] A list of participants is attached at the end of the summary of sessions.

Mr. Menger noted that artists are not a "stigmatized population," and asked what difference this would make. *Mr. Heckathorn* noted that it would make it easier to use RDS to develop a sample. He suspects that for artists, the monetary reward would be of less material value (given its small size) than symbolic. It is best when respondents recruit peers because having been through the interviews themselves, they can attest to the fact that the experience is positive and recruit artists who might otherwise be reluctant to participate.

Mr. Throsby asked if research has been done on the effects of incentive magnitude. *Mr. Heckathorn* suggested that one could use small rewards to recruit artists (given their likely willingness to participate) and indicated that respondent-driven recruiting is probably less costly than hiring paid outreach workers to build trust in the respondent community. But he believes more research is necessary on this topic; for now, one should proceed by trial and error in the field – if recruitment is too slow, one can increase the incentive.

Mr. DiMaggio noted that artists in some art forms do their work collectively (e.g., in performing-arts groups) whereas other artists (many visual artists or fiction writers) create in isolation, and asked if there are different rules for working with groups that differ in this way. *Mr. Heckathorn* noted that the method works best for populations with robust contact patterns: where artists work in isolation, it may be necessary to saturate the general population with very high numbers of "steering incentives" (i.e. recruitment coupons) to ensure that relatively isolated artists can be reached.

Ms. Karttunen observed that this method produces a list of names and can also be used to study networks in subfields. Could this method be used to study the network structure of the members of the art world as a whole? *Mr. Heckathorn* responded that the approach could be used to determine proportional size of a group and also to analyze its network structure. Given that certain groups (elite artists) are likely to have more or fewer connections than others, one could determine how elite artists are connected to less successful members of the art world. In his research thus far, Mr. Heckathorn has found that in many cases, the smaller the group, the more homophilous it becomes, as members work harder to maintain group identity and network ties outside the group decrease.

Mr. Tepper asked if one could start with jazz artists and eventually reach a sample of all artists in a community. *Mr. Heckathorn* replied that one could if jazz artists have contact with other kinds of artists; but it would be better to start with a wider net of artists in order to ensure that one could reach a broader range of network regions relatively quickly.

Mr. Bradshaw asked Mr. Heckathorn to say more about the timing of the process, in particular the time between survey waves. *Mr. Heckathorn* noted that the duration can be brief but that it is important to schedule interviews appropriately. The period from wave to wave depends on the number of interviewers, the length of interviews, and the size of initial sample. Respondent-driven sampling tends to recruit more respondents more quickly than alternative methods (e.g., the use of outreach workers), so that care should be taken to make sure that interviewers are not swamped by a large response.

Professor Angela Aidala (School of Public Health, Columbia University): Identifying Dispersed Populations with Rare Attributes: Lessons from Medical Research. Professor Aidala indicated that she agreed with the points that Professor Heckathorn had made in his presentation. She indicated that she would say more about practical measures, especially measures used to find members of stigmatized populations that may be both hidden and dispersed, including populations whose member do not interact with one another very intensely. How can researchers find people who are outside of the system, missing persons, and people who might prefer not to be found?

There is a conventional sets of procedures for locating hidden populations that her research group uses --- a menu of field methods that is constrained only by limitations on time and expense. She believes that these conventional methods can be adapted to make it possible to find artists with few links to other artists.

The starting point is always some kind of a list, used for chain-referral samples. Often her respondents are recruited from a sample of population members who are clients of a cooperating social agency. After the researchers interview these people they ask them to provide names (or initials) of other members of the same population. Incentives are offered for each person that the recruiter brings in.

A supplementary approach to recruiting is *location sampling* --- using ethnographic field methods to find "outcroppings" where members of the population are likely to congregate. In some cases, Professor Aidala uses the initial interviews to gather information about these key locations. Location sampling is a particularly helpful supplement to chain-referral methods because the researcher can compare the characteristics of the persons interviewed at focal locations (some of whom may have few social ties to other members of the population) to those of the sample derived from the chain referrals.

Researchers should always be open about what they are doing. Rather than try to blend in or build ethnographic rapport, Professor Aidala trains her staff (some of whom may be recruited from current or former members of the population) to understand the scene and dramatize their role with the use of props that demonstrate they are care-oriented researchers and not law-enforcement personnel. She tries to have small gifts to give respondents (e.g., condoms or other preventative health-care items for people at risk for HIV infection). In interviewing artists, one might offer complimentary pens, mugs, tools, coupons to art stores or vouchers to artistic events.

How might these methods be applied in the arts? She believes that RDS can be useful, with starting samples derived from organizational membership lists and locational or casual-encounter sampling, or from small screening surveys. To find the right locations, one must understand your population's needs for material survival or identity confirmation. Once you find out how they satisfy these needs, you will find the people you are looking for. For example, visual artists need to buy materials, so one can look for them at art stores. Dancers need dance space and may work out in particular gyms.

Professor Aidala reported that advertising for subjects has been unproductive, and may even be counterproductive if it attracts unwanted attention to research projects. Conventional survey methods (telephone calls to households at selected hours) are also unlikely to be useful, especially for studying populations with unconventional activity patterns. Such survey methods as approach style, staffing, and timing should be based on careful analysis of the population's activity patterns and life style.

Wednesday, May 24, 1:00 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.:
J. Miller McPherson (Sociology Department, University of Arizona)
Hypernetwork Sampling

Professor McPherson described a method that he developed to find representative samples of organizations when he parameters of organizational populations are unknown. Researchers had long wanted to identify probability samples of organizations because only with representative samples can one make comparisons over time and across different types of organizations. Hypernetwork sampling enables one to do this. For example, in the National Organization Survey, researchers took a random sample from a known population (working Americans over the age of 18) and asked respondents in the paid labor force to identify their primary employer. The list of employers thus generated was a random sample of employing organizations weighted by the number of people that each employed. That sample of organizations was then contacted for a second survey.

Professor McPherson has extended this approach as a means of studying many different kinds of intersecting forms of organization: persons, organizations, occupations, and ideas, for example. One could use hypernetwork sampling to undertake a study of artists, arts organizations, occupations, artifacts that artists produce, materials with which they work, and associations of which they are members; and to analyze the connections among these units of analysis in an integrated way.

We already have a vast armament of methods for sampling individuals. The key idea behind hypernetwork sampling is that we can take advantage of our understanding of how to sample individuals to leverage our way into studying other units of analysis (events, ideas, organizations, artifacts, and so on).

One begins with a "hypermatrix" taken from an individual point of view. Individuals in a survey sample constitute the rows; the other units (e.g., groups or organizations of which individuals are members) constitute the column axis. If the first person in the sample is a member of the 3rd organization, then one places a "1" where row 1 intersects column 3; if that person is not a member of that organization, then a "0" goes in that cell. One then analyzes the hypermatrix thus produced, exploiting sociologist Ronald Breiger's insights about "the duality of persons and groups." That is, organizations serve to link the people who are members of them; and, at the same time, a person links two organizations when she is a member of each. (Put another way, groups constitute individuals in much the same way that individuals constitute groups.)

From the standpoint of hypernetwork sampling, the most important thing to know about organizations is, first, how many people are in them – how many members or employees or clients do they have --- and, second, what are the attributes of these people. We can project organizational size through a random sample of persons by using probability theory. If we take a probability sample of persons and ask them to list the groups to which they belong, groups with lots of members will be mentioned more frequently than groups with fewer members. We can use this information to project organization sizes and thus to develop stratified random samples of organizational populations.

We can also ask people to report on the size of organizations to which they belong. McPherson noted that although people cannot report the size of the organizations perfectly, their responses are reasonably reliable. Respondents in a probability sample of

persons enable the researcher to estimate how many groups and organizations there are and to create a sample frame of particular kinds of groups and organizations (for example, associations of artists) from which to select other respondents.

Professor McPherson noted that hypernetwork sampling permits the researcher to summarize not only the relationship between individuals and groups, but also the relationships between individuals, groups and other entities (such as ideas or events). Additional methodological techniques, for example Galoise lattices and other types of multipartite graphs make it possible to integrate information about groups and events (through individuals) in a single analytic framework.

Professor McPherson introduced the concept of "Blau space," which he named after the sociologist Peter Blau. "Blau-space" is an N-dimensional space created by the intersection of some set of N attributes of a given unit of analysis. For example, one could define a "Blau-space" based on information about the age, educational attainment, and income of a sample of persons. Each respondent would occupy a position within that 3 dimensional space defined by her or his position on each of these three continua. (Even though one cannot portray more than 3 dimensions on one graph, "Blau-spaces" of larger dimension are mathematically tractable.)

It is often useful to consider the distance between certain points in a "Blau space." If we put lines between all those people (or organizations) who have cooperative relations, a system characterized by high levels of homophily (where actors cooperate with others like themselves) will have shorter lines and denser clusters than a system in which homophily is low. One can then use this information to make estimates of other system properties (e.g., about the rate at which information can travel through the system).

One can also place associations (for example artists' organizations) in a Blau-space on the basis of the attributes of their members. For example, in our 3-dimensional example defined earlier, the position of an association can be defined on the basis of the average age, average educational attainment, and average income of its members. The higher the dimensionality of the space (the more variables with respect to which we define an association's location in the space), the more information that location will contain. Comparing the distribution of persons and associations in a comparable Blau-space can give us valuable information about the likely trajectory of a field of organizations. For example, where a region of Blau-space is crowded with artists' associations relative the number of individual artists in that region, we might expect that some of those associations will either go out of business or expand their programs to reach artists who are less well represented. If a region of Blau-space has lots of artists but few associations, we might anticipate that new associations will form there (or established ones will move in that direction). Professor McPherson's study of voluntary associations in midwestern communities has confirmed these intuitions with a broader set of membership organizations, and has also exemplified the utility of this analytic framework.

Professor McPherson raised a number of questions about artistic fields that hypernetwork sampling can be used to address:

1. What is happening in the artistic hinterland? He noted that most studies of artists he has seen focus on artists who are highly committed to their work, whom he regards as "core" artists. By contrast, he would like to know about the artists on the periphery? Are new organizations emerging out of mainstream organizations?

