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Abstract
This paper uses data on over 800,000 cultural participants in 1996 and 2004 to examine changes in patterns of cultural participation over these years. The authors discover a consistent pattern in which areas of metropolitan Philadelphia with a large number of cultural organizations are those most likely to have high rates of participation. The connection between institutional presence and cultural engagement was one of SIAP’s first discoveries in the mid-1990s and remains one of its most durable findings.

With respect to change over time, there were also unexpected findings. Participation became more tied to both social class and ethnic diversity. The authors explain this seeming paradox in the context of the “new urban reality”—as ethnic groups became more economically differentiated, high-income, ethnically diverse neighborhoods also became more common. These were now the neighborhoods with the highest rates of cultural participation.

Another pattern uncovered in the 1990s—what SIAP called “alternative” participation that linked socially diverse audiences to newer, more experimental cultural production—seemed to wither over the decade. By 2004 the former “alternative” cultural organizations had participation patterns identical to those of more “mainstream” organizations, a trend attributed to the increasing market orientation within the cultural sector.
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Introduction

Cultural participation provides the single best measure of the importance of the arts and culture to the life of a community. Yet, our ability to measure this vital social indicator has been constrained by a variety of methodological issues. The foremost of these has been researchers’ reliance on surveys as the major tool for estimating cultural participation. Surveys have three features that prevent them from delivering information with sufficient precision. First, they are expensive, so it is difficult to collect enough data to assure clear estimates. Second, a lot of people just don’t answer them, and because those who do are likely to be participants, they generate artificially high estimates. Third, surveys ask people about their behavior instead of measuring it directly, so they are likely to measure what people would like to have done, rather than what they actually did.

In addition to these narrow methodological concerns, there is a broader conceptual problem with surveys. Everything we know tells us that cultural participation is influenced by neighborhood ecology, but surveys are generally ill-suited to measuring these factors. Indeed, in our 2000 paper, we discovered that characteristics of the census block group in which an individual lives is as good as her individual characteristics in predicting that person’s cultural participation.¹

Because of these problems, the Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP) has sought to use organizational records as a means of estimating cultural participation. Although this approach has its own challenges, these tend to decline over time, so that the method has the promise of producing a system for regularly monitoring changes in participation. In addition, based as it is on working with cultural organizations around their data-gathering, it produces a salutary side-effect—organizations develop the capacity to assess their practice and to respond to changes in their environment.

SIAP made its first estimates of cultural participation in metropolitan Philadelphia for 1996.² Thanks to funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, over the past two years, we have developed a comparable set of estimates. This paper reports on our findings of this first approximation of how Philadelphia area cultural participation has changed over time.

The story these data tell is both simple and complex. In 1996 we found that there were two dominant dimensions to regional cultural participation. One—which we called ‘mainstream’ participation—was connected to older, more established cultural

institutions and to high-income neighborhoods with many local cultural institutions. The other—which we called ‘alternative’ participation—connected cultural organizations that were newer and involved in more innovative forms of cultural production to neighborhoods that were diverse in their ethnic composition, economic status, and household composition.

By 2004 the difference between our mainstream and alternative dimensions of cultural participation had disappeared. The organizations that had represented the alternative dimension of participation, by 2004 had the same demographic and spatial profile as the mainstream organizations. As in 1996, this profile was strongly correlated with the presence of cultural organizations and high socio-economic status.

That is the simple part of the story, and it appears depressing. It seems to suggest that during a period of eight years that not just one, but a group of organizations that had formerly reached out to a distinctive set of neighborhoods, now were drawing their participants from ‘the usual suspects,’ well-healed neighborhoods that also provided the bulk of participants for older, more established groups. It appears that the Philadelphia ecosystem has lost an important element of diversity, and—as in any ecosystem—the loss of diversity is a warning sign.

The story, however, gets more complex. Although the former ‘alternative’ dimension of participation had disappeared, it turns out, something else had also happened. During the same years, the character of the high-participation neighborhoods itself had changed. In 1996—using 1990 census data—we found that the ‘mainstream’ cultural factor had been uncorrelated with social diversity. By 2004—using 2000 census data—the mainstream neighborhoods had become much more diverse in their ethnic, economic, and household characteristics. In short, during the same years that ‘alternative’ cultural participation had become more mainstream, the mainstream had become more diverse.

Cultural Participation and the New Urban Reality

Cultural participation must be viewed within the context of two dynamics: first, a new urban reality characterized by the expansion of social diversity (fueled by new residential patterns, the emergence of young adult districts, and immigration); and, second, economic inequality and the marketization of the nonprofit cultural sector.

The changing face of cultural participation is an important part of what we have called the new urban reality. After four decades during which the image of the ‘urban crisis’ was the dominant lens through which to understand cities, the contemporary city is best understood as a mix of forces of decline and regeneration. Most importantly, American cities are moving in two directions at once, with the cultural lives of cities moving toward diversity and integration while their economic lives are moving toward segregation.

Over the past three decades, the diversity of American cities has increased dramatically. The most visible indicator of this new diversity is the changing ethnic composition of urban neighborhoods. In Philadelphia, for example, the proportion of the population living in an ethnically diverse block group nearly doubled between 1990 and 2000. But there are two additional dimensions to urban diversity: economic diversity and household

---

3 A diverse block group is one in which no single ethnic group—white, African American, Latin American, or Asian American—makes up more than 80 percent of the population.
diversity. A block group is economically diverse if it has both higher than average poverty and proportion of the labor force in professional and managerial occupations. Household diversity is defined by the proportion of non-family households. Between 1990 and 2000, in the Philadelphia metropolitan area, the proportion of the population living in block groups that were diverse on at least one of these dimensions rose from 29 to 41 percent. In the city of Philadelphia, the increase was from 47 to 60 percent of the population.

Most of this increased heterogeneity was the result of the expansion of ethnic and household diversity. These sections of the city are home to either many different ethnic groups or households that diverge from the so-called ‘traditional’ family. Both of these dimensions represent the cultural differentiation of the city, caused by immigration, declining ethnic segregation, and the diversification of family life. Thus, the major forces of diversification are related to culture.

The new urban reality counters this cultural diversification with increased economic inequality. Over the past two decades, the gap separating the incomes of the poor and the well-off has increased dramatically. Between 1980 and 2000, the Gini coefficient—which measures the proportion of all income that would have to change hands to achieve total income equality—increased from .40 to .46, an increase that wiped out the modest moves towards equality between the 1940s and the 1970s. Two forces combined to achieve this rapid increase in inequality. First, the American economy became what Frank and Cook call a ‘winner-take-all’ economy—one in which a smaller share of participants grab a larger and larger share of rewards. Second, the historic exclusion of African Americans and women from high paying jobs ended. This paradox—that the end of group exclusion and the increase in inequality can go hand-in-hand—is one of the defining features of our era.

