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1. Summary of Proposed Research

The global financial crisis and recession are shaking, but not deterring, a widespread interest in theories of the creative economy, creative cities and geographic distribution of cultural and creative production. The creative economy is estimated to contribute 6%-8% of GDP in many countries, but there is scant consideration of how artists’ changing work practices actually interact with the stretched urban infrastructure and social economy in Canadian communities.

It is well known that labour markets play a pivotal role in urban competitiveness, cooperation and social cohesion. However, conventional arts/culture/heritage policymakers have not presented a credible challenge to the hegemony of social policy in the ‘discourse’ about urban growth, decline or regeneration or to the primacy of economic policy in the creative industries.

The proposed seven-year collaborative research project, led by the Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities, will investigate past, recent and new evidence on “cultural labour” as a major factor in the presence and future of Canadian cities and citizens. It builds on the findings of a three-year project on the state of knowledge about Canadian cultural infrastructure and creative spaces. It will map artists, cultural workers and entrepreneurs in selected Canadian cities to identify how policies related to cultural infrastructure, the creative economy, labour, social and urban fields interact to affect cultural/creative working conditions, social inclusion and equity. What policies best leverage innovation and creativity in developing sustainable communities?

This study will use quantitative and qualitative methods in cross-sectional and longitudinal design to test hypotheses about the changing nature of cultural work. It has five interlocking research components: 1) Four waves of an on-line survey of artists, with a minimum target of 2400 respondents in selected communities; 2) Longitudinal life cycle studies of individual workers; 3) Ethnographies of arts, heritage and cultural organizations; 4) Case studies of cultural spaces and socio-economic infrastructure pertaining to cultural work; 5) Deliberative Policy Paper Calls on themes that complement the other components.

The urban cultural/creative experience in Canada will be compared to advanced theory, empirical research and best policy practices in Europe, Australia and the United States. An international team of researchers leading such inquiry in communications, visual art, history, geography, economics, labour studies, urban planning and policy studies will advance understanding of culture and communities beyond current neo-liberal thinking, inform and advance place-based cultural policy and planning in Canada and train a new generation of cultural entrepreneurs, artists and scholars to lead in building sustainable creative communities. In recessionary times, governments need insights and practical tools to contribute to individuals’ well-being, cultural expression and communities.
2. Description of Proposed Research

Introduction

Scholarly interest in the creative economy\(^1\), creative cities and geo-spatial distribution of cultural/creative production in urban labour markets is widespread, but there is scant consideration of what artists and other cultural producers actually do, or of the multiple roles of cultural organizations from museums to media industries. In particular, little is known about the changing work practices of artists and other creators, their interaction with the social economy,\(^2\) and how their modes of self-organization blend into a stretched urban infrastructure. The Under Construction project (Duxbury, 2008) of Simon Fraser University’s Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities (CPCC) confirmed a large gap in built cultural infrastructure in many areas of Canada, with major facilities outdated, unsafe or simply unsuitable. Municipalities have taken on more fiscal and policy responsibility for cultural communities and ensuring citizen access to cultural services. The tendency to under-resource operating and maintenance costs jeopardizes public legacies and cultural productivity. Building on these findings, this seven-year major collaborative research initiative, led by the CPCC, will examine the complex and far-reaching human, social and economic infrastructure supporting cultural/creative production. The goal is to identify how policies related to cultural infrastructure, the creative economy, labour, social and urban fields interact to improve or worsen cultural/creative working conditions, promote or impede social inclusion and equity.