What are the connections between the hinterland and the core? To what kinds of non-arts associations are artists connected?

2. How connected is the total art-world system? Is there a single entity that dominates the system? Are there cleavages in the system? Is the system segmented by artistic discipline or other criteria?
3. To what extent and in what ways are arts-world entities cooperative or competitive? By this, he referred not to competition among artists for exhibition opportunities or performing jobs or book contracts, but rather whether the success or decline of particular arts disciplines or types of arts organization influences the success of others? (For example, does the expansion of live theatre limit the growth of film, or does it add to the labor force of accomplished actors so that filmmaking becomes easier?)
4. What niches do different kinds of artistic entities – artists' occupations, disciplinary organizations, styles, and so on –occupy and how do these niches interact?

<u>*Discussion*</u>

Mr. DiMaggio asked if hypernetwork sampling could be used to identify a sample of artists in a given area. *Mr. White* asked if one could survey a sample of individuals to get a list of artist's organizations, and then sample the individuals who are members of these organizations? *Mr. McPherson* responded that doing so would give you a representative sample of organizations.

Mr. Heckathorn suggested that one could use respondent-driven sampling to sample an unknown population and then hypernetwork sampling to identify the organizations that serve members of that population. *Mr. McPherson* indicated that this would be possible, although it would be expensive to do so.

Ms. Jeffri noted that this procedure limits one to studying artists who join organizations. If artists are not in organizations, how will this method help us find them? *Mr. McPherson* indicated that one could use a survey of persons to identify artists, proto-artists, and nonartists, if the sample was large enough. This would make it possible to study the differences between artists who join organizations and those who do not. *Mr. Greenblatt* asked if there was any practical way to get around a sample that is biased towards individuals who are tied to organizations using this method. *Mr. McPherson* said that these would be in the initial sample of persons.

Mr. Menger said that he understood how you could use hypernetwork sampling to develop a sample of employers from people who have a stable job. But many artists, he notes, work on projects rather than for organizations. An actor or a musician, he notes, may have dozens of employers over the course of a year. How can we use surveys to gather reliable information about these? *Mr. McPherson* described the life-history calendar approach to prompting recollection, which he believes is a means of gathering reliable data on difficult-to-recall life events of this kind at an extremely high rate. One reconstructs salient memories by beginning with major life events that the respondent can time directly, and then placing less salient events in relation to those major events, using

the latter as anchors for date estimation. This method takes time, and can tire respondents out; at the same time, however, many respondents find it cathartic and rewarding.

Mr. Bielby acknowledged that a hypernetwork sample of persons can create a sample of associations and that one could then get a list of artists from the artists' associations that one finds in this way. But he asked if one could not do this more directly by asking respondents from the starting sample to provide contact information for artists that they know personally, or to name artists who they may have seen in local performances. *Mr. McPherson* responded that hypernetwork sampling, properly defined, allows one to move from one kind of unit of analysis to another and that this struck him as being closer to chain-referral sampling. *Mr. Heckathorn* added that treating artists as analogous to organizations would raise other difficulties: Artists with few friends would be less likely to be named by people in the original probability sample.

Wednesday, May 24: 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Research on Artists Using National Statistics
Panel: Mr. Tom Bradshaw (National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division); Ms. Sari Karttunen (Statistics Finland); Ms. Jacqueline Luffman (Statistics Canada); and Professor David Throsby (Economics Department, Macquarie University, Australia)

Professor David Throsby (Economics Department, Macquarie University) began by presenting an overview of the use of census statistics in Australia. He noted that there are three primary kinds of information.

National Census. Australia undertakes a Census every six or seven years. They attempt to use categories that are suitable for cross-national comparison, but until recently the definition was so vague that it was difficult if not impossible to use the data to study artists. In the late 1980s and 1990s, however, the definition was clarified, so that there is now a special category for "artists and related professionals" with subcategories that fit well with the way that artists designate themselves. Self-identification is still problematic however: The question "what was your main job last week" may not capture the way that artists think about their work very well --- If an artist has a day job to stay alive but spend more hours working on art (but without a single employer), how will the artist respond?

Labor Force Surveys. Monthly surveys track employment and other labor force information. Each month a particular category is selected for intensive study. "Cultural Activities" is one category that has received special attention. An intensive survey focussed on part-time and occasional cultural work, spells of joblessness between employment, non-artistic work in cultural industries, and other topics. Although the data are not perfect, they provide useful background information for studying employment in the cultural industries.

Professor Throsby's own research for the Australia Council (the federal arts funding authority). The Council set up a Committee of Inquiry in 1983 to study the living and working conditions of individual artists weren't being overlooked. That study led to recommendations for a survey of artists that would provide a foundation of knowledge for policy discussion. The study generated a great deal of sympathetic media interest and was used by advocates to show that artists, while terribly important, are underpaid, and overworked. Similar studies were undertaken in 1987 and 1993.

Professor Throsby's study identified writers, craft artists, visual artists, dancers, choreographers, musicians, singers, actors, and other kinds of artists. Without the option of drawing a random sample, the researchers were forced to assume that artists would appear on some lists --- membership associations, the Australia Council's data base on artists who have applied for grants, and so on. These lists were used to estimate the size of the population for each of several kinds of artists. Census data were used to confirm that these estimates were roughly accurate. They hoped to include practicing professional artists – artists who have been recognized by being hired by a professional organization, who is recognized by peers, who define themselves as artists, and who produce work of high quality --- even if they were not full-time arts workers whose primary economic sustenance came from their art.

Unfortunately, their survey of just 1000 artists must be representative of all Australia and of all art forms. As a result, they can say little about artists in narrowly defined

disciplines. They can make inferences about visual and plastic artists, but not about sculptors or painters for example.

Professor Throsby indicated that much of the data is germane to economic analysis. The surveys measure labor supply, time allocation, and income from three categories of work: artistic, arts-related, and non-arts-related work.

The Bureau of Statistics has more resources now than in the past, and will therefore be more involved in this work. *Artswork* is a publication of the Australian Council that synthesizes data from these three sources.

Ms. Sari Karttunen described research on artists in Finland. The Arts Council of Finland, which commissioned several studies of the status of artists in the 1970s, originally undertook most of these studies. In the 1980s, six researchers did work on eight art forms as part of an effort to evaluate the effects of arts policies on the arts.

Currently, Statistics Finland, the Finnish statistical agency, is responsible for cultural statistics. Every two years, it undertakes a study of a particular matter of interest for cultural policy making. In 2000, the agency studied cultural occupations and cultural industries, using Census data. But the data are not up to the task: They face the challenge of assessing the quality of arts-and-culture related statistics and raising the standard.

The Arts Council has studied artists who are members of unions and hope to establish an ongoing study that would help monitor the influence on artists of government arts policies. These studies have never used Census data because that source categorizes artists in so unsatisfactory a fashion. (Finland undertakes a Census every five years, using personal identity codes as respondent identifiers [which also facilitates data linkage]. But artists find the way in which the Census defines artistic work to accord poorly with their own view of their work.) Instead, the Arts Council studies have used sources like the tax register (which provides income data), union records (on employment), and the records of arts schools (for education).

In addition to those noted above, the Census data present other problems. For one thing, they do not distinguish between income from artistic and nonartistic sources. When artists have no employment income (even if they have grant funding) they are not even counted as being in the labor force. Census reports are also not as timely as some would like, as it takes two years to process the data.

Ms. Karttunen noted that there are current efforts to improve the situation. Researchers are going back to raw, uncoded data to try to reclassify information on artists in a way that is more responsive to the information needs of cultural policy makers. Other researchers are interviewing artists to better understand the categories that practitioners find meaningful. Statistics Finland hopes to create occupational categories that are less heterogeneous than that currently used. The 1997 classification of artists is based on skill level and accords with European Union standards. By contrast, the 1980 occupational classification is based on nature of work. Because the 1997 categories require more information, a larger proportion of respondents (including many musicians) is classified as "occupation unknown." Nonetheless, artists' occupations in Finland appear to have been faring well in recent years, with the number of artists increasing by 80 percent during a period in which the size of the workforce as a whole declined.

Mr. Tom Bradshaw, Director of the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division, described national data sources on artists in the United States, highlighting three: the Decennial Census of Population (Census); the Current Population Survey (CPS); and the Occupational Employment Survey (OES).

The Census of Population is undertaken every ten years, and a sample of respondents complete a long form that requests detailed occupational information, as well as detailed demographic and geographic data. But the Census asks only about the respondent's primary job.

The Current Population Survey is a monthly survey of 50,000 households that collects detailed information about occupation and employment status, but with less demographic and geographic detail. Since 1994, it has gathered data on secondary as well as primary employment. NEA has funded a study of artistic employment using the CPS that will be printed in June 2000.

The Occupational Employment Survey (OES) is undertaken over three-year cycles by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and is administered through employment offices around the United States. It is an establishment survey that covers 400,000 businesses. Information on occupation, employment and wages is less detailed than the CPS, self-employed people are excluded, and the occupational classification system is different.

Mr. Bradshaw discussed the means by which each of these research programs determines respondent occupations and the advantages and disadvantages of each source. The Census codes occupation based on responses to a series of questions about jobs. The advantage of the Census is its very large sample, which allows detailed analysis of differences in artist's earnings by discipline, location, and demographic characteristics. The disadvantage is that it is only undertaken every 10 years and the data are aggregated to the 3-digit occupation-code level.

CPS codes occupation in the same way as the Decennial Census, and does so on an annual basis, making it possible to track change. However, samples sizes for some artists' occupations are too small for confident analysis and, like the Census itself, the data are aggregated to the three-digit level, obscuring differences among more narrowly defined artists' groups. Interestingly, CPS, which is administered through in-home interviews, reports higher numbers of artists than does the Decennial Census, perhaps because interviewers can probe respondents about part-time or less frequent work.

The OES codes occupations at the establishment level, requesting that employers indicate the number of persons employed in each occupation listed on the survey form. The OES provides more detail for some artist occupations (for example, college and university teachers of art, drama, and music) than the other sources. But it does not include self-employed persons and is less complete in its coverage of artists occupations overall.