Economic forces have also influenced the arts world. The marketization of the nonprofit cultural sector—the increased stress placed on earned income and financial performance—has been the dominant policy in the cultural sector for the past 15 years. With the end of the era of expanding institutional and government support for nonprofit culture, existing organizations have had little choice but to give greater priority to economic health. This trend has been accelerated by the adoption of managerial ideologies by philanthropic grant-makers who have used concepts of accountability and sustainability in an attempt to turn to negative fiscal necessity into a positive good.

Increasing marketization has disparate effects on different parts of the cultural sector. Larger nonprofit institutions begin to act more like large commercial organizations—competing for market share and revenue streams. Very small organizations—those most dependent on volunteer labor and élan—are the least affected. Those caught in the

---

4 Here we use the census definition of a family. A family household is defined as one in which the head of household is living with either a spouse or a child. Other domestic arrangements that might be called a family—cohabiting couples, for example—are not family households by this definition.


middle—literally—are mid-sized organizations that have professional staff, relatively large fixed costs, and little ability to compete in a new winner-take-all world. As a recent Rand Corporation study concluded:

While the commercial recording and broadcast performing arts industry is growing more and more concentrated globally, live performances are proliferating at the local level, typically in very small organizations with low operating budgets and a mix of paid and unpaid performers and staff. At the same time, a few very large nonprofit and commercial organizations are growing larger and staging ever more elaborate productions. Midsized nonprofit organizations, on the other hand, are facing the greatest difficulty in attracting enough revenues to cover their costs. Many of these groups are likely to disappear. 7

The new urban reality—characterized by increasing cultural diversity and economic inequality—and the marketization of the cultural world were two powerful forces shaping the contours of cultural participation during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Yet, because most studies rely on survey data that do not measure the spatial impact on neighborhoods, these changes have gone largely unnoticed. SIAP’s small-area participation estimates provide an important means of measuring these influences.

Methodology

Small area participation estimates

What are small-area participation estimates? Small-area estimates of cultural participation are developed using organizational records to measure the actual behavior of residents and linking that behavior to specific parts of the city. We develop participation data bases, by organization, using a variety of data. These include: audiences, patrons, or visitors (single ticket buyers or subscribers); students or other program registration (typically for classes or workshops); membership and individual volunteers or donors; and mailing list entries. Using geographic information system (GIS) software, we can take, for example, an address list of people registered for classes at an art school and identify the specific geographical location of each student. Once an individual record is placed in a specific location, we are able to aggregate all the records for a particular list to determine which parts of the city have the most registrants and which have the least.8 Through the geo-coding and analysis of not just one but many lists, we can begin to uncover specific, persistent patterns of cultural participation present in a metropolitan area.

A number of the data bases used in SIAP’s 2004 cultural participation estimates were made available by the Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance (GPCA) and come from the Philadelphia Cultural List Cooperative (PCLC), a master data base of mailing lists compiled from participating Cultural Alliance member organizations. The purpose of the List Cooperative is to simplify mailing list exchanges, save time for cultural marketers, and cut costs for individual organizational members. The PCLC was developed by GPCA

---


8 One feature of the method to ensure confidentiality is that after the initial geographic coding of a household address, all individual information on that address is deleted. All geo-coded data are immediately converted to ‘block group counts,’ that is, the number of participants for a particular list located in a particular census block group. From then on, all information is concerned with this aggregate number, not with a particular individual or set of individuals.
as a marketing tool for members but has been adapted by SIAP for the participation research. Information from 51 cultural organizations came from the PCLC list. In addition, SIAP contacted many organizations directly. As a result, another thirteen organizations were added to the data base for the 2004 set of estimates.

Although small-area estimates have several advantages, they possess drawbacks as well. The first issue is representativeness. Given that we can collect data on only a finite number of organizations, do the data provide a balanced representation of total cultural participation? There are several predictable biases in the estimates based on our method. First, more established organizations are more likely to gather routine data on participants. For example, we were able to collect information from about five percent of all cultural resources in metropolitan Philadelphia. Among more established groups, our sample ranged from 12 percent of small organizations ($100,000 to $500,000 total annual income) to 34 percent of very large groups (over $5 million income). We collected data from less than one percent, however, among the over 800 cultural resources with budgets of under $100,000. Our sample also varied by the type of organizations. We collected data from more than a fifth of community arts centers, but from less than one percent of historic sites and libraries.

One of the greatest challenges in using these data is the predominance of large organizations. As we have seen, these groups are more likely to have been sampled than smaller groups. In addition, because of their sheer number of participants, large organizations tend to dominate the raw participation figures. For example, of the total of 615,000 participants included in the 2004 analysis, the top six organizations account for over 300,000. In contrast, the smallest forty organizations account for less than ten percent of all participants.

We responded to the reality of this distribution in two ways. First, we have to accept that there are limitations to the analysis. Specifically, smaller organizations that might have a participation distribution that differs from that of groups included in the analysis are not represented. It may be that there are patterns of participation in addition to those we have uncovered.

The second response is methodological. Because of the huge differences in size of participant base, we have employed statistical techniques that use the standardized distribution of each organization’s participants. So, whereas the participation rate of one organization may be one-hundred times that of another, they are both represented in the analysis as if they have a mean of zero (0) and a standard deviation of one (1). As a result, our analysis of underlying patterns of participation is not biased by the differences in size of organizations.

This method has an additional benefit: it reduces selection bias. Although a larger organization has a better chance of being in the sample than a smaller group, any pattern of participation visible among the smaller groups will not be overwhelmed because due to their small size. Because the focus of the research is distinct patterns of participation—rather than simply their aggregate—this method will uncover these patterns, even among under-represented categories of cultural providers.

The final potential problem with the method is that there are types of behavior that simply do not show up on these participation lists. Free, unticketed performances and
exhibits, street festivals, other special events generally are not represented in this study. With previous analyses that focused on community-based cultural resources, we have arranged for research assistants to record the names and addresses of participants at these types of public events. However, by and large, “sign-in” data are not included in the regional cultural participation data base.

Small-area estimates are not a perfect method. However, they provide a level of reliability that would be very difficult to achieve using survey methods. In addition, because they focus on actual behavior rather than reports of behavior (which are likely to be influenced by memory and perceptions of social desirability), they provide superior estimates to those produced by surveys.

After all records are geo-coded and aggregated to block groups, we create a single data base of the metropolitan area’s block groups with separate participant counts for each organizational list. Typically, a number of participant records can not be geo-coded because the address is incomplete or incorrect. Those un-geo-coded cases that have an identifiable zip code are then assigned to the block groups in that zip code in proportion to their share of the zip code’s population. Finally, the adjusted participant counts are divided by the block group’s population (and multiplied by 1,000) to give us a participant rate (per 1,000 residents) for each data set.