What policies best leverage innovation and creativity in developing sustainable communities? Cultural production is widely recognized\(^3\) as a dynamic sector that is responding to long- and short-wave economic restructuring (Hesmondalgh, 2007; Harvey, 2008). Comprehensive understanding of cultural labour becomes especially critical in the context of the current global economic and financial crisis (Hesmondalgh, 2007; Cunningham, 2008; CBOC, 2008; ILO, 2008). At a time when massive public investments as economic stimuli are taking shape around the world, there is concern that an incomplete evidence base may be used to frame policy choices, cultural infrastructure may be excluded or the best type of stimulus measures to increase the creative/cultural sector’s contribution to productivity may be misunderstood. The recession of the 1930s witnessed a surprising degree of public investment in and consumption of arts and culture in many countries. Keynes himself had affinity for the cultural field (Throsby, 2008) and the New Deal had large public art and artist employment programs (Adams and Golbard, undated).

This MCRI explores three main premises about the nature of cultural work: Cultural producers are increasingly working in several areas of the economy, adding symbolic value to the production of goods and services; cultural producers are modifying their vocations under the influence of new technologies of expression,

---


2 The social economy consists of association-based economic initiatives founded on values of: service to members of the community rather than generating profits; autonomous management; and democratic decision-making. Various organizations include social assets (housing, childcare, etc.), social enterprises including cooperatives, equity and debt capital for community investment, social purpose businesses, community training and skills development, integrated social and economic planning, and capacity building and community empowerment. See http://www.socialeconomyhub.ca/hub/index.php?page_id=9
leading to a blurring of amateur/professional, full/part-time, self-employed and collective work and a desire to maximize the freedom to innovate; the conditions of creative production are based on a realization of value from intellectual property, whether held in private or in common in new ways.

These and other hypotheses will be tested by a research design involving: 1) cross-sectional surveys of cultural workers; 2) longitudinal life cycle studies; 3) selected institutional ethnographies; 4) analysis and case studies of socio-economic infrastructure supporting cultural work, and 5) related policy papers. The goal is to advance understanding of why some places thrive culturally while others don’t and produce recommendations to fill a growing policy vacuum and improve coordination in multi-level cultural governance. This MCRI will collaborate with colleagues in Europe (especially the UK), Australia and the United States, to construct a local and global appreciation of the changing structure and substance of cultural/creative work.

**Theoretical Framework**

This research program begins primarily from creative economy theory as it intersects with new urbanism and critiques of neo-liberal thinking about the creative city. An emerging intellectual consensus defines the creative economy to include all activities that are based on the original expression of an idea and economic or gift transaction of intellectual property held in private or in common (Strathern, 2006; Hartley, 2005; Hesmondalgh, 2007; Cunningham, 2008). New techniques of measuring economic impacts are finding that the creative economy is larger than supposed (Conference Board of Canada, 2008), is highly labour-intensive and, according to the OECD and UNCTAD, is growing faster than many other sectors and showing sharp agglomerative tendencies to “cluster” (Mommsen, 2004). Disputes arise over what cultural activities are included in the creative economy. For our purpose, cultural labour encompasses the entire arts and culture industry and heritage sectors, attendant education and service sectors and, increasingly, urban planning, design and architecture. This range is consistent with Professor David Throsby’s path-breaking concentric model of the cultural/creative industries. It is somewhat wider than the Statistics Canada definition, but sufficiently consistent with the Canada Council’s disciplinary categories to assist in historical comparison.

It is well known that labour markets play a pivotal role in urban competitiveness, cooperation and social cohesion. They are still relatively place-bound despite the emergence of new virtual modes of work and mobile networks, and labour appears to have become a more important factor in business location decisions as the need for proximity to material inputs has diminished. The capacities for urban environments to spread knowledge and generate “thick” labour markets that permit worker mobility through new business start-ups, firms of differing scales, self-employment and informal networks are increasingly critical, but multiple constitutional jurisdictions make them more difficult to effect (Gordon and Turok, 2005).