The NEA Research Division has supported specialized surveys of artists to transcend the limitations of these regular data sources. Such surveys are more costly to NEA (because the costs of the other data systems are borne by other agencies). For studies of visual artists and choreographers, these studies have selected a limited number of cities, identified all of the venues in each city in which artists of a certain kind can exhibit or perform, and then developed lists of all of the artists who have been associated with these venues during the previous three years. This method brings into the survey population artists whose work has survived professional review and received public exposure while at the same time including artists who would fall outside the Census or OES. The sur-

veys focus on earnings, time allocation, other types of work, and related issues, going far beyond what the Census or CPS in identifying other occupations in which artists are often employed, and separately identifying earnings from arts-related jobs and those not arts-related, as well as financial losses associated with artistic work. Arts policy makers and arts advocates used this research, for among other things it dispelled the myth that artists sit around waiting for grants. The Research Division has a continuing interest in research that will help the Arts Endowment serve artists in cost-effective ways.

Ms. Jacqueline Luffman of Statistics Canada spoke next about research on Canada's cultural labor force. Ms. Luffman is a research analyst in Statistics Canada's Culture Statistics Program (CSP), which comprises nine cultural surveys, as well as data analysis and integration, and communication and reporting activities. The program, which tries to meet the data needs of other Canadian government agencies, covers a broad range of cultural occupations in addition to artists.

Statistics Canada develops information about the size, growth rate, and demographic composition of the cultural labor force; the impact of culture-sector economic activity on job creation; and on the effects on the culture labor force of consumer demand, government spending, and the export market. Among other things, Ms. Luffman's program attempts to adjudicate amongst the estimates of the size and demographic composition of cultural occupations that are in circulation, with the premise that which estimate is best depends on what questions one is asking.

Sources of variation in estimates of the size and composition of the cultural labor force reflect differences (among different data sources) in the way that "culture worker" and "culture sector" are defined; differences (especially in the treatment of non-culture workers in cultural industries) between studies that focus on industries as units of analysis and those that focus on occupations; and differences in survey technique and sample design.

Statistics Canada's own studies are modeled after the *Canadian Culture Statistics Framework*, which defines cultural occupations as including heritage, printing, architecture, audio-visual and performing arts, fine and commercial arts, and writing. The choice of indicators or ways of aggregating data for a particular piece of research depends on the policy question the information is needed to address.

Sources of data on Canadian artists include the national Census, which is administered every five years. This is the best and most frequently used source of information. The Monthly Labor Force Survey (LFS) is a second valuable resource. Annual or biennial Culture Surveys of arts and cultural establishments collect data on the number of artists of different kinds that organizations employ (or have working as volunteers). And other Statistics Canada labor-force studies at times yield useful information about artists.

A 1993 Cultural Labor Force Survey was a special survey of artists whose names appeared on lists provided by 1000 cultural organizations. This study focused on artists' training and employment needs. The data are rich, but did not include artists who did not appear on one of the lists from which the sample was drawn.

Each data source has distinctive strengths and weaknesses. The Census only collects information on the respondent's primary job, thus not counting as artists people whose primary source of income is not in the arts. Occupational classification has been improved but there is more room for improvement. Demographic and related

information is limited, but makes it possible to classify respondents by employment status, age, sex, and education (but not income).

The Cultural Labour Force Survey lack sample sizes adequate to sustain comparative analysis of narrowly defined occupational categories, and also fails to collect information on freelancing and other contract work. Moreover, it lacks detail on government workers in the culture sector and on cultural unions or associations.

Statistics Canada uses all of these data sets to develop its cultural information system (the *Framework)*. The Framework outlines the scope of activities along the economic chain from creation to consumption. The direct economic impact of the culture sector ranges from $20 - $30 billion per years, and it employs 4.6% of Canada's labor force. (Most of this information comes from the LFS – which shows cultural employment as ranging from 180,000 to 650,000 workers, depending on the definition used --- and data modeling generates an overall estimate.) The 1993 Cultural Labor Force Survey has received less use due to lack of funds for secondary analysis, but it did provide information on secondary artistic jobs.

Statistics Canada's dissemination program entails releasing the results of ongoing analysis in its publications, undertaking and reporting the results of economic-impact and labor-force studies under contract to other agencies, exchanging information with other data users and policymakers, and participation in the Data Liberation Initiative, which aims to make data readily available to universities.

Ms. Luffman stated that she places a high priority for future work on finding basic indicators of the health and vitality of the cultural labor force; creating international comparisons; exploring methodological issues having to do with data reliability; and improving the quality of benchmark employment data (now provided by LFS).

Discussion:

An unidentified participant asked *Mr. Bradshaw* about the availability of data. He reported that CPS data are available on a monthly basis, but only a portion of the CPS sample -- respondents participating in the sample for several months --- are asked about jobs other than the primary job (since 1994). There have also been some longitudinal studies of panels of Americans that demonstrate that the job characteristics of artists fluctuated markedly over time. Micro data from the Decennial Census can be downloaded directly from the internet (http://www.census.gov/main/www/pums.html). The utility of the Census occupational data for 2000 for many purposes is threatened by a proposal currently under consideration to code occupations at no more than 97 categories.

An unidentified participant asked about occupational classification in Finland. *Ms. Karttunen* said that the quality of occupational categories declined due to a decision to adopt the system used by the International labor Organization, which does not capture artists' occupations as effectively as the previous Finnish system, to which Statistics Finland will return for most studies (though perhaps not for the regular Census). Because of the classification problems, occupational data has not been tabulated since 1993, though a file from a 1987 survey is available for analysis.

An unidentified participant asked about the comparability of statistics across countries. *Ms.* Luffman said that Canadian and U.S. data can be compared for the industry that em-

ploys the artists because there is a means of moving between the two countries' industrial classification codes. But this is not the case for occupational classification. *Mr. Bradshaw* said that the United States Standard Occupational Classification (S.O.C.) has undergone revision. The U.S. can do a crosswalk between different versions of its own S.O.C., but cannot easily compare its occupational data to that from surveys in other countries. *Mr. Throsby* said that Australia's data are relatively similar to Canada's and can be used for comparisons. The 1993 Australian artist survey had a sample of only 1000, but he hopes that it will be increased next time, with more information about rural, as well as urban artists.

An unidentified participant asked how the surveys define an "artist." Mr. Throsby said that artists are defined (in Australia) as people in cultural organizations doing cultural work. Distinguishing between cultural and noncultural workers in cultural industries can be complicated, however.

Ms. Shikegawa asked if the data sources capture, first, media artists, and, second, aboriginal artists. *Mr. Throsby* said that in Australia the Census data identifies ethnicity, making it possible to identify Aboriginal artists, and that there has been a special study of such artists. In previous Australian surveys, the media arts were *not* included, because the definition of "art form" was constrained by what the Australia Council supports. Now that the Council has established a new media arts fund, media artists will be defined as a separate artist group.

Ms. Luffman said that Canada has not done much research on aboriginal artists and art forms, nor do they have a separate occupational code for artists working in new media. *Ms. Karttunen* reported that Finland is unable to identify the ethnicity of its artists, and that media artists are categorized as visual artists. *Mr. Bradshaw* indicated that in the U.S. craft artists are in the visual artists category, and that one could cross-classify this occupation with ethnicity (e.g., American Indian) to arrive at rough estimates of the number of some kinds of traditional craft artists. With respect to media arts, using Census microdata files would enable one to cross-classify industry and occupation for information about film artists.

Wednesday, May 24: 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Recap: Reflections on the First Day's Program
Panel: Professor David Throsby (Economics Department, Macquarie University); Professor Harrison White (Sociology Department, Columbia University); Dr. Harriet Zuckerman (Vice President, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation).

Dr. Harriet Zuckerman reflected on the day from the perspective of her experience as a sociologist of science who devoted much of her academic career to research on scientists. Science and art, she noted, are similar activities in that both are creative activities that produce public goods. Science *is* public knowledge: If it isn't published, it isn't science.

In comparison to art, science is far more organized and institutionalized, which saves sociologists of science a great deal of time: There is no discussion in that field about *who* scientists are. They constitute a highly visible population: Although there is no master list, it is easy to find appropriate populations from which to draw representative samples for most purposes. Because scientists' training is institutionalized, key training sites and courses of study are easy to identify. Moreover, scientists are members of scientific and professional societies; they are listed in registries; the government keeps track of science and scientists because science is big business. Ongoing data collection efforts (e.g., Science and Engineering Indicators) produce volumes of data.

Professor Zuckerman called attention to three units of analysis that are of great interest to sociologists of science and that she believes may exist in the arts in analogous form and also may be of interest to scholars who study artists:

1. *Collaborative Groups* – In both science and artwork gets done in a mix of temporary and unorganized settings to highly institutionalized organizations. In order to understand how science is done, one must look at the products of groups that vary in size and complexity. Dr. Zuckerman expressed surprise that there was no discussion of the role of groups that work together in the arts. One might ask of such groups: How big are they, how long do they last, are the skills similar or complementary, are they self-financed or endowed? Students of science learn a great deal by looking at sets of authors who write papers together, studying the mixtures of specialties, the age distributions, and other characteristics of these groups. Co-authorship arrangements can be very complex, ranging from just a few collaborators to more than a hundred co-authors in some fields.

2. *Scientific specialties.* Informal specialty networks consist of people who work on same kinds of problems in different places, and share similar perspectives. Networks like these are where the intellectual action is. The arts have different schools or styles as well: They may not be as organized as their scientific counterparts, but they also push forward the development of their fields. There have been studies of the rise and decline of specialties in science, as in art. There have also been studies of the social structure of specialties: McPherson's work might be helpful in enabling us to sample specialty groups and to better understand their recruitment and composition.

3. *Scientific publications.* Much work in the sociology of science starts with publications, which are roughly equivalent to performances or visual art works in the arts. Because science is public knowledge, the student of science begins with what has been published. The same might be true of the arts. Dr. Zuckerman expressed surprise that there had not been more discussion of research on performances – for example, on the life span of plays, how they are produced, and how this information is related to tastes,

fads and fashions. Sociologists of science also study the impact of publications: whose work survives and whose does not, and why. To do this, they draw on data on citations. Although there is no equally convenient measure of influence in the arts, studies of the impact of performances or artworks would seem to be a promising avenue nonetheless. She also mentioned writers conferences and writers centers as a way of getting a informal organization in a group of artists that has very little formal organization.