**Factor analysis**

The major element of the data analysis consists of using data reduction techniques to discover the various dimensions among the individual participant datasets. Factor analysis is a multivariate technique that analyzes the co-variance a set of variables. Its purpose is to determine if several separate variables have the same pattern of co-variation. When it identified these patterns, it calculates the extent to which the general pattern (factor) is correlated with the original variables. Typically, a factor analysis will discover several of these underlying factors; in the analysis in this paper, we looked only for factors that were not correlated with one another (orthogonal). Through a process called ‘rotation,’ the analysis can then maximize the connection between a particular set of variables and each factor.

In this study, the purpose of the factor analysis was to determine if several different cultural organizations shared the same geographical pattern of participation. For example, if two groups draw many of their participants from the same neighborhoods—and, by the same token, are underrepresented in other neighborhoods—they would both load on the same factor. Through statistical tweaking, we can identify a set of factors that represent distinctive geographical patterns across the metropolitan area.

Once the factor analysis is completed, we can ask two other questions. First, we can examine the cultural organizations that are strongly represented on a particular factor and ask if they share any characteristics that might explain their similar geographical pattern. Second, we can look at the geographical areas and ask if they share any characteristics. This ability to link cultural participation patterns with the characteristics of organizations and neighborhoods gives small-area participation estimates their explanatory power.

Of course, this method would only be useful if geography matters, that is, if the area in which one resides in some way influences the likelihood that one will participate in the
arts. SIAP’s previous work suggests that these ‘neighborhood effects’ are indeed an important part of the explanation of cultural participation in metropolitan Philadelphia.

**Importance of Neighborhood Effects**

One of the major discoveries in SIAP’s previous work on cultural participation is the relative importance of ‘neighborhood effects’ in explaining participation. Thanks to assistance from the research office of the National Endowment for the Arts, we were able to use a version of the 1997 survey of public participation in the arts that included the zip code of each respondent. This allowed us to link information on the respondent’s immediate neighborhood to her individual information and therefore to assess the relative contribution of individual and ecological influences on participation. In addition, we were able to use the survey to compare our findings on Philadelphia with three other metropolitan areas: Chicago, Atlanta, and San Francisco.9

One of the major preoccupations with cultural research in recent years has been to explain the significance of culture to the larger society. Not surprisingly, in a nation as wedded to individualism as is the United States, the bulk of work on developing such a framework has looked at the individual as the appropriate unit of analysis for understanding the impact of the arts.

This individualistic bias—although consistent with Americans’ prejudices—is out of step with recent trends in the social sciences. In recent years, sociologists have devoted increased attention to the role of context—in particular, communities and networks—in influencing social phenomena. William Julius Wilson, for example, is only one of many poverty researchers to examine the role of social and spatial isolation on the problems of the very poor.10 Robert Putnam, in an influential new book, has argued that social networks are the critical mechanism through which social capital is developed.11 Along similar lines, a number of scholars, including Robert Sampson and Felton Earls, have suggested that “collective efficacy”—a process through which geographic neighborhoods are transformed through the development of social networks—is the critical element in understanding a variety of child outcomes from physical health to cognitive development. As Sampson has noted, a framework that focuses on the embeddedness of individual action in social contexts can avoid “the psychological reductionism that flows from the dominant theoretical and empirical focus on individuals.”12

The study of public participation in the arts is a perfect example of the focus on individual actions to the exclusion of the social context. Public participation studies have focused on the role of individual demographic characteristics and the biography of participants to the exclusion of obvious contextual variables like the availability of cultural opportunities and how the social milieu might encourage or discourage cultural participation.

---

participation. This individualistic bias, of course, has been reinforced by the surveys of public participation in the arts (SPPA) commissioned over the past two decades by the National Endowment for the Arts. Although these surveys and the scholarship based on them has enriched our understanding of who is involved in the arts, the lack of ecological information has made it difficult for researchers to examine in a balanced way individual and neighborhood effects on participation.

**Individual characteristics and cultural participation**

As previous research would suggest, individual demographic characteristics had notable correlations with levels of cultural participation. Gender, ethnicity, education, and income all have significant correlations with individual participation.

The strongest and most consistent correlate of participation was education. Individuals with more than a bachelor’s degree attended an average of over eight events during the previous year, more than four times as many events as high school graduates (Figure 10?). This same relationship of socio-economic status and cultural participation is reflected in the data on income. Across the four cities in the study, individual respondents with incomes over 100,000 dollars in 1997 attended about six (6) events a year, while those earning less than ten thousand dollars and those earning between forty and fifty thousand dollars attended 1.28 and 2.4 events respectively. Gender, age, and ethnicity were also correlated with participation, although these relationships were not statistically significant when controlled for other variables.

**Ecological influences on cultural participation**

The contours of individual participation, however, changed quite dramatically when we considered ecological influences on participation. We found that a neighborhood’s institutional presence, socio-economic status, and social diversity each had a substantial ecological effect on participation as reflected in the SPPA. For example, respondents who lived in a zip code with many cultural institutions attended nearly three times as many cultural events as those who lived in zip codes with few institutions.

Compared to institutional presence, the ecological influence of socio-economic status was quite modest. Across the four cities, respondents in high-income neighborhoods attended only about twice as many events as those in low-income neighborhoods.

Diversity also had a strong impact on individual participation. The strongest influence was of neighborhoods that were both ethnically and economically diverse. If a respondent lived in a zip code in which more than fifteen percent of the population lived in block groups that were ethnically and economically diverse, they attended more than six events per year, compared to only three events for respondents in zip codes with no “doubly diverse” block groups. Ethnic and economic diversity, alone, were also correlated with participation. Finally, household diversity—the frequency of “non-

---

13 The relationship of ethnic diversity to participation was not consistent across the four cities. Ethnic diversity’s impact was strongest in Atlanta, where the respondents in the most diverse neighborhoods attended six times as many events as those in the least diverse. In San Francisco, however, respondents in ethnically homogeneous areas actually attended more events than those in the most ethnically diverse zip codes. This result was undoubtedly related to the unique ethnic composition of the Bay Area where the size of the Latino and Asian populations means that the vast majority of the population lives in areas that—
family” households in a particular area—had a strong and consistent effect on participation.

What explains these correlations between neighborhood and participation? We have identified at least three mechanisms through which neighborhood influences cultural participation.

- **Social expectations.** In some parts of the city, attending cultural events is part of the expected social life of families. We found this effect to be particularly powerful in homogeneous areas of the region.

- **The neighborhood ‘scene’.** In neighborhoods in or near Center City, the wealth of cultural venues and the concentration of young, unmarried, college-educated residents creates a critical mass of cultural participants that boosts participation overall.