While slow to react to developments in global (Sassen, 2005) and ordinary cities (Robinson, 2006) in the 1990s, researchers have now produced a critical mass of literature on the creative economy (with Britain and Australia as the acknowledged leaders) that provides an initial theoretical context for this proposed MCRI. Several theorists have proposed a New International Division of Cultural Labour (Miller et al, 2005) or a blurring in the division of labour between profit and not-for-profit sectors in the United States due to increasing crossover activities (Di Maggio, 2006; Markusen, 2007), while others are exploring the difference that place makes in clustering local and regional cultural labour markets (Scott, 2006; Evans, 2007; Bradford, 2007). The Innovation Systems Research Network in Canada (ISRN, Gertler and Wolfe, 2006), David

---

4 This model includes the “core” traditional or performing and visual arts and cultural industries, radiating outwards. It also allows for a consideration of heritage, which is often completely excluded from the creative economy sector: a position which is logically absurd, given the importance of trade in cultural artifacts. Dr. Throsby is an advisor to this MCRI. See, as well, Gollmitzer and Murray, 2008.
Hesmondalgh (2007) and others have pioneered historical comparison as a means to understand new modes of creative work in the cultural industries in the for-profit sector.

Typically, the public sector, the not-for-profit sector and self-organizing sole proprietors have been largely ignored. The bridging of traditional arts and the new media in the academy are relatively unexamined. There is, however, recent work (Rossiter, 2003) that contests workers’ actual interaction with intellectual property regimes. The interplay of place and space in “bohemian” urban areas has long been of interest (Blau, 1989; Zukin, 1995) and now researchers are exploring sociometric approaches to the study of dense “inner” artists’ networks and their productive interactions (Crossley, 2008; Curid, 2007), as well as creative destruction of traditional art boundaries. At the same time, explorations of the cultural conditions of the new capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2005; Sennett, 2006; Gollmitzer and Murray, 2008) suggest that the prevailing system of income security in most advanced economies necessitates analysis of the concept of “flexicurity” with respect to part-time labour, proposing the cultural sector should leave behind specific economic protections through status of the artist legislation. Furthermore, the role of social capital, including the contribution of voluntary labour to arts and cultural production, is only a very recent component of theories about the creative economy (Dubinsky, 2005; Phillips, 2007; Anheier, 2003). Finally, Richard Florida’s work (2002, 2008) has gained widespread attention for its provocative thesis about the creative classes, but there is a growing concern that it represents a lifestyle marketing category rather than dynamic social force, may misunderstand the production of bohemians, and provide little guidance about the way social outcomes such as unrestrained gentrification and sharper polarization of class fragments are measured or mitigated (Peck, 2005; Donegan et al, 2008). Attention to the impact of recent immigration on urban labour markets suggests, for example, that mobilization of cultural work may occur in more socially-segregated ways than earlier studies suggested (Reitz and Banerjee, 2007), and a range of studies (Oakely, 2007; Evans, 2006; Murray et al, 2007) are contributing to understanding new ethnic cultural enterprise.

While the extent of the creative economy is certainly recognized in Canada (Conference Board, 2008), federal and provincial governments have been slow to adopt a conceptual and policy framework that explicitly reflects this reality. Many Canadian cities have jumped on the creative city bandwagon. Toronto was recently recognized as one of the top ten global cities, after twinning with London on basic research and development initiatives (Gertler and Evans, 2005). Vancouver was pursuing a specifically socio-cultural approach to creative city development as early as 1986. Montreal received City of Design recognition within UNESCO’s Creative Cities Network established in 2004. Several small and mid-size cities have also adopted plans that embrace creative city principles (London, Ottawa and others). Canada is globally acknowledged as a leader in modernising its framework for cultural statistics, charting city growth, pioneering an International UNESCO Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions and developing new guidelines for the measurement of decent work, labour underutilization and volunteer work (ILO, 2008). Yet, paradoxically, the last comprehensive study of cultural work was done in 1993 — based on the precepts and structure of a traditional industrial economy and insufficient to support urban labour market level analysis. Once a leader in evidence-based development of cultural policy, Canada risks falling behind.