Professor Harrison White began by asking why so many people are interested in artists and so few are interested in dairy farmers. Farmers find economic opportunity vanishing; many of them have part-time jobs to support themselves. They have some of the same problems as artists. But the difference is that farmers are disappearing as an occupation. Oddly, however, despite the fact that there is no overwhelming demand for acrylic canvases, the number of artists is increasing. We need to trace out this growth in numbers and understand why and how it is occurring. Maybe, Professor White wondered, the growth reflects the fact that artists' work is deeply integrated with their identities. Yet, he reflected, dairy farming is also about character building, so that can't be the reason.

Professor White then moved to an analogy to sport. After describing *Making the Majors,* Eric Leifer's study of how entrepreneurs built the industries of professional football, basketball, and baseball, he noted that these entrepreneurs focused intently on local competition. Perhaps the answer for the arts is to build in a more sophisticated competitive mechanism tied to local areas. Perhaps the arts would benefit if they could get people interested in making discriminations and keeping score against other groups of artists.

Professor White suspects that it is not artists as a particular set of occupations that is important, but rather art as an activity: genres, themes, troupes of artists, and how each of these develops. Artistic activity might be regarded as a kind of conversation. More and more artistic performances involve some kind of interaction between artists and audiences. And in other settings, artists speak to artists and perform for other artists: He sometimes finds himself the only person in a new-music audience who is not a real or aspiring professional musician. An analysis on conversational activity reminds us that art is a highly reflexive activity.

Finally, Professor White drew an analogy between the arts and the Army. It is well known that in order to get one soldier on the front line, seven people have to be employed --- they hire the soldiers, make sure they are fed, get their armaments, handle the logistics and develop the strategy. The soldier on the front line, the one who does the shooting, is the least respected, is paid the least, and has worst working conditions. Professor White asked the group: "Does this remind you of anything?" He then wrote on the board some notes on Canadian artists he took during Ms. Luffman's presentation.

	Dollars Earned	
	In ART	In OTHER things
Artists	$11,500	$19,400
Non-arts jobs in arts organizations	$31,300	$30,000

Artists are the front-line workers, it takes several non-arts workers to get them to the front lines, and artists are paid less than are other people in the arts.

Professor White noted that we should think of art as an activity that moves in and out of different fields. Professor Heckathorn's approach fits this well. (Professor White commented that the probability of a member of one group recruiting a member of another

ultimately comes down to an equilibrium, which is not inconsistent with, but is a somewhat different approach, than semi-markov models.) In any case, he believes that one must study the arts from the standpoint of multiple interacting levels from the start. Markov transition probabilities create these different levels and sides, and complexity comes in from the effects on these parameters of the behavior of populations outside the arts.

Professor David Throsby described his comments as reactions from a "practitioner's" point of view." Methodology, he said, is our servant and not our master. We must not frame the questions to suit the methodologies. Rather we must go back to our interest in what makes artists tick. A first goal is to identify the size and characteristics of the population of artists; and to draw a random sample from that population that is large enough to permit one to make inferences. One does this to learn about individual artists, about their current and likely future circumstances, and about the occupational, market, and organizational systems in which they operate. The day's presentations point to ways of improving the methodologies that researchers are already using.

Professor Throsby noted that one must always define the "artist" in terms of the questions one is asking. Operationalizing these definitions in the context of actual research is the difficult thing. Have researchers made the best use of available methods in the work that has been done on artists thus far? Quite clearly, he said, we have not yet done so. Studies often rely on crude methods of sampling and identification. We should better contextualize our research, he argued, with respect to the entire world of art in all its diversity. We are still stuck in a groove of looking at labor force statistics, pigeonholing people into occupational categories and so on, rather than setting the research in the broader context of the nature of the arts and the cultural development of society. He reported that his own profession, the economics profession, has disregarded this advice, preferring to employ models to which they are accustomed and therefore often failing to come to terms with the most important cultural questions.

Studies of artists often begin with a list. The lists are often inadequate. For example, there is purportedly a list of Australian artists, but everyone knows that it is incomplete. Professor Throsby finds respondent-driven sampling a promising complement or alternative to this approach.

Discussion

Ms. Jeffri noted that no one had spoken about amateur artists. Primarily the focus has been on professional artists, and not on artists from the community. Many artists have noticed this omission (in the field as a whole, not just in this conference) and have tried to build outreach capability. For example, the Metropolitan encourages community groups to try to do opera in new ways. Semi-professional theatres also include the community. Audience involvement is growing in the performing arts in New York, New Mexico, and other locations. But this activity is harder to identify and study.

An unidentified participant suggested that life-history diaries might be useful in studying a venue or a performing group's life cycle.

An unidentified participant noted that many artists are doing work in commercial sectors; in such areas as media, we no longer have clear ideas about what is and is not art.

Wednesday, May 24: 9:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
The Artists Speak
After dinner, visual artist ***James Siena*** of New York City and composer ***Paul Lansky*** of Princeton offered informal and off-the-record reactions to the day's events, describing the development of their own careers and the challenges that they continue to face. Their remarks were followed by a general discussion.

Thursday, May 25: 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
Studying Artists Labor Markets
Panelists: Professor William Bielby (Sociology Department, University of California at Santa Barbara; Professor Pierre-Michel Menger (Directeur, Centre de Sociologie des Arts, Center National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris). *Moderator*: Professor Cecelia Rouse (Economics Department, Princeton University).

Professor William Bielby spoke about the opportunities and challenges of working with labor unions. His own research has been in cooperation with the Writers Guild West, the Hollywood-based union that represents film and television writers. The Guild's leadership was concerned with opportunities for women, writers of color, and older writers and wanted professional-quality research to use in collective bargaining. Professor Bielby and his collaborator Denise Bielby had worked on issues of gender equity in the labor force, and found this an attractive opportunity. The Guild provided data and asked the researchers to answer questions about the relative work experiences of women and men, writers of color and white writers, and writers over forty and those forty years old or younger. The contract specified that the researchers could use the data for their own scholarship so long as confidentiality of individual records was protected.

Professor Bielby noted that the data are collected and organized by the Writers Guild West for administrative purposes --- enabling them to administer certain benefits programs – and were not designed for scientific purposes. This is likely to be true for any union records used for research on artists. Moreover, whenever one works with unions or other formal organizations, political issues come into play. The Writers Guild represents everyone who writes for network television and the major cable networks and almost everyone who writes for feature films produced in the U.S. Its members range from struggling freelancers, a group whose median annual earnings are "0," as well as the most successful writer-producers, who hire and supervise other writers. Because of the nature of work in this industry, there are no union "locals."

Professor Bielby noted that this opportunity intersected with a number of ongoing research interests of his and of his collaborator, Professor Denise Bielby. One such interest was in how changes in the organization of work influence different kinds of workers. In this case, he was interested in how changes in the TV industry affect people who work freelance and those who are long-term employees in ongoing series – a distinction that maps onto the "markets vs. hierarchy" distinction of great interest to many social scientists. They also had a longstanding research interest in discrimination that the Guild leadership shared; and in the effects of regulation and industrial change on the labor force. A very few large studios dominate television production and a small number of television networks control distribution. Since the 1970s, the federal government has relaxed syndication rules that were originally intended to separate production and distribution, creating an interesting natural experiment in which researchers can address the issues of the relationship between concentration and product diversity that Richard Peterson and David Berger raised (for the music industry) in a classic article in 1975.

Professor Bielby spoke about a number of interesting methodological issues that the research raised. The researchers had the advantage of studying a whole population – members of the Writers Guild of America West, which includes almost everyone who writes fictional narratives for companies that produce films in the U.S. and for most of

the major television production companies. Thanks to the closed-shop status of most of the industry, he did not face the "hidden-population" about which so much was said on Wednesday.

For this population, a number of different units of analysis are important: individual writers, the projects they work on, credits and so on. There are many parallels to the research on scientists about which Dr. Zuckerman spoke the previous evening, and many fine points in reading and coding credits. (For example, a writing credit to "Smith & Jones" means something different [co-writing] than a writing credit to "Smith and Jones" [Jones rewrote Smith's work]. Elaborate union rules govern who gets credit and in what order.) Other units of analysis that are important include the companies that for which writers work (there are hundreds though just a few account for a high proportion of the work), joint ventures, and ties between writers and the talent agencies, which now do not simply get writers jobs but also are major packagers of entire projects. Genres are yet another level of analysis, one that involves the understanding of aesthetic criteria used by audiences and industry gatekeepers. Genres are like scientific disciplines except that audiences have as much claim to define them as do creators.

Professor Bielby noted his interest in how the writers' labor markets work – how writers find jobs, how organizations match them to jobs, and how labor market processes are structured and play themselves out. This labor market is different from many other labor markets (including some artistic ones) in that there is no tenure and little job stability: people build careers by moving from project to project. Whereas in science there are well-understood criteria for identifying high-quality work and experienced investigators know when they have a paper that is publishable in a good journal, in film an television no one knows even after the final script is done whether it will fly or not – risk, ambiguity, and uncertainty are endemic. Their ubiquity is a key factor structuring the industry and labor market.

Professor Bielby described the difficulties of turning an administrative database into a social science database. One might think that the administrative data linked writers to projects to credits to collaborators and employing organizations, with information about earnings. But most of these bits of information are in separate data files. Sometimes they can be matched through identification numbers, but only with months and months of work (including hand coding of raw documents) were necessary to create a usable data set. The central data source is a "work effort file" that contains information on employers, projects, and quarterly earnings for each writer. A separate membership file contains basic information on Guild members at the time they joined the Guild: gender, race, and the name of their agents. The Guild collects full data about on-screen credits, but not on writers in a project who do not received credit on screen.