- **The ‘food chain.’** Neighborhoods with many smaller cultural organizations are more likely to have higher rates of participation at regional cultural venues. Community cultural events increase individuals’ ‘taste’ for culture, strengthen social networks focused on participation (“If you liked this play, why don’t we go to another one next week”), and provide avenues for disseminating information about other cultural organizations.

Whatever the cause, these neighborhood effects are powerful. In a statistical analysis, we discovered that neighborhood characteristics were as strong as individual characteristics in predicting the number of cultural events a person would attend in a given year.
Cultural Participation in 1996

Total Regional Participation

SIAP made its first estimates of cultural participation in 1996. That analysis produced a clear portrait of variation in participation across the metropolitan area. Aggregating information drawn from our sample of regional cultural providers showed how different the region’s neighborhoods were in residents’ involvement with the arts and culture. The average participation rate for a city block group was 60 participants per 1,000 residents or six percent. The Pennsylvania suburban average was slightly less, 52 per 1,000 residents (5.2 percent). The highest participation areas of the city had rates above 120 participants per 1,000 residents (12 percent). At the other extreme, some sections of Delaware County and much of the city had participation rates below 30 per 1,000 residents (3 percent), less than half of the median for the metropolitan area.

Figure 1. Regional cultural participation rates (per 1,000 residents), metropolitan Philadelphia, 1996

The map of regional participation in 1996 shows that five sections of the metropolitan area were most prominent: Center City, suburban Montgomery County, Chestnut Hill and Mount Airy, and East Falls and the Art Museum area. Most of West, South, and North Philadelphia, Delaware County, and lower Bucks County had relatively low overall participation. (See Figure 1.)

In addition to this overall measure of cultural participation across the region, we used factor analysis to identify specific dimensions in the distribution of participation. This analysis identified two distinctive dimensions: “mainstream” and “alternative” participation.
**Mainstream Participation**

Mainstream cultural participation represents our orthodox view of “high” culture. The groups that are most related to this factor tended to be large, Center City-based organizations like the Philadelphia Orchestra, the Opera Company of Philadelphia, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art. A number of smaller organizations—like the Please Touch Museum and the Philadelphia Singers—also drew their participants from similar sections of the metropolitan area. (See Figure 2.)

![Figure 2. Mainstream cultural participation, metropolitan Philadelphia, 1996](image)

The mainstream cultural index closely paralleled the spatial pattern of total regional participation. Suburban Montgomery County and Center City were the sections of the city most correlated with this factor. In addition, Chestnut Hill and the Swarthmore section of Delaware County also were more likely to score strongly on this factor.

**Alternative Participation**

The second factor to emerge from the 1996 participation index was strongly related to cultural organizations with a more contemporary focus. The Painted Bride Art Center, one of Philadelphia’s leading venues for cutting-edge performances, was strongly represented in this index as were folk music series and a number of organizations with both a community and regional presence, like the Samuel S. Fleisher Art Memorial.

In contrast to our mainstream index, the alternative participation factor was strongly represented in the city of Philadelphia. In addition to parts of Center City, this factor was strongest in neighborhoods on the periphery of Center City to the north (Art Museum, Fairmount, and Northern Liberties) and south (Queens Village and Bella Vista). Although many of the organizations associated with the alternative participation factor
were identified as African-American, these groups had high participation rates within the region’s more diverse neighborhoods. This factor had strong representation in sections of West Philadelphia, Point Breeze in South Philadelphia, and some neighborhoods in North Philadelphia as well as more ethnically diverse areas like Mount Airy, Germantown, East Falls, and neighborhoods near Center City. (See Figure 3.)

![Figure 3. Alternative cultural participation, metropolitan Philadelphia, 1996](image)

**Cultural Participation and Neighborhood Effects**

The three patterns of cultural participation identified by the 1996 analysis—*total regional* participation, *mainstream* participation, and *alternative* participation—each had a distinctive social profile. Socio-economic status, social diversity, and the concentration of cultural organizations influenced each of these measures of participation in a different way.

The presence of local cultural organizations was strongly related to high rates of total regional participation in 1996. The correlation coefficient for the relationship of the regional rate and the number of cultural organizations within one-half mile was .59. When we control for other variables, block groups with the fewest arts organizations had less than 14 participants per 1,000 residents, while neighborhoods with the most arts groups had nearly 120 participants per thousand or nine times as many participants.

Institutional presence was also an important predictor of “mainstream” and “alternative” participation. As with the raw participation rate, total number [of social organizations (.44) and number] of arts and cultural organizations (.54) were the variables the most strongly correlated in explaining the “alternative” factor. For the “mainstream” factor, they are important but somewhat less powerful than socio-economic status. Alternative
regional participation and community participation had similar patterns; both were much higher in neighborhoods with many community cultural providers. Socio-economic status had its strongest influence, however, on mainstream cultural participation. The correlation coefficient between per capita income and the mainstream cultural index was .62, well above the figure for total participation. In contrast, the correlation of per capita income with “alternative” participation was quite weak, explaining less than one percent of the variation in that index. In other words, while one dimension of cultural participation—what we have called mainstream—was strongly associated with the wealth of a neighborhood, alternative participation was related to other, more complex influences.

If mainstream participation was structured by social inequality, alternative participation was most strongly related to diversity. We distinguish three separate dimensions to diversity—economic, ethnic, and household—each of which was related to alternative participation. Economic diversity identified neighborhoods whose residents had high educational and occupational backgrounds but also relatively high poverty. A neighborhood was defined as ethnically diverse if no single major ethnic group—whites, African Americans, Latinos, or Asians—made up more than 80 percent of the population. Finally, household diversity reflected the frequency of what the Census Bureau defines as “non-family households” in a particular neighborhood.

The consistency of the connection between diversity and cultural participation was quite remarkable. For example, neighborhoods that were economically diverse in 1990—that is, both their poverty rate was above average and they had a higher than average proportion of their workforce in professional and managerial occupations—had much higher alternative participation than other parts of the city. In contrast, mainstream participation was strongly related to socio-economic status with lower-than-average-poverty block groups having the highest scores on this index.

The analysis of ethnic patterns of participation reinforces the connection between diversity and alternative participation. Predominantly white neighborhoods had the highest scores on mainstream participation, with somewhat lower scores on total regional participation. Homogeneous African American neighborhoods scored low on all three indexes. However, ethnically diverse neighborhoods scored above average on total participation and much higher than other parts of the city on alternative participation.

The final dimension of diversity—household diversity—was measured by the proportion of “non-family” households in the population. This variegated category included single-person households, same-sex households, and POSSLQs (Persons of Opposite Sex Sharing Living Quarters). Cultural participation rates consistently flourished in these domestically diverse neighborhoods. In neighborhoods that scored in the top quartile on this measure of diversity, all three indexes of participation were higher than average. Total regional participation and alternative participation, in particular, were strongly related to household diversity.