Economic multiplier effect studies and statistical aggregates of various sectors are readily available but do little to substantially capture the specific conditions and contexts of cultural labour at local, regional and national levels. Research clusters such as the Metropolis project or ISRN either overlook the changing demographic

---

5 No worker should therefore receive a wage that is insufficient to live on; be deprived of the payment of wages or benefits to which they are entitled; be subject to coercion, discrimination, indignity or unwarranted danger in the workplace; or be required to work so many hours that he or she is effectively denied a personal or civic life. See Arthurs, 2006, and www.ilo.org/global/About_the_ILO/Mainpillars/Whatis

DecentWork/lang-en/index.html. Dr. Arthurs was awarded the Intl. Labour Organization (ILO) Decent Work Research Prize in 2008.
composition of the cultural workforce or, typically, emphasize single cultural industries such as video games or new media. Work by the Canadian Labour Market and Skills Network is generic, and while principles of labour regulation have long recognized special classes of workers (Arthurs, 2005), little work has been done at the intersection of urban policy, labour policy and the creative economy. Even less modelling has been done on the interaction of creative work with social welfare services or other key determinants of human capital (Nordic Innovation Centre, 2007). Immigrant labour has been particularly under-studied in the creative economy. A recent CPCC study of ethnic media in the greater Vancouver region, for example, found systemic under-representation of small ethnic media business start-ups in official directories. Work by the ISRN (with David Wolfe and Meric Gertler) on clusters of innovation in new media and Robert Young at the University of Western Ontario on new trends in municipal governance and policy provides important foundations for this MCR.

As for the policy considerations, Jon Vickery (2007) makes the tough argument that conventional arts/culture/heritage policymakers have not presented a credible challenge to the hegemony of social policy in the ‘discourse’ about urban growth, decline or regeneration, or to the primacy of economic policy in the creative industries. In part, he says, this is due to a weak concept of culture and an under-theorised understanding of the relation between culture, the economy and sustainable communities. Consequently, cultural policy is either marginal, outside the mainstream of heavyweight urban, labour and social policy areas, or appended as an afterthought. Many municipalities in Canada attach cultural planning, responsibility to invent inducements to attract investment or labour force adjustment issues to recreational or economic departments, with little coordination.

Challenging traditional premises about the nature of cultural production has profound implications for both cultural and urban policy. Canadian cultural/creative policy research in the university is underdeveloped and, if it occurs, focuses on specific policy areas. Insufficient attention is paid to the devolution of policy activity to the local level, or to the horizontal migration of the cultural policy field to a range of other policy areas requiring new disciplinary perspectives. Such trends challenge traditionally narrow aesthetic definitions of culture as “specific.” Policy analysts in blinkers (in areas of immigrant adjustment, gendered exclusion or labour union policy) can no longer ignore the cultural/creative innovation of the self-employed so-called “precariat,” or part-time, self-employed creative worker. If artists and creators are more likely than the average workforce to work part-time and be self-employed, as studies have shown, are they more or less likely to climb out of the “precarity trap”? What strategies do they use? Are they the advance wave of the new creative economy, or do they represent a paradigm shift for sustainable communities? Close observations of Canadian public policy have found the “weakness of the urban dimension disquieting” (Andrew et al., 2002). Little is known, for example, about the range of urban or provincial labour policies specific to the cultural/creative sector, such as if or how well they attract and retain cultural labour, link social infrastructure and leverage productivity. As American geographer Allen J. Scott perceptively observes: “the widening search for instruments to harness the forces of creativity in order to promote local economic development … is deeply problematical” (2006). Doubly so, we contend, during a sharp economic downturn.

Given the principal aim of this proposed project and the theoretical sources and reservations noted, the research propositions are as follows:

---

6 There are sources on the cultural industries, or the arts, or heritage, but rarely on all. The last comprehensive policy review of the sector was the Applebaum-Hebert Committee in the early 1980s. The 2005 report by the Auditor General on support for the cultural industries called upon the Department of Canadian Heritage to develop more comprehensive policy coordination, yet the recent restructuring by cabinet removed responsibilities for multiculturalism, causing more difficulties in coordination.
P1. Conceptual confusion exists about whether cultural work is distinctly different from other types of work, if there is actual innovative content and if cultural work is a significant proportion of the current economy.