Professor Bielby presented graphic information that demonstrated that the numbers of writers has increased at a far faster rate between 1988 and 1997 than the amount of work available. The work is still dominated by white men, with few gains for women and minorities. The latter had 21 percent of writing jobs in 1982 and just 27 percent in 1997. Writers of color (men and women) accounted for about 5 percent of the work, their numbers rising and falling with trends in ethnically specific genres. (For example, when the UPN cable network was trying to break into the market, they focused on the African-American audience, with shows with largely African-American casts and writing staffs. Now that they are trying to expand to the "mainstream" market, some of these

opportunities are declining.) Whereas, Census data suggests that in most writing professions (and in most countries around the world) majority-race men account for about half of the work, the number for film and TV in the U.S. is closer to 75 percent. This disparity suggests that what sociologists refer to as processes of "social closure" --- social processes that tend to reproduce the privilege of a particular group over time – are at work.

Between 1982 and 1997, generational succession has been evident in the age profile of writers. As recently as 1987, those pre-boomer-generation writers who had survived the blacklist era constituted about half of all writing credits, compared to just 20 percent in 1997. By 1989, the boomers came to dominate the industry, with doing about two thirds of the writing work; at that time "Gen X'ers" (the first post-baby-boom generation) were beginning to achieve a significant share.

If one examines the "age-earning profile" – the graph of earnings plotted against age – one seems another kind of change. In the 1980s, the highest paid writers were in their 50s. By 1990s, as an emphasis on youth swept the industry, the best paid writers were in their 30s. Most writers continue to seek work up to age 64, but by 1997 the percentage that were actually employed declined monotonically with age. Moreover, as the number of Guild members increased, the percentage of writers in any age range declined with one exception: under the age of 30, who were *more* likely to be employed in 1997 than they were in the 1980s and early 1990s. Professor Bielby indicated that this youth movement reflected increased competition in the industry, and increased uncertainty on the part of industry executives about strategic response. Unsure of their own reflexes, they recruit writers from the generation of viewers they are hoping to reach.

How has the rise of cable television influenced the industry? In their last report to the Guild, William Bielby and Denise Bielby examined the proportion of employment accounted for by motion picture and film divisions of major motion picture studios and the TV networks and found that the proportion has actually increased: the large multinationals account for a larger share of writers' work than they did in 1987. This is a result of the relaxation of regulatory constraints on production by networks themselves.

Freelancers account for about 25 percent of all writers and about 15 percent of on-screen credits for most of the networks, with UPN the outlier, having almost twice that proportion. Freelancers hold 62 percent of the work force (and 38 percent of on-screen credits) for shows written for 1st-run syndication (i.e., sale to independent stations rather than initial runs on major networks) (Most first-run writing is still done for network television, not for original cable programming, which is still a small market.)

Professor Bielby reported that only 30 of the 130 television series produced in 1997-98 employed more than one writer of color. The 14 series that employed the most writers of color were all African-American-oriented genre shows (mostly comedies, with two dramas). Earnings (logged) are a function of age (being younger is better) even controlling for recent success. The advantage of the young has become greater over time; and has Of 130 series in 97-98 series, only 30 employed more than one writer of color. The top 14 were African-American genre shows (mostly comedy, with a couple dramas). As nets like UPN get larger they go for larger white audience and these opportunities dry up. Earnings (logged) are a function of age (being younger helps) – even controlling for recent success. This relationship, which is stronger in television than in film, has become stronger in both media over time, as television also becomes a young person's game.

The reason for this is that all the producers are trying to attract a young audience. Moreover, the ability of ratings services to measure viewer age has improved. Because the producers believe that young (under-35 year old) writers are able to reach this audience, they compete for their services, at the expense of the veterans.

Professor Pierre-Michel Menger spoke about the relationship between "demand-side" data and "supply-side" data on artists, and how they are related to one another. He began by summarizing the results of his research on French artists. Artists as a whole are younger than the general work force, better educated, more concentrated in a few metropolitan areas, more often hold multiple jobs, and have higher rates of self-employment, unemployment, and constrained underemployment (including nonvoluntary part-time work, intermittent work, and fewer hours of work). They earn less than workers in similar occupational categories, yet their occupational markets are steadily expanding. How can artists be doing so poorly when demand for their services appears to be increasing?

Professor Menger called attention to discrepancies between supply-side data and demand-side information. From a labor-supply standpoint, each worker has one career. In the arts, however, it is difficult to turn professional commitments to work and careers. Self-employment, freelancing, and contingent work all have similar effects: to induce discontinuity and alternation between professional work, "day jobs," and spells of unemployment, as well as to increase the time spent on job search and networking. Therefore statistics on the number of artists are probably not true indicators of the level of artistic supply (and unemployment in the relevant labor market) because not all "artists" are looking for art work at all times.

Labor demand data – information on such things as the number of contracts, hirings, or works sold on the market – would seem to be more straightforward. Data on Such data can be aggregated to statistics on the demand for artistic labor, as well as on the quantities and prices of work.

Professor Menger wishes to bring supply and demand together. What is the impact of data on artist occupations of the fact that labor demand is expressed primarily in terms of freelance, short-term contingent work? Research actually shows that the number of artists has increased more quickly than the level of activity (demand) for which artists are paid. There is more work, but the number of competing artists is growing even more quickly. The result is excessive unemployment, greater inequality, more work rationing, and more cycling among employment states.

Professor Menger displayed data on the French labor market for performing artists between 1986 and 1997. During this period the number of hirings and the number of artists working at all grew very quickly. By contrast total earnings and the total number of days worked have increased much more slowly. Median hirings per artist have risen steadily over this period, but median days worked (per year) and median earnings have declined over this same period. Data on contracts note that the median length of employment spells declined very sharply. Median income per day worked has risen, but not quickly enough to make up for the decline in the duration of employment spells.

The usefulness of supply-side data on spells of employment is limited by problems with the way that artists are identified and sampled, so these data must be supplemented with research on the demand side. In the best of all worlds, one would follow cohorts of artists through longitudinal surveys. Cross-sectional data provides only

a snapshot, though perhaps we can do better at gathering retrospective employment data --- though the complexity of artists' working lives makes this difficult.

Research on labor demand is rendered difficult by specific characteristics of the arts. We need to get information on industry wide work agreements and institutions, drawing on data from social security records, pension funds and so on. The rise of contingent work in the arts means that researchers must learn to work with earnings reports that are based on totally disaggregated data, with separate information on each job that each artist receives.

Professor Menger noted that new research opportunities are available. He has worked with data from the motion picture industry's health and welfare fund; William and Denise Bielby have worked with the Writers Guild-West; and Menger has collaborated with Canadian colleagues on the application of random-effects logistic regression models to panel data (as a substitute for durational models, with their more stringent assumptions). Labor-force segmentation can be carefully modeled with data not just on human capital variables but also on the mechanics of work allocation, reputation building, and bargaining relationships with employers and clients – in effect, models of both sides of the labor market. The human-capital framework does not apply so well to many artistic occupations. Age-earning profiles vary greatly among art forms. The effects on earnings of work experience are positive only over a short period of time. In many fields, young artists may be much in demand, then experience a long eclipse, only to be rediscovered (if they are lucky) later in life.

Analyses based on the customary census indicators and approaches (e.g., human capital theory) challenge conventional ideas about how to design quantitative research on labor markets and occupations (e.g., on the effects of day jobs, and movement in and out of employment, on earnings). Even classical music artists, who, when they work for orchestras, hold relatively stable jobs, supply several interlinked labor markets by holding multiple jobs and filling different roles. As a result, the best research designs combine analysis of micro-data from professional arts sources with results from specifically designed surveys, tailored to a particular artistic specialty. Samples for these studies are based on amount of work, earnings, and sectoral diversification of artistic work, as documented in personal records gathered from guilds, unions, pension funds, and so on (data that can then be merged with survey results). The surveys focus on such issues as work schedule, cycling among employment states, multiple job-holding, portfolio employment strategies, monetary and nonmonetary evaluations of different kinds of work situations, and so on. .

Professor Menger noted the paradoxical status of artists as highly skilled contingent workers. Contingent employment is expanding rapidly in several highly skilled service professions (accounting, human resource mgmt, law) and the performing arts have been avant-garde in this respect, with labor markets that have become hyper-flexible. Freelancers can be hired for 2 to 3 hours and then released without the costly dismissal processes that must be applied to regular employees. These developments raise two important research questions. First, how do artists manage their occupational risk? Which risks are manageable through diversifying work and income sources? Which risks are better managed collectively, through union activity? Which must be managed socially, through public support programs? Artists, he argues, are special because they must control as much as possible of the supply of a highly differentiated good: his or her

talents. Second, how can an apparatus of collective agreements and social institutions substitute for the missing role of the unique employer? Some artist occupations are moving towards a three-tier compensation scheme, wherein collective bargaining, contracts, and regulation all help to sustain earnings. Unions may find a new role in this system.

Uncertainty is a market characteristic that leads both to uncertainty and to the nonroutine experiences that stoke the fires of innovation. Artists oscillate between the dark side and the sunny side of uncertainty in their work.

Discussion

Ms. Rouse reported that she was struck by the fact that both speakers raised – but did not explain – a puzzling anomaly from the standpoint of economic theory. Both talked about the growing supply of artists in the face of constant demand. Yet in neither case were earnings per hour falling; and in neither case did the greater level of competition produce more equality between male and female wages. Are employers using their stronger market position to discriminate more rather than reduce wages?

Mr. Bielby responded that writers who are successful are making lots of money, and the unions have been effective in keeping wages high through collective bargaining. On gender, he believes on the basis of other research that social closure is most likely to be successful in decision-making contexts that are surrounded by uncertainty, risk, and lack of accountability with respect to the impact of employment practices on groups with unequal access. Professor Bielby said that by these criteria, if he wanted to design a system that without any explicit animus would nonetheless have a negative impact on women, he would design precisely the system that now operates in the performing arts. He notes that in the 1920s, before the factory system was instituted, women were more active in the movie industry than they were thereafter. *Mr. Menger* added that he computed income inequality among men and women in France, and found that actresses earn 15 percent less than actors, the same as in the broader labor market. The mechanics of work allocation induce a huge variance of income (so much so that one cannot use normal statistical indicators like median incomes to judge central tendencies). In France, actors have an inducement to work at very low wages because they must work a certain amount to become eligible for unemployment benefits. Employers are well aware of this. In effect, bargaining in France involves the employer, the employee and a (passive) insurer.