Multivariate analysis confirms the neighborhood patterns previously identified. Per capita income, institutional presence, and diversity were all significantly related to cultural participation. Controlling for other variables, well-off block groups had a total participation rate that was more than twice as high as that of block groups in the 50th -74th
percentiles. Those block groups with the highest number of cultural providers near them had participation rates in 1996 of 120 per 1,000 residents, roughly 12 percent, compared to rates of 13 to 42 per thousand (1.3 to 4.2 percent) for other parts of the region.

Our two major factor indexes—mainstream and alternative participation—qualified these results. The mainstream index tilted toward per capita income and institutional presence, while the alternative index related more strongly to diversity and institutional presence. Overall, per capita income was the single best predictor of mainstream cultural participation in 1996 with an eta-square of .20. Block groups in the top quartile of the income distribution had significantly higher mainstream cultural participation scores than other areas of the city. Institutional presence, the number of cultural providers within one-half mile, was the second most powerful predictor with an eta-square of .08.

Our three measures of social diversity had relatively limited impacts on mainstream cultural participation. Household diversity was significantly related to participation, but the difference between scores for neighborhoods with many non-family households and those with few was relatively small. Neighborhoods that were economically and ethnically diverse, in fact, scored lower on mainstream cultural participation than other neighborhoods. Rather—consistent with the per capita income results—neighborhoods with below average poverty and homogeneous white neighborhoods scored highest on this index when other variables were controlled.

Our analysis suggests that mainstream more than alternative cultural participation was a socially determined phenomenon in 1996. Our model was able to explain 33 percent of the variance—relatively high for this sort of analysis—in mainstream participation. By contrast, using the same variables, we were able to explain only 13 percent of the variance in alternative participation.

Among the variables in the model, institutional presence, with an eta square of .03, was the strongest predictor of cultural participation. Block groups with many providers had an adjusted alternative participation rate of 45 per 1,000 residents, compared to a rate of 24 per thousand in block groups with the fewest cultural institutions. Ethnic, economic, and household diversity all had a significant relationship to the alternative cultural index. For example, ethnically diverse block groups in 1996 had an alternative participation rate of 34, twice the rate for homogenous white neighborhoods.14

---

14 Adjusted factor scores were derived through the following steps. We calculated weighted group mean and standard deviation for each factor by multiplying each organization’s per capita participation rate by its factor loading and summing the results. We then calculated the adjusted factor score adding the group mean and the block group’s standardized factor score by the group standard deviation. For example, for the alternative factor in 1996, the weighted group mean was 18.9 and group standard deviation was 72.3. Each block group’s adjusted alternative participation rate, then, was equal to 18.9 + 72.3 * (standardized factor score for alternative factor).
Regional cultural participation in 1996 was marked by several clear characteristics. First and foremost, it was consistently tied to institutional presence. Neighborhoods that had large numbers of cultural institutions in their vicinity had uniformly high rates of cultural participation. Beyond this commonality, participation broke down into two patterns: a mainstream pattern that was heavily correlated with socio-economic status and an alternative pattern associated with various forms of diversity.

However, neither the metropolitan area nor the cultural community was static during the late 1990s and early 2000s. The new urban reality and the marketization of the cultural sector exerted important influences on neighborhoods and organizations. By 2004, although the overall contours of participation remained familiar, important changes had influenced the region’s patterns of cultural participation.
Regional Cultural Participation in 2004

Total Regional Participation

In many ways, the map of cultural participation in 2004 looked remarkably similar to that of 1996. The highest concentrations of participants in both years were in a set of neighborhoods in Center City Philadelphia and its adjoining neighborhoods, Northwest Philadelphia, and the close-in northern and western suburbs. The neighborhoods that were in the top ten in 1996 all remained in the top twelve in 2004. The only changes in the rankings, in fact, were the rise in the rank of two park neighborhoods—Wissahickon and Pennypack—that have relatively few residents. Otherwise the top of the rankings remained quite stable. The most significant changes in the geography of participation occurred in the outer-ring suburbs of northern Bucks and Montgomery counties and western Chester County. These block groups recorded participation rate increases well above the regional average. The most obvious explanation of this trend is exurbanization. As new suburban communities are developed in the region’s outer rings, the links between them and established Philadelphia cultural organizations have strengthened.

Regional cultural participants per 1,000 residents
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Figure 4. Regional cultural participation rates (per 1,000 residents), metropolitan Philadelphia, 2004

15 In contrast to 1996, when our estimates were based on data from 25 organizations, our 2004 estimate is based on data drawn from roughly three times as many organizations (Appendix 1). The rapid rise in our raw number estimates of participants per thousand residents should not be taken as a real increase. (We will look at data for a consistent set of organizations later in this paper).
Yet, although the changes in the spatial pattern of participation appear minor, a closer examination of where growth occurred makes it clear that more important changes were underway. Because we obtained data from more cultural organizations in 2004, we cannot simply subtract one figure from the other to identify growth in participation. Instead, we have used regression analysis to use 1996 participation rates to ‘predict’ the 2004 rate. By subtracting this ‘predicted’ value from the actual 2004 rate—what statisticians call the ‘residual’—we are able to identify areas that have higher participation than their 1996 rate would have led us to expect.

This residual analysis tells a single, compelling story: between 1996 and 2004 cultural participation in metropolitan Philadelphia expanded in well-off neighborhoods and declined (at least in relative terms) in poorer sections of the region.

The correlations between participation change (as measured by the residual) and socio-economic status can be seen in a variety of variables. The strongest correlations are: average household income (.39), average gross housing value 1990 (.37), professionals and managers as percent of labor force (.38), as well as median family income, per capita income, and median value of housing. At the other end of the spectrum, the residual was negatively correlated with low educational achievement (-.40), female-headed households (-.25), and poverty (-.21).

We examined changes between 1996 and 2004 using an alternative method—that is, restricting our analysis only to organizations for which we had comparable data in both years. This method’s strength is that it allows us to estimate absolute changes in participation, albeit for a relatively small set of organizations. The analysis suggests that for this subgroup of organizations, participation rates increased from around 51 per 1,000 residents in 1996 to 73 per thousand in 2004, an increase of 43 percent over the previous eight years. These data are consistent with the most recent NEA survey of public participation in the arts (2002), which suggested a modest increase in cultural participation over the previous decade; as well as the Rand study, previously discussed, which suggested that larger organizations are strategically positioned to expand their audiences. This method’s findings are also consistent with the residual analysis with respect to which neighborhoods most expanded participation. Block groups with high socio-economic status were most correlated with increases in the ‘same-organization’ participation rate, while those with low educational achievement had a high correlation with declines in participation.