P2. Public policy lacks a concept of culture that embodies both subject-specific values and socially-grounded action (Vickery, 2007).

P3. Cultural work directly contributes to sustainable communities.

P4. New indicators are needed to measure community sustainability in ways that properly accommodate the value of cultural productivity.

P5. The current intellectual property regime cannot accommodate changing work practices and conditions.

P6. Cultural workers have not sufficiently acquired the multidisciplinary competencies required to engage in effective work that bridges profit and not-for-profit sectors.

P7. The collapse of traditional aesthetic hierarchies (high/low art or professional/community) and the tension between specialized skills and multidisciplinary practice are enhancing artistic mobility.

P8. Despite working conditions that appear to be more intermittent, precarious and difficult than in other sectors, modes of self- and collective organization have not yet assembled sufficient security supports.

P9. The voluntary work that has cross-subsidized the cultural/creative sector appears to be transitioning or disappearing.

P10. The not-for-profit institutional form shows a surprising durability and salience in the social organization of cultural work.

P11. Women stay in the creative sector at a lower rate than their education and training suggest, and show sharply different success rates in ascending to creative control in different parts of the cultural value chain (Ference Weicker, 2005).

P12. Studies of recent immigrants point to the persistence of an urban underclass, which suggests continuing segmentation of cultural work.

Detailed research on these hypotheses/presuppositions will advance understanding of the relationship between cultural work and class in Canada, particularly the easing or perpetuation of poverty or gentrification and intersection of cultural and urban social policy such as affordable live/work spaces, federal welcoming communities initiatives for immigrants, small business enterprise start-up assistance or policies to combat social exclusion and build healthy communities (Gollmitzer and Murray, 2008).

**Method/Research Design**

The conceptual breakthrough of the proposed design is to place higher priority on operationalizing locational factors than disciplinary specificity. The team proposes to look at a stratification of cities/city regions:

1. MTV (Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver);
2. Other city regions with populations of one million or over, and provincial capitals;
3. Edge/other mid-sized cities;
4. Small cities; and
5. Rural areas or small cities with rural catchment areas.
While the number is not yet set, the proposal envisions about 30 cities/areas representative of high, medium, normal and low growth cultural work markets. A representative set of cities in Europe, Australia and/or the US will be sought for comparative purposes should funding permit. The primary propositions guiding this design are that original research must be place-based and work-centred, not employment- or occupation-driven, and must rely on self-described artistic content and practice. Classical labour force measurement at Statistics Canada is not adaptable to these needs, necessitating new research and new meta-analysis of existing secondary research using the dimension of time as follows:

1. **An on-line cross-sectional survey of artists and other cultural producers in years one to four,** focusing on the conditions and contexts of practice across sectors and networks, in different stratified city samples each year. The survey will probe time spent on work, remuneration, use of career resources, negotiation of the use of intellectual property resources or exercise of rights, training and use of social policy and government programs. Two major studies providing a framework for this investigation are Markusen’s U.S. study of work crossovers (2006) and a U.K. study of innovation (Oakley et al.). Research questions include: How do we build a more complex and flexible model of the cultural workforce that is not occupation-based but practice-based? (Throsby, 2001). What kinds of material supports — employment and benefits, grants and awards, and space — do artists need? Are artists' training programs preparing them for the environments they will encounter? What kinds of connections and networks enable artists to pursue their careers? (Urban Institute, 2006). What are the characteristics, contexts and pathways associated with creative edge, i.e., ideas, styles, designs and genres which subsequently may be converted into market-based opportunities? (Hannigan, 2008).