Ms. Karttunen asked if the data that Mr. Menger presented cast any light on the Baumol/-Bowen thesis? Is it possible that labor has become more efficient? *Mr. Menger* notes that the Baumol-Bowen thesis was based on the cost of full-time employment. One solution to the "cost disease" has been for arts producers to substitute contingent labor for regular employment. Baroque music has grown as a result of the replacement of permanent by nonpermanent jobs (making it easy to employ small ensembles for short times). In this way, contingency can encourage innovativeness. The positive side of these arrangements is that artists may like to be more flexible and have more jobs, because they can then learn more, develop better professional networks (which are central to employment in the arts), and acquire more human capital as well.

Ms. Shikegawa asked Mr. Bielby if one sees the same trend towards youth in directing and studio jobs as well as in writing. *Mr. Bielby* responded that this is definitely the case for the people who are making programming decisions at networks and studios, many of whom are under 30. It is probably not yet the case for directors of feature film, or for directors in Probably not yet true among directors in feature film, or in directing for episodic TV. TV producers are all writers as well: They tend to be young, except for an elite of people like David Kelly and Stephen Botchko, who are older but who now hire younger writers to work for them.

Ms. Shikegawa asked Mr. Menger to say more about his comment that researchers can create "pseudo-longitudinal" studies to compensate for the lack of real longitudinal research. *Mr. Menger* replied that it is difficult for artists to reconstruct their careers because memory is too imperfect for retrospective surveys to be effective. *Mr. White* asked Mr. Menger if one could use the life-history-chart approach that Mr. McPherson described on Wednesday. *Mr. Menger* responded that you might for some purposes, but that given the episodic nature of artistic work, it would be difficult. He added that one of the main advantages of demand-side data is that one can use information from unions and pension funds to rebuild the career line for particular artists. If one can add to this the advantages of supply-side research (specialized cross-sectional surveys of artists in particular fields) one can have the advantages of both.

Mr. Heckathorn asked about the role of uncertainty in artistic labor markets, and how it might generate differences among different art forms. Movie making, for example, is highly uncertain, but orchestras face less uncertainty. He notes that it seems that lots of Hollywood stars' kids and siblings become successful actors, whereas not many world-class orchestra musicians can pass down positions to their children. Mr. Heckathorn speculated that this is a result of uncertainty. Because symphony orchestras use objective standards to audition musicians, the age distribution in orchestras is pretty heterogeneous. By contrast, in rock music, where there is greater uncertainty, you have greater age homogeneity. *Ms. Rouse* replied that heterogeneity of age in orchestras reflects the institution of tenure, and not the age at hiring, which is relatively homogeneous.

Mr. Throsby asked if there are ways to use our surveys to ask about uncertainty. *Mr. Bielby* said that he prefers to examine institutional mechanisms used to deal with uncertainty. That is why he began to study talent agencies, which have changed their function into project packagers in order to help reduce uncertainty. *Mr. Menger* said that how one studies uncertainty depends on one's theoretical framework. If one can interpret the distribution in artists' careers of recurrent and non-recurrent types of work as a measure of uncertainty, then a survey can gather this information. He argued that producers try to reduce uncertainty at all costs, whereas artists try to keep it high, but not so high hat they lack the stability they need to do their art.

Mr. DiMaggio asked why people keep going into the arts, given the decline in work opportunities associated with increased competition. *Mr. Bielby* noted that the youngest people are actually doing well – unemployment is down in their cohort – and that there are also ways to make money writing for the new media (in jobs that do not show up in

the union records). *Mr. White* suggested that the arts constitute a "sucker occupation" – people are lured in long enough to get stuck, and then the opportunities go downhill. *Ms. Rouse* argued that the skewed distribution of rewards makes the average expected earnings rather high, although very few people will ever see them. She suspects that many people go into the arts when they are young, roll the dice, and if they don't make it very big, they move on. *Mr. Menger* stated his view that culture is a truly new economic sector, less idiosyncratic now then in past, with more social support for being an artist. He noted that Mr. Throsby makes this point in a forthcoming book.

Mr. Wassall stated his opinion that the demographics that Mr. Bielby found in Hollywood are driven by demand. He noted that the database contains only income from film and television writing. He wondered if older writers with better knowledge of the lay of the land are finding opportunities outside of film and TV writing that they accept happily. He asked if there is any anecdotal evidence about what the older writers may be doing. *Mr. Bielby* reported that the anecdotes suggest that it is getting tougher and tougher for older writers. More of them are writing for shows that are produced for first-run syndication, a residual market that is widely perceived as a less desirable sector of the industry.

Mr. Urice noted that he was struck by the over-time consistency of the 75 percent of writers who are white males. He asked if there are any other changes that have occurred in the composition of this group – for example in sexual preference, geographic distribution, religious memberships, or so on. *Mr. Bielby* said that these data were not available.

Mr. Tepper asked if artists are playing probabilities. Do they have enough human capital that they are confident of being able to move on if artistic careers prove unviable? Do we have any information about the other occupations to which artists move when they leave the arts? Or do they stay in the arts and struggle for their whole work lives? *Mr. Bielby* answered that duration of employment in artistic professions is highly variable. This is a serious issue for the Guilds, who wonder if they should be putting resources into representing young people who roll the dice once, as opposed to their members who are playing the recurrent contracting game, doing pretty well, and have different interests. *Mr. Menger* said that in France one third of performing artists vanish from the labor rolls within two years of entry. *Mr. Bielby* noted that the number of aspiring writers far outpaces the number who ever sell scripts. The Writers Guild's script registration program, a service that protects intellectual property, registers 30,000 scripts or script treatments per year. *Ms. Sidford* asked if the Guild keeps records on how unemployed writers supplement their income. *Mr. Bielby* responded that they do not, and that is how supplementary surveys of the kind that Mr. Menger advocates can be useful.

Ms. Jeffri noted that union records include many people who are really no longer in the active labor force, because once you get into the union, you usually don't choose to get out. She notes that she pays her $39 to Actors Equity twice each year, and is counted as a member who has no income from acting. *Mr. Bielby* replied that with longitudinal data from union sources, one can limit analyses to people who have worked at least once during the previous three years.

Thursday, May 25: 10:45 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Methods for Studying Artists through Communities and Organizations
Panel: Teunis IJdens (Art and Culture Studies, Erasmus University); Maria-Rosario Jackson (The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.); Joan Jeffri (Research Center for Arts and Culture, Columbia University)

Teunis IJdens
Professor IJdens began by discussing the concept of population, and the question of who is an artist and who is not. He argued that occupational population, unlike natural populations, are produced by politics (broadly defined) and labeled through a series of political decisions. It is important to ask to what extent the research we do is theory-driven, policy-driven, or driven by methodology, and how that affects the concept of population that we use.

Professor IJdens discussed the way in which artists were defined in the Netherlands, pointing to shifting definitions and long-term controversy over who should be permitted to join professional associations of visual artists. This was part of a research project on the history of the largest association of visual artists in the Netherlands (BBK). This national association was formed by the end of the 2nd World War by artists who took part in the Resistance against the German occupation. Just after the war, a correct (anti-fascist) attitude was the first requisite for membership. In the fifties, eligibiliyt was predominantly discussed in terms of `art' versus `kitsch.' Artistic quality became the first criterion. In the sixties, traditional ideas on artistic quality were challenged by new art forms. At the same time, the issue of membership criteria became mixed up with the growing importance of a special social scheme for visual artists, the BKR (Provision for Visual Artists). In this scheme, the state (through the municipalities) bought works of art at a standard price in order to establish a minimum wage for professional artists who couldn't make a living in the private art market. In order to qualify for the scheme, an applicant's work had to meet certain basic requirements of artistic quality. Municipalities decided on admittance to the scheme on the advice of committees which partly consisted of association's members. Conflicts arose about older members in these committees rejecting younger members' work. This dispute was settled in favor of the younger generation and the syndicalist faction in the association, and many older artists were removed from the BKR-committees. After this, the relationship between admittance to the scheme and criteria for membership remained a central issue. In 1968, the association demanded that all members should be admitted to the BKR if they applied for the scheme. One year later, the association decided that anyone who had been admitted to the BKR automatically qualified as a professional artist and thus for membership. It seems that hardly anyone realized that this was of course a crucial change in the relationship between the organized occupation of visual artists and the state.
Professor IJdens described his research on art lease-lending organizations, which focused on the composition of the artists who were covered, the composition of the art collections themselves, how clients chose among suppliers, and the practices of the organizations themselves. One of the factors that have an impact on choices by (potential) art lease clients is the quality of collections in their vicinity. It wasn't left up to clients alone to judge the quality of collections, nor - for obvious reasons - to curators and managers of

art lease organizations. Instead, a database was gathered of artists who received recognition through different forms of state-sponsored support, subsidized acquisition of their work by museums, subsidized commissions, et cetera, in the period from 1984 until 1990. The number of artists who scored at least once on one of these indicators of 'institutional recognition' amounted to nearly 6.000, and each artist's institutional recognition was measured by the number of times (years) he or she appeared in a list of beneficiaries. The Law on Income Provision for Artists (WIK) grants professional artists about 70 percent of a normal social welfare benefit. In exchange, it relieves artists on social welfare from the obligation to apply for non-artistic paid work, and it offers them the opportunity to earn extra income up to about 125 per cent of the social welfare level. The introduction of a strict obligation to look for paid work into the new social welfare regime of the nineties was an important argument for special legislation on artists' incomes. An artist can make use of the WIK for a maximum of 48 months in a flexible pattern, according to his financial situation, and for a maximum period of ten years. Municipalities, who decide whether applicants qualify for the WIK (they must be *professional* artists whose *income* is below the social welfare level) are statutory obliged to consider the advice of an independent national agency on whether the applicant is a professional artist. Another national agency was statutory assigned to register artists who are admitted to the WIK and to keep score of the time they've used up. The income provision, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Labor, is accompanied by measures aimed at improving an artist's chances to become self-sufficient with or without additional income from arts-related or non-arts related work. The Ministry of Culture is responsible for this professional development program, and has assigned its implementation to two separate national agencies: one for visual artists, and one for performing artists. Professor IJdens has been asked to conduct an evaluation study of this development program. He has proposed to use administrative data collected by municipalities and various national agencies in order to measure the program's coverage and impact. Apart from the technical and conceptual questions which are raised by this approach - some standardization of key variables and a central database will be necessary -, the main problem until now has been one of *control*. Data-collection on artists is not a neutral tool, but is tied up with strategic behavior by agencies who are stakeholders in the distribution of power and financial resources.