This strong connection of increased inequality and participation is highlighted by a variable that identifies high, middle, and low-income sections of the metropolitan area.16 By this measure, the participation of low-income block groups was roughly three percent (34 per 1,000 residents) below what we would expect, while middle-income block groups were virtually the same as we would expect. In contrast, upper income neighborhoods had 2004 participation rates that were more than five percent (54 per thousand) higher than we would expect based on the 1996 data. Overall, income class alone explained 12 percent of the variance in the residual figure.

---

16 Middle-income is defined as between 67 and 133 percent of the median figure for the metropolitan area.
The relationship between income stratum and participation is even stronger if we examine changes in income class during the 1990s. Block groups that began the 1990s as low-income as well as those that began as middle-income but fell to low-income during the decade—all had residual figures between –3 and –4 percent. At the other extreme, block groups that remained high income throughout the 1990s—block groups that included about half a million residents—saw their participation increase by more than six percent (62 per thousand) above what we would expect based on the 1996 data.

The shift in the economic profile of cultural participation had an impact on the relationship between participation and diversity. Participation rose by one percent in block groups that were white in 1990 and fell in black, Latin American, and diverse block groups. Similarly, the residual rose in block groups with low numbers of non-family households and fell in those with many. The participation rate in economically diverse block groups rose slightly, but not as high as in those with below average poverty. The strength of these relationships suggests that the economic stratification of places—not their homogeneity—was the driving force behind the change in participation. Still, because well-off neighborhoods were more likely to be homogeneous, this shift had the consequence of reducing participation in diverse sections of the city.

The raw participation rates provide the single most important yardstick for estimating cultural participation for metropolitan Philadelphia’s block groups. Yet, everything we know about cultural participation suggests that no single number can capture its variation across organizations, disciplines, and space. To do so, we turned again to factor analysis, a data reduction technique that allows us to identify underlying commonalities in the data. As in 1996, we entered all participation data on individual cultural organizations into the analysis. The output identifies the underlying patterns or ‘factors’ that link particular organizations to specific variations across space.
The results of the factor analysis were quite striking. Recall that in 1996, the analysis identified two major factors: one, a mainstream factor identified with established organizations and well-off neighborhoods with many cultural organizations and, two, an alternative factor identified with less-established cultural organizations and diverse neighborhoods with many cultural organizations. By 2004, the alternative cultural participation factor had disappeared. The organizations that were part of this factor in 1996 were, in 2004, part of the mainstream factor. The distinction between the two patterns had vanished. Yet, at the same time that more groups had become mainstream, the mainstream had become more diverse. Whereas in 1996, the mainstream factor was strongly correlated with socio-economic status and not correlated with diversity, by 2004 the mainstream factor was correlated with both diversity and socio-economic status. As cultural participation had become more ‘mainstream,’ the mainstream had become more diverse. This is the major conclusion of the 2004 participation analysis.

**Mainstream Participation**

The mainstream factor in 2004 explained about 30 percent of the variance in participation among all the organizations. This is slightly lower than the 1996 mainstream factor, a fact explained by the larger number of organizations included in the 2004 analysis.

The mainstream factor drew heavily on the region’s major cultural organizations. The Philadelphia Museum of Art, the Opera Company of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Orchestra, and the Kimmel Center for the Performing Arts were prominent among the organizations strongly correlated with this factor. Yet, the list of organizations included in the mainstream factor was much broader and more diverse than it was eight years earlier. A set of organizations that were strongly correlated with the ‘alternative’ factor in 1996—including the Painted Bride Art Center, Fleisher Art Memorial, the Wilma Theater, and the Prince Music Theatre (formerly the American Music Theater Festival)—were now heavily correlated with the mainstream factor. In addition, a set of organizations that are less established, but not included in our earlier analysis—including the Philadelphia Live Arts Festival and Philly Fringe, InterAct Theatre Company, and Mum Puppettheatre—had the same spatial pattern as the organizations mentioned above.

Although the organizations that composed the mainstream factor changed over the eight years, the neighborhoods from which they drew their participants did not. As in 1996, Center City, Northwest Philadelphia (Chestnut Hill and Mount Airy), and the northern and western inner-circle suburbs were the major strongholds of the mainstream factor. The most noticeable change in the geography of mainstream participation was its spread into the neighborhoods near Center City (University City, Powelton, Northern Liberties, and Wharton/Hawthorne). These neighborhoods all had formerly been strongly correlated with alternative participation. (See Figure 6.)
As in 1996, institutional presence and per capita income were the most important variables correlated with mainstream participation. In 1996 the mainstream participation rate for block groups with the highest number of cultural providers within one-half mile was over 200 per 1,000 residents, when other variables were controlled, while the rate for block groups with the fewest number of cultural organizations was only 24 per thousand. Block groups that gained cultural organizations between 1996 and 2004 were even more likely to have high mainstream participation.
At the same time, the mainstream factor maintained the high correlation with socio-economic status that we found in 1996. The correlation coefficient between the mainstream factor and per capita income was .57, making it the single strongest predictor of mainstream participation. Controlling for other variables, high-income block groups had an adjusted mainstream participation rate of 186 per 1,000 residents while those at the bottom of the economic order had an adjusted rate of only 20 per thousand.

Although there is much familiar with the socio-economic contours of the 2004 mainstream factor, on closer examination some features distinguish it from the 1996 mainstream factor, especially with respect to social diversity. Consider ethnic diversity. In 1996 the mainstream factor was virtually uncorrelated with ethnic diversity. Homogeneous white block groups had converted mainstream factor scores that were nearly 20 participants per 1,000 residents above the metropolitan area average, while diverse block group scores were 27 per thousand below the regional average, and black and Latino block group scores were even lower. In 2004, although African American block groups continued to score below average on mainstream participation, ethnically diverse block groups along with white block groups scored slightly above the regional average.

The difference with economic diversity was even more striking. In 1996 economically diverse neighborhoods had below average scores on mainstream participation. By 2004, the adjusted mainstream participation rate for economically diverse neighborhoods had increased to 95 per thousand, well above the regional average.
The strongest link between diversity and mainstream participation in 2004, however, was with household diversity. The areas of the region with the highest percentage of non-family households in 2004 had an adjusted mainstream participation rate of 137 per thousand, while the rate for those with the fewest non-family households was 50 per thousand.

Between 1996 and 2004, both Philadelphia’s neighborhoods and its mainstream cultural participation patterns changed. A city that according to the 1990 census was—in the words of Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton—‘hyper-segregated’ became less so. All types of diversity expanded both within the city itself and in its surrounding suburbs. At the same time, however, the metropolitan area became more polarized economically as the number of middle-income neighborhoods declined and the number of upper- and lower- income neighborhoods expanded.

Mainstream cultural participation reflected these neighborhood demographic changes. As in 1996, it was highly correlated with socio-economic status. However, as Philadelphia became more diverse, so too did mainstream participation. By 2004, diverse neighborhoods were home to many mainstream cultural participants. Finally, the organizations that shared the mainstream cultural profile diversified as well; by 2004 many organizations that formerly had been part of the alternative cultural participation pattern had joined the mainstream.