2. **Longitudinal life cycle studies of individual workers undertaken throughout the project.** The estimated number is 250, subject to some inevitable drops over time but taking into account generational, gender and racial factors. Career choices, migration, changes in practice, crossovers in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors, accrued value from intellectual property investment and the impact of social networking and new forms of sociality in production will be explored in depth. Important qualitative precedents are an AHRC-funded project by David Harvey and Nicola Thomas at the University of Exeter that traces the biographies of creative makers in South West Britain (2008) and a forthcoming AHRC study by David Hesmondalgh comparing music making in Britain and Australia.

3. **Institutional ethnographies of arts, heritage and cultural organizations in the profit, not-for-profit and public sectors will be undertaken over the seven years.** Already identified are shifts in musical practice that are being mapped by new ethnographies of live music and recording studios elsewhere, and the continuing persistence of many museums throughout rural and urban communities despite financial and infrastructure constraints. Other possible avenues may include, but are not limited to, mapping the origins of new cultural enterprises since 2000.

4. **Specific studies of socio-economic urban infrastructure pertaining to cultural work will begin in the first year and continue until completion.** This strand explores the changing role of artists’ guilds, unions and service organizations, the emergence of social networks, new alliances or lobbies, and the introduction of capacity-building assistance by all levels of government. The last point considers changes in emphasis to triple P-driven (public, private and not-for-profit) cultural development, new social enterprise development to cross-subsidize cultural organizations, or alternative funding mechanisms to sustain for-profit and not-for-profit enterprises. This segment will examine the impact of academic and skills training on urban creative labour markets, especially given the dramatic increase in programs and degrees in Canadian higher education in the past 15 years (Canadian Art, Winter 2008).

---

7 This term is drawn from Dorothy Smith (2005). For sample studies see Druick’s analysis of the National Film Board (2008) and Cole’s portrait of Canadian art museums and galleries (2006). Oral history methods like those employed by the Centre for Digital History at Concordia University are promising for their application to institutional settings and lifecycle studies.
5. Deliberative Policy Paper Calls either internally generated or open — based on an adaptation of the best of the Metropolis Project model — will be implemented annually. These include calls (produced out of democratic deliberation by MCRI members) for papers on specific themes to complement those which arise out of the first four components, to remain attuned to developments in the policy arena while the related longitudinal and cross-sectional studies are proceeding. The proposed MCRI will seek advice and continually inform partner organizations and other possible stakeholders, such as the Canada Council, about the policy paper calls and other ongoing work.\(^8\)

To integrate the historical evolution of the guild and craft traditions in social and cultural organization of the arts, the research will address six simplified core sectors in a flexible and asymmetrical manner: **Visual Arts**—video games, new media, film, TV including internet (cultural industries), art galleries (painting/prints/sculpture/fibre/photography) design, architecture; **Music**—choral, orchestra, composers, sound recording, music publishing, radio including internet podcasting; **Performing Arts**—theatre, improv, circus, dance; **Literary/Publishing Arts**—writing, magazine and book publishing; **Heritage**—museums, archives, collections, libraries; and **Arts Schools and Faculties, Public Institutions, Intermediaries and Services.** The goal is to chart the factors and issues common to all cultural arenas, venues and communities of practice, which remains exceedingly important to initial and potential community partners.

**Program Outcomes**

Each overlapping policy field suggests a range of possible influences on the development of policy advice. For example, traditional labour policies have flagged the need for active labour market policies as championed by the ILO, but the creative sector may generate different needs than the current models with respect to job placement services or search support, and some provinces/city/regions do better than others at this. The overall intent is to contribute to the dialogue on changing cultural governance, coordination of disparate policy fields and identification of areas of convergence and divergence at the intersection of labour, urban, creative economy, infrastructure and social policy. Annual publications (Y1-4) will feature individual and co-authored publications addressing each wave of the national survey and themes emerging from the life cycle studies and the institutional ethnographies in progress with the aim of reaching a wide and diverse public in and beyond academia. A set of case studies of municipal cultural/creative labour profiles (some 30) will provide the basis for a collected edited book. Sectoral study on the changing nature of, for example, the visual arts labour force, will draw on international comparative cases. A set of four to six strategic policy papers will be prepared and presented at annual conferences, which may be conducted in partnership with the Conference Board of Canada within its International Symposia on the Creative Economy should it be continued. Ongoing workshops and salons, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, op eds, social media and other web-based dissemination will be used to communicate research to cultural workers and organizations through and beyond the project partners.