Returning to his initial statement, Professor IJdens once more stresses the fact that occupational groups such as artists are socially and politically constructed. The three research projects he has talked about may serve as an example and as an argument in favor of an institutional approach to defining artists' populations. Social scientists should consider the role they play in the social construction of such populations, before they turn to the apparent 'technicalities' of empirical research.

Maria-Rosario Jackson

Dr. Jackson reported on a study of artists that she is currently planning, as well as on the implications of her earlier work, which sought to develop a deeper understanding of arts and culture at the neighborhood level. This work on neighborhoods, she believes, poses conceptual issues that should be considered in studies of artists.

The Arts and Cultures Indicator Project asked how the arts and culture are valued in neighborhoods, and what kind of data may enable us to explore the relationship between the arts and neighborhood well-being. Dr. Jackson's research team used interviews with residents, artists, and community-building practitioners in low-income communities and communities of color to develop criteria for assessing the influence of arts and culture on quality of life. They arrived at several principles that governed their work.

First, in determining criteria, the values and preferences of residents in a given community have to be valued. Aesthetic paradigms have to be revealed through research, understood, and honored.

Second, art must be understood as both process and product. Art carries multiple meetings and can be valued for aesthetic and technical qualities or for its expression of ethnic identity or for other meanings. These values can be produced by the artists (producer) or by the audience.

Third, art should be understood to include formal and informal, professional and amateur, expression.

Fourth, art happens in traditional and non-traditional, explicit and implicit venues. Even schools can be important cultural venues.

Fifth, people participate in the arts not just as audience members, but as creators, interpreters, volunteers, and donors.

Sixth, cultural activities are supported by systems and organizations that can be either arts-specific or non-arts-specific (for example, schools, social service agencies, or health organizations).

Dr. Jackson asked how the arts contribute to community building and serve to catalyze civic participation? How do the arts raise social consciousness and contribute to collective action? What is the role of the arts in creating new community assets and revealing olds ones? How do the arts figure into neighborhood development strategies?

Having examined the role of the arts, she is now looking at the role of artists. She has been studying art-based community building processes in Los Angeles, Oakland, and Washington D.C. She noted that three artists' identities have emerged as important: (1) the artist as advocate and community organizer through his or her work; (2) the artist as a social commentator whose work serves as a catalyst to identify issues of community concern; (3) and the artist as teacher. In some cases, other community members use the work of artists who are not particularly interested in community building to further collective purposes.

She is currently struggling to find an operational definition broad enough that she will be able to include artists with a wide variety of perspectives on their work in her new study. Thus far she has developed a tentative definition of artists as individuals who describe their primary professional or vocational identity as that of artist and who demonstrate their practice of or their commitment to the arts through the following: knowledge in specific artistic disciplines, evidence of artistic training, evidence of work and product, dissemination of work, quality of artistic work, peer and non peer recognition, relationship to arts organizations, and relationship to audiences or other intended beneficiaries.

Dr. Jackson hopes to answer questions that have rarely been addressed in the past. For example, what accounts for the intensity of artists' relationship to their work? How is their work valued and judged and by whom? How are artists validated, and is this validation adequate?

Joan Jeffri

Professor Jeffri described the work she has done at the Columbia Center for Arts and Culture (RCAC). That Center has investigated the artistic, social, and human needs of artists in order to provide data to researchers, knowledge for public policy makers, and information for advocates for artists. In studying artists, she has found the sociologist's challenge, the economist's nightmare, and the arts administrator's reality.

RCAC's first study was Information on Artists (IOA), a ten site survey of 10,000 artists in eight cities and two rural areas. The Center undertook fund-raising and held town meetings in each of those sites, presenting the project before audiences of local artists. Her goal was to get to know the community of artists and to find means of entry to that community. Artists who came to the town meetings provided names of organizations that serve artists, which in turn provided lists of artists. Actors' Equity provided lists of its own members.

The Artists Training and Career Project was a national study of painters, actors, and craftspersons. Out of this research came an understanding of how artists view themselves as professionals. The three criteria were marketplace success; educational credentials and professional affiliations; and definition by one's self and one's peer. In nine of the ten IOA cites, the latter was the most common definition. (Only in New York did the marketplace definition predominate among her artist respondents.)

Information on Artists II (IOA-II) was a replication of IOA in four of the original cities ten years later. IOA-II revealed many more multicultural artists and arts organizations than in the original study. As a result, special effort was taken to collect a second sample focused exclusively on artists of color. In IOA-II, RCAC asked respondents for permission to resurvey them later, creating a panel of 600 artists who agreed to be re-interviewed. This will make it possible to identify artists who leave the field (and those who return after they have left).

Professor Jeffri described the Artists of Culture Project, an attempt to reach Hispanic Visual Artists through a questionnaire circulated in Spanish and English, telephone interview, and focus groups. The goal was to understand the special needs, methods, communities, and issues faced by Spanish-speaking artists. For this study RCAC sought to use bilingual liaisons to build bridges to community leaders and to leaders among the Hispanic artist population. Although the project was not brought to the desired fruition, it revealed that Hispanic artists had been marginalized or consigned to specialized roles and that definitions of professionalism differed from those of other artist communities.

Currently, Professor Jeffri is collaborating with Mr. Heckathorn on a study of jazz musicians that will employ response-driven sampling (RDS). RDS seems particularly appropriate for identifying members of a population that differs in structure from city to city and that includes artists who eschew organization memberships and work with trust-based networks of collaboration. The study will also rely on lists to identify jazz artists who are members of the musician's union, and will draw a comparison sample of other kinds of musicians to compare with the jazz artists

Professor Jeffri described her concern, which she believes other researcher share, that her work does not simply end up on bookshelves like many other research reports. She emphasized the importance of disseminating information to organizations that

cooperate in the research, artists' advocacy groups, organizations that make grants to artists, and to museums, state and federal agencies, and to other researchers.

Professor Jeffri observed that some artists would prefer not to be called artists. Their desire to see themselves as unique makes many of them unwilling to respond to surveys. They tend to rely more on informal family-like networks and less on formal organizations and associations than members of other occupations. All this makes them particularly challenging to reach.

Discussion

Mr. McPherson questioned Mr. IJdens statement that populations were politically constructed, by noting that probability samples of populations are the only way to derive generalizable results in studies of artists or other groups. Mr. McPherson noted that sociology originally focused on communities, and that hypernetwork sampling is a way to preserve the advantages of probability sampling, while recovering the emphasis on relationships and holistic analysis that characterized the community-study tradition. Hypernetwork sampling is not individualistic in orientation: rather it uses individuals to understand the interlinkages between the individual and other entities in a system. Probability sampling is the only tool that can be used to give answers that can be replicated across time and across space.

Ms. Rodriguez asked why studies of artists often focus on "artistic quality" as a criterion for membership in the population, when one would not use quality criteria to determine whether someone was a real teacher or plumber, for example. *Ms. Jackson* suggested that the emphasis on quality emerged in part out of the system of patronage that has supported artists and studies of artists. *Ms. Jeffri* said that RCAC never uses quality criteria.

Mr. IJdens asked Ms. Jackson why a definition of professional artists is needed in the Arts and Cultures Indicator Project, which focuses on the impact of the arts on the formation of social capital and neighborhood well-being. *Ms. Jackson* responded that a goal of her project was to understand how artists contribute to communities, and that to do that one had to be able to identify artists. *Ms. Shikegawa* said that the goal was to study the value that artists add to communities, but not to saddle the artist with an obligation to serve the responsibility. *Mr. White* questioned whether "community" should be associated with "neighborhood" as a physical place and asked whether the researchers themselves were imposing a definition of community. He referred to the contentious debate within sociology on the nature of communities and how they should be identified. *Ms. Jackson* responded that she has not used administrative definitions, but has also relied on interviews with community organizations.

Mr. DiMaggio asked *Ms. Jackson* if the criteria she enumerated for defining artists were all necessary to identify someone as an artist, or if any one of them would be sufficient. He wondered if self-identification was crucial, as there are cases where being an "artist" is context-dependent and situationally defined, whether or not the "artist" views himself or herself that way. *Ms. Jackson* replied that the definition was at this point just for heuristic purposes – she and her colleagues are taking each of the components seriously but are not committed to any one of them at this point. *Mr. Throsby* noted that there is a

danger that if one restricts oneself to people whose *primary* profession is artist, one will exclude many people who are real artists by most other definitions.

Ms. Aidala asked the panelists how they learn about very young artists. *Ms. Jeffri* said that if jazz musicians consider an 11-year-old a jazz musician, then the child should be included, even if she or he is not on an organization list. *Mr. Heckathorn* noted that the RDS method would ensure that such artists *are* included. *Mr. DiMaggio* noted that different artistic disciplines and geographic or other communities vary in the way that they use the term artist for themselves or others, so that sensitivity to local vocabulary is important.

Thursday, May 25: 1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Closing Session

On behalf of the co-sponsoring organizations, Tom Bradshaw, Paul DiMaggio, and Joan Jeffri thanked the participants; praised the staff of the Princeton and Columbia Centers for their work on behalf of the meeting; suggested that the group use the closing session to discuss both what they had learned, and what they had not learned that they wished they had learned, during the meeting. Representatives of philanthropic foundations interested in using information about artists to design programs to assist artists were invited to begin the discussion.