Across time, however, the local presence of cultural organizations continued to be an important correlate of mainstream participation. In addition, those neighborhoods that gained cultural groups between 1996 and 2004—when the influence of other variables was controlled—had even higher participation rates than other sections of the city.

**The ‘City’ Factor—A New Alternative Participation?**

As we have noted, the alternative participation factor documented in 1996 had merged into the mainstream pattern by 2004. The cultural organizations and neighborhoods that had characterized the alternative pattern were both prominent in the reconstituted cultural mainstream of 2004.

The second most powerful factor to emerge from our 2004 analysis had strikingly different characteristics than the 1996 alternative participation factor. Indeed, there is virtually no correlation between what we shall call the ‘city’ factor and any of the results from the 1996 survey.

The organizations most strongly associated with the ‘city’ factor were quite diverse. There were several more established organizations like the Preservation Alliance, the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Choral Arts Society of Philadelphia, and the Moore College of Art and Design. In addition, several newer organizations—including the Art Sanctuary, Blue Sky, Jeanne Ruddy Dance, and Enchantment Theatre Company—loaded heavily on this factor. Finally, several organizations that focus on reaching under-served populations—including Art-Reach Inc. and Strings for Schools—had participation patterns that fit this factor.

---

Very few of the major cultural organizations in the metropolitan area were associated with the city factor. As a result, the adjusted participation rate for this factor was only 32 per 1,000 residents, less than a quarter as large as the total regional participation rate.

The geography of the city factor included a set of neighborhoods with different socio-economic profiles. Center City scored high on this factor, but so did a set of African American neighborhoods in or near the city, including Poplar in North Philadelphia, Wynnefield and University City in West Philadelphia, East Mount Airy, and Yeadon.

Indeed, the city factor was most distinguished by its concentration within the city of Philadelphia. Whereas overall cultural participation was slightly higher in the suburbs than in the city, the city factor’s adjusted participation rate was 43 per 1,000 residents in the city of Philadelphia and only 24 per thousand in the suburbs.

The city factor was also correlated with a set of variables not usually associated with cultural participation including high poverty, high vacancy rates, and high numbers of female-headed households. These characteristics are associated with many urban neighborhoods.
Two characteristics, however, do link the city factor to overall participation—institutional presence and household diversity. The presence of cultural organizations was the variable most strongly correlated with the city factor, although somewhat less strongly than with the mainstream factor. Non-family households was also associated with the city factor but at a much lower level than with mainstream participation.

Using multivariate analysis, which controls for correlations between different socio-economic variables, ethnic composition emerged as the most important influence on the city factor. African American neighborhoods had a city participation rate of 50 per 1,000 residents compared to a rate of only 31 per thousand for white neighborhoods.

Institutional presence and institutional growth had a modest impact on the adjusted participation rates for the city factor. The block groups with the highest number of cultural organizations had an adjusted participation rate of 50 per 1,000 residents compared with rates of around 37 per thousand for other areas. If a block group gained cultural institutions between 1996 and 2004, its participation rate was 47 per thousand compared with 37 per thousand for those that had no change over the period.

Economic diversity was associated with the city factor. ‘Pov-prof’ neighborhoods had an adjusted participation rate of 52 per 1,000 residents compared with a rate of 37 per thousand for block groups with below average poverty. Non-family households increased the probability that a block group would have high city factor participation, but the differences were modest.

The city factor represents a new feature on Philadelphia’s cultural horizon, but one that has not yet come into focus. First, the method used—factor analysis—is fully capable of producing statistical tricks. Its purpose is to look for patterns in data; sometimes those patterns make sense, and sometimes they are just a pattern without logic. The fact that
the city factor includes such a range of neighborhoods and organizations should make us
skeptical. Still, given the new urban reality, we need to be open to patterns that do not
conform to our preconceptions of the city and its social life. The connection of diversity,
an African American presence, and a complex set of organizations should encourage us
to pay attention to see if the city factor finds resonance with future discoveries about
Philadelphia’s cultural landscape.
Conclusion

This paper has examined new evidence on cultural participation in Philadelphia in light of the dynamics of urban life. It has used two lenses—the new urban reality marked by increasing diversity and inequality and the marketization of the cultural sector—to explain the dynamics of cultural participation.

The empirical findings of the paper are clear and unambiguous. Virtually all of the growth in cultural participation in metropolitan Philadelphia between 1996 and 2004 occurred in upper-income sections of the region. This finding is consistent with general trends in the nonprofit cultural sector. The increased competition and financial pressures that cultural organizations are facing has pushed them to adopt more market-oriented strategies of sustainability. In the absence of new infusions of support from philanthropic and public sources, nonprofits are required to seek out those participants and potential participants who are more able to pay the cost of cultural production. The shift of cultural participation toward upper-income neighborhoods, then, is a natural consequence of environmental conditions in the cultural sector.

The increasing prominence of high-income neighborhoods is tempered somewhat by emerging urban residential patterns. As we have noted, over the past two decades, Philadelphia neighborhoods—especially higher-income neighborhoods—have become more diverse. In 1990, only 2 percent of the population of high-income neighborhood lived in an ethnically diverse black group. In 2000, 9 percent did. As a result, while participation became more tied to high-income neighborhoods during the 1990s, the diversity of participation also increased.

One result of this convergence of market and cultural forces is the redefinition of ‘alternative’ cultural participation. In 1996, when mainstream participation was associated with high-income, homogeneous sections of the city, alternative cultural participation had a distinctive, diverse profile; a set of organizations that focused on new forms of cultural expression and drew an ethnically diverse, if not particularly prosperous, audience. By 2004 this dimension of participation had largely disappeared. The organizations that historically made up the alternative cultural scene now have participation profiles that are similar to those of more established cultural organizations. Furthermore, some new organizations that fit the ‘alternative’ profile also are part of the mainstream cultural scene.

In its place, alternative cultural participation has taken on a more urban look. The ‘city’ factor that emerged from our analysis is more tied to African American neighborhoods in the city of Philadelphia. Certainly, one of the implications of this paper is that we must in the future pay attention to this phenomenon to confirm whether it represents a new feature of the cultural scene or a statistical aberration.

Although the results of this analysis are surprising, there is really no reason why they should be. As we have noted, the findings are a logical outcome of broader trends in the city and the cultural sector. Most importantly, the convergence of increasing economic inequality in American cities and pressure on cultural organizations to respond to market forces has tilted cultural participation decisively toward greater reliance on high-income participants. Historically, the public sector, with a push from philanthropy, has been the moving force behind diversification of cultural participation. At a time when few in the
public arena are looking to expand governmental responsibilities, it seems unlikely that a new era of government-initiated cultural expansion is on the horizon.

The prospects of addressing the increasing inequality of participation are clouded as well by social trends. For the past half century, our template for addressing inequality has been to reduce racial and gender inequality. Since the mid-twentieth century, however, the character of race and gender inequality has fundamentally changed. One consequence of this change has been a remarkable expansion of African American, Latin American, and Asian American representation within high-income strata and neighborhoods. As a result, efforts to expand cultural participation among ethnic minorities—although justifiable on multi-cultural grounds—no longer assure that the cultural participation of low-income groups will occur.\(^{18}\)

One piece is missing from this story: trends in cultural participation in small and informal cultural settings. As we have noted, these sectors are poorly represented in our data because so few of these organizations have the organizational capacity to collect the data necessary for small-area estimates. What data we have on these activities suggest that they represent a growing share of total cultural participation. In fact, a recent SIAP study of cultural participation in two neighborhoods of metropolitan Philadelphia demonstrates that informal social engagement is a large and critical part of total cultural participation.\(^{19}\) Although a complete portrait needs to include these informal settings, it is unlikely that their inclusion would fundamentally alter our conclusions about the inequality of cultural participation.

When government made its original commitment during the 1960s to expanding cultural opportunities, it was driven by a strong belief that bringing the benefits of Western culture to more Americans was in the national interest. Over the years, that belief was whittled away. First, conservatives objected that it was, at best, social engineering or, at worst, a systematic plot to undermine social morality. At the same time, the great social awakening of the 1960s and 1970s challenged elite assumptions about the edifying impact of mainstream culture.

It is unlikely that a new effort to expand participation will take place without public initiative. One necessary, but certainly not sufficient, condition for a future expansion is to document in concrete terms how culture benefits all of us. SIAP’s work on cultural participation and the connection of cultural expression to social well-being, we hope, may contribute to an understanding of how culture makes a difference and eventually a new effort to bring those benefits to a wider cross-section of our citizens.

---


APPENDIX 1.

Regional Cultural Participation—Data Sources and Partners

For its analysis of cultural participation in the Philadelphia metropolitan area, SIAP has used data from four sources. The U.S. censuses for 1990 and 2000 provided data on family composition, ethnicity, and socio-economic status. The National Endowment for the Arts sponsored Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts that provided evidence on individual participation rates in cultural activities. Estimates of the number of cultural providers across the Philadelphia city and region are drawn from SIAP inventories compiled from public and nonprofit sources.

Finally, SIAP’s small-area estimates of cultural participation have been derived from data provided by the Philadelphia area cultural community. A set of cultural organizations have allowed us to use their administrative records—including mailing and membership lists, subscribers and ticket-buyers, class and workshop registrants, artists and staff—to estimate the number of participants in every census block group in the metropolitan area.1

Two organizations enabled us to expand our participant data-gathering. Upstages Box Office at the Prince Music Theater, a nonprofit ticket consortium, contributed ticket-buyer information in both 1996 and 2004 for a number of smaller cultural programs. The Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance (GPCA) facilitated our 2004 estimates by assisting with SIAP access for research purposes to its master member data base, the Philadelphia Cultural List Cooperative (PCLC).

We extend special acknowledgement to Laura Burnham, executive director of the Abington Art Center and member of the GPCA board of directors, who was instrumental in gathering 2004 participation data from individual organizations as well as through the Philadelphia Cultural List Cooperative.

This appendix lists the names of the organizations represented in each year of study.

---

1 All participant data-sharing is confidential and anonymous. SIAP uses only household address information, which is geo-coded and aggregated to the census block group level for statistical and geographical analyses like those presented in this report.
Regional Cultural Participation Database 2004

Abington Art Center
Academy of Vocal Arts
Allens Lane Art Center and Allens Lane Theater
Annenberg Center for the Performing Arts
Arden Theater Company
Art-Reach, Inc.
Art Sanctuary
Asociacion de Musicos Latino Americanos
Atwater Kent Museum of Philadelphia
Bread & Roses Community Fund
Blue Sky
Bristol Riverside Theatre
Bryn Mawr Film Institute
Chamber Orchestra of Philadelphia
Chester County Art Association
Choral Arts Society of Philadelphia
The Clay Studio
Creative Access
Curtis Institute of Music and Curtis Opera Theater
Delaware Theater Company
Enchantment Theatre Company
Samuel S. Fleisher Art Memorial
Franklin Institute Science Museum
Free Library of Philadelphia Lecture Series
Grand Opera House
Institute for Contemporary Art, University of Pennsylvania
InterAct Theatre Company
Japan America Society of Greater Philadelphia
Jeanne Ruddy Dance
John Bartram Association
Kimmel Center for the Performing Arts
Khyber
Main Line Art Center
Mann Center for the Performing Arts
Mendelssohn Club of Philadelphia
Moore College of Art & Design
Mum Puppettheatre, Inc
New Freedom Theatre
Opera Company of Philadelphia
Pagus Gallery
Painted Bride Art Center
Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts
Pennsylvania Ballet
Peter Nero & the Philly Pops
Philadelphia Folksong Society
Philadelphia Live Arts Festival and Philly Fringe
Philadelphia Museum of Art
Philadelphia Orchestra Association
Philadelphia Singers
Philadelphia Shakespeare Festival
Philadelphia Theatre Company
Philadelphia Young Playwrights
Philomel Baroque Ensemble
Piffaro, the Renaissance Band
Please Touch Museum
Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Prince Music Theater
Relache, Inc.
Sedgwick Cultural Center
Singing City
Strings for Schools
Suburban Music School
Tempesta di Mare, Inc.
Temple Theaters, Temple University
Temple University Boyer College of Music & Department of Dance
Theatre Alliance of Greater Philadelphia
Walnut Street Theatre
Wilma Theater
WXPN 88.5 FM
Regional Cultural Participation Database 1996

Academy of Vocal Arts
African American Museum in Philadelphia (former African American Historical and Cultural Museum)
Allens Lane Theater
Annenberg Center of the Performing Arts
Asociacion de Musicos Latino Americanos (AMLA)
Bach Festival of Philadelphia
Chamber Orchestra of Philadelphia (former Concerto Soloists)
Samuel S. Fleisher Art Memorial
Franklin Institute Science Museum
Free Library of Philadelphia Lecture Series
International House of Philadelphia (Festival of World Cinema; Folklife Center)
Mann Center for the Performing Arts (former Mann Music Center)
New Freedom Theatre
Opera Company of Philadelphia
Painted Bride Art Center
Philadelphia All Star Forum Series
Philadelphia Folksong Society
Philadelphia Museum of Art
Philadelphia Orchestra
Philadelphia Theatre Company
Please Touch Museum
Prince Music Theater (former American Music Theater Festival)
Prints in Progress (no longer exists)
University of the Arts (Continuing Studies)
Walnut Street Theatre
Wilma Theater