Mr. Stephen Urice (Pew Charitable Trusts) began by pointing out that what we do research on should depend on what we want to accomplish. Learning for the sake of learning is marvelous if you can afford it. Learning for the sake of action requires different tools. We are interested in information as input, and for this we need both demand for research and delivery systems for research findings. In our program, we want to increase information on arts and cultural policies, but we also focus on what we and others can do with that information and to whom we can and should disseminate it,

Are we studying only one half of a problem, when we investigate who artists are and what the system looks like? Mr. Urice suggested that we also need to look at what information policy makers (public and private) need to make decisions. What information do we have to take the trustees to help them judge the amount of funds that are necessary for different programs to make a business? It is harder in the arts than in environmental grant making to estimate concretely what an individual program will do for society or the economy. Moreover, we have no idea what it would take to increase government support for arts and culture.

In the age of the Internet, we are all artists. The question is what *is* a professional artist. Should we base our definition on status, activity, output, or some combination of the three? Mr. Urice noted that most poets that he knows make their living teaching, even if they are successful as poets; by contrast, successful visual artists make their primary living doing visual arts. Also, we may want to consider breaking out those artists who work in commercial art as opposed to non-profit art.

There has been a call for more information on career trajectories of artists, which would be very useful. Equally so, he suggested, researchers should be studying the career trajectories of works of arts.

The Pew Charitable Trusts have funded a study, undertaken by Americans for the Arts, that is attempting to map the universe of cultural activity in ten urban areas around the United States. There is not enough information on the number of museums and cultural institutions in the U.S. The project is trying to establish where the cultural institutions are, whom do they serve and how are they funded. The Pew Charitable Trusts are also trying to gather information, through a project undertaken by the Rand Corporation, as to whether good data exist on various art-related questions and, if so, where those data are. They are supporting a process by which arts service organizations are attempting to arrive at comparable data-collection and reporting systems, including output measures of effectiveness. Finally, a "Business of the Arts" desk is being added to the Minnesota Public Radio show "Marketplace."

Ms. Joan Shikegawa (Rockefeller Foundation) noted that the Rockefeller Foundation has just re-evaluated their overall program under the leadership of their new President, whose background is in agricultural economics. Traditionally, 60 percent of the Foundation's grants have been made overseas on behalf of public health and agricultural. Currently, the four major sections of the Rockefeller Foundation are food security, health equity, working communities (formerly equal opportunity), and creativity and culture, to which the Foundation has reaffirmed its commitment.

Ms. Shikegawa noted that the Foundation is supporting a working group on research on the arts at the Social Science Research Council, which has chosen to tackle the challenging topic of the meaning of the art experience in the lives of individual Americans. The Foundation is also supporting work at the Fordham Institute that has produced a book of social indicators entitled *The Social Health of the Nation*. The project was initiated with support from the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation supported the development of a section on arts and cultural indicators.

Ms. Shikegawa said that she was reassured to hear that effective sampling methods exist to study artists. She was surprised, however, to hear so little about new technologies. One of her new program areas is on creativity in the digital era. Might the internet be a useful source of data? She expressed concern about the lack of comparable and transparent data in the arts policy field, noting that administrative data that might be useful for improving the lot of artists is suppressed for political reasons. Will the advent of new technologies make it easier to permit the public to benefit from data collected with public funds, by making those data more readily available?

Ms. Holly Sidford (Ford Foundation) asked how artists serve as agents of connection between institutions and audiences. She noted that she will be working with the Urban Institute on a study of nonprofit organizations' relationship to artists. There are three goals: first, to create a data base of existing programs, fellowships, residencies, and apprenticeship programs from which artists can benefit; second, to assess the role of academic institutions, the commercial sector, and other non-arts institutions on artists in 10 selected communities; and, third, to study other industries that have supported creative work to see if there are implications for artists. Ms. Sidford is interested, as well, in the role of the Internet in philanthropic activity, and in illuminating the arc of artists' careers. And she hopes to learn what are the interventions that would make a significant difference in helping artists.

Ms. Janet Rodriguez (Geraldine Dodge Foundation) reported that she would leave the meeting with a deepened understanding of "homophily." She reports that the Geraldine Dodge Foundation make grants of $3.2 million per year in New Jersey, making it the state's largest private philanthropy. The question they always ask before making a grant in the arts is: How will this grant affect artists and the making of art? Ms. Rodriguez believes that artists want people to know about their suggestion, and are dying to be counted. Who counts them, and how one counts them, is the critical issue.

Ms. Rodriguez underscored the importance of understanding the cultural context for the artist's work, especially if one wants to find a representative and inclusive sample to study. New Jersey has communities of artists who are Ghanaian, Dominican, and Haitian, among other groups. They don't work nine to five, and they pursue different

patterns – for example, to find performing artists from some groups one would need to look in after-hours nightclubs. Visual artists are the most difficult to locate because of the nature of their work. African-American artists, for example, know each other and stay in contact with schools and with one other, but not necessarily with galleries and funders. In the Puerto Rican community, many artists work on paper --- originally, because it was economical. There is much movement between Puerto Rico and Puerto Rican communities on the mainland. One can go to Puerto Rico to and meet with a primary teacher who has taught a whole school of artists working throughout the US. There are artists who make the costumes, floats, and other things for ethnic community festivals. There are also minority web designers. Mr. Rodriguez suggested that foundations that support artists may be helpful in locating artists of different communities, especially the artists they must say "no" to, who are always more numerous than those who receive grants.

Mr. Tom Bradshaw (National Endowment for the Arts) reported that he took away at least three things from the meeting. First, he was fascinated with the methodological implications of the work discussed, and especially with the promise of respondent-driven sampling and the power of probability sampling. Second, the need to learn not just about the artists, but about the network in which artists work, and how these networks shape artistic activity impressed him. Third, he found it interesting to hear from folks in other countries who share similar issues and concerns. The discussions of definitions of artists are very critical, and Ms. Karttunen's paper was very important in addressing the issue.

Discussion
Ms. Rodriguez noted that the word "art" may not work to arouse interest everywhere – for example, the word "environment" works better in South Jersey.

Mr. Bradshaw called attention to the fact that many participants had mentioned the importance of building trust and really understanding the community in doing research on artists. Both national actors and local community members can put information from research on artists to good use, and a track record of using information can help in attracting artists and others to respond to research in the future.

Ms. Shigekawa noted that the Ad Council sometimes runs series of ads (they did one series about artists), and that such publicity for a study might be useful. *Ms. Aidala* agreed that formal and informal publicity is useful before a study gets launched.

Mr. Heckathorn asked, if you help artists, is that going to help art, and suggested that research could tell us what programs work best in assisting artists. It may also tell us to what extent improving the quality of an artist's life improves the quality or quantity of art. We have been speaking about the epidemiological studies of artists, but impact studies are also essential, and may be used to convince policy makers of the value of arts programs. *Mr. DiMaggio* agreed, but noted that it is important to define the goals of programs in a realistic fashion, lest evaluations be fated to bring bad news. As an example, he mentioned programs of arts education, which have been shown to have little effect (in well-designed studies) on learning in non-arts field – a disappointing result,

until one realizes that well-designed studies *never* show significant cross effects of education in one narrowly defined topic area on performance in another. The problem here is not with the programs, but with the expectations that have grown up around them.

Ms. Sidford asked Mr. DiMaggio what he meant when he remarked that artists appear to be in the avant-garde of the labor force, and that research on artists may be important for understanding broader dimensions of economic change. *Mr. DiMaggio* noted that he was referring to an observation that Mr. Menger made in his presentation. There is a trend towards outsourcing and contingent employment in many industries, especially high technology, and Mr. Menger's presentation (and a paper by Ms. Benhamou that will be published in the *Journal of Cultural Economics*) had demonstrated that these were also important trends in the arts. *Mr. Menger* added that the arts are very avant-garde and may presage the employment system of the future. This may or may not be good for artists and the arts: It is important to learn more about arts organizations (in both sectors) and how they manage their relationships with artists.

Mr. White added that we should acknowledge the importance of the government role that Mr. Menger mentioned earlier in the day. Because of differences in government policy, he pointed out, employment trends for artists work differently in the U.S. than in France, and in France from Germany. *Ms. Jeffri* added that there are also important differences between employment dynamics in different artistic disciplines.

Ms. Jeffri concluded the meeting with a call for reflection and collaboration.

Participant List
Research on Artists
Conference -- May 24, 25

Angela Aidala, Columbia University, School of Public Health
William Bielby, University of California, Santa Barbara, Sociology Department
Donnell Butler, Princeton University, Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies (graduate affiliate) and Sociology.
Tom Bradshaw, National Endowment for the Arts
Paul DiMaggio, Princeton University, Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies and Sociology
Shelley Feist, Pew Charitable Trusts
Robert Greenblatt, Survey Consultant, Columbia Research Center for Arts and Culture and American ORT, Inc.
Douglas Heckathorn, Cornell University, Sociology
Teunis IJdens, Erasmus University (Rotterdam), Department of Art and Culture Studies
Joan Jeffri, Columbia University, Research Center for Arts and Culture
Sari Kartunnen , Statistics Bureau of Finland
Stanley Katz, Princeton University, Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies and the Woodrow Wilson School
Jacqueline Luffman, Culture Statistics Program, Statistics Canada.
Carrie Massey, Columbia University, Research Center for Arts and Culture, graduate research assistant
Pierre-Michel Menger, Director, Centre de Sociologie des Arts, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (Paris).
J. Miller McPherson, University of Arizona, Sociology
Maria Rosario Jackson, The Urban Institute
Adrian Ready, Columbia University, Research Center for Arts and Culture, graduate research assistant
Cecilia Rouse, Princeton University, Economics
Ikuya Sato, Visiting Fellow at Princeton University, Sociology and Professor, Hitotsubaski University
Kyoko Sato, Princeton University, Sociology
Holly Sidford, Ford Foundation
Steven Tepper, Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies
Anna Sun, Princeton University, Sociology
David Throsby, Macquarie University (Australia), Economics
Kees van Rees, Tilburg University, Literature, Visiting Fellow in Sociology at Princeton; Editor, *Poetics*
Janet Rodriguez, Geraldine Dodge Foundation
Stephen K. Urice, Pew Charitable Trusts
Greg Wassall, Northeastern University, Economics
Harrison White, Columbia University, Sociology
Catherine Wichterman, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Adina Williams, Graduate Research Assistant, Columbia Center, Columbia University, Research Center for Arts and Culture, graduate research assistant
Harriet Zuckerman, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.