**Background on Applicant**

Catherine Murray is Co-Director of the Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities (CPCC) at Simon Fraser University, which will lead this MCRI. Dr. Murray is a co-author of “Creative Spaces” (forthcoming: Sage), *From Economy to Ecology: A Policy Framework for Creative Labour* (2008), *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Media in BC* (2007), *Researching Audiences* (2003) and more than 70 other publications. She has served on nine not-for-profit boards, including SFU, BC Film and the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council. Dr. Murray was a member of the Mandate Review Committee exploring the future of the CBC, NFB and Telefilm, an advisor to the Auditor General of Canada on programs in support of cultural industries and a

---

\(^8\) Project collaborators have already received many suggestions for commissioned papers such as the impact of pension/tax law changes on artists’ income and evaluation of retraction in cultural tourism on the extent, quality and location of cultural work. Given this range, the project is aware of the unlimited possibilities for study and therefore, and even at this LOI stage, recognizes the need for careful deliberation so that the overall initiative remains scholarly significant and policy-useful.
member of the Minister of Canadian Heritage’s Expert Advisory Council on the Instrument for Cultural Diversity. She is currently a member of the International Advisory Board of the Cultures and Globalization Series for Sage Publishers, which continues UNESCO’s World Cultures Reports. The network assembled for this MCRI has evolved out of professional associations with the Canadian Cultural Infrastructure Project over the past three years. Many of the members are known to each other, and have co-published. The Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities possesses the expertise and resources to undertake and coordinate a program of this magnitude. During the past three years it has conducted a nation-wide consultation with more than 100 policy analysts and stakeholders at three levels of government on the state of cultural infrastructure in communities across Canada, commissioned extensive secondary data analysis and sponsored a major international colloquium attended by 400 in the spring of 2008. Through this initiative, it has developed a proven track record in knowledge outreach, a regular listserv of more than 5,500 subscribers, regular salons and more than 30 publications in the field of creative space, infrastructure gaps and municipal, provincial and regional planning approaches to cultural infrastructure. The CPCC’s current projects include a review of cultural development planning in rural areas, an international comparison of cultural districts, a partnership in a global review of women’s participation in film and TV production and an international comparison of “flexicurity” initiatives to support cultural work.

Nature and Breadth of Collaboration

For this LOI, the CPCC has developed partnerships with researchers from 16 universities, across nine disciplines and from four countries. We have assembled a stellar team of international partners and scholars currently engaged in similar work, including Ann Markusen, Yudhishthar Raj Isar and David Throsby, David Hesmondalgh, Graham Evans, Kate Oakley, Paula Hamilton and Stuart Cunningham, secured agreement to license some survey protocols and located cases with a strong comparative potential. Canadian participants include the Centre for Governance at the University of Ottawa, the Carleton Centre for Public History, INRS and the major national cultural service organizations such as the Canadian Conference of the Arts, Canadian Museum Association and the Canadian Art Directors’ Museum Association, as well as the Creative City Network of Canada. Other Canadian collaborators will be sought, subject to the development of the research design. Annual conferences for two of the seven years will alternate locations with our international partners. We intend to expressly ask co-authors to tackle similar questions from different disciplinary, linguistic or cultural perspectives and promote comment. All partners share an interest in generating long-term strategic planning and relevant research to help construct sustainable communities, improve cultural/creative working conditions and promote social inclusion and equity while leveraging innovation and creativity. RTS total 10/pa/7 years, may be rotated and are capped at 12% of the budget.

Project Governance Structure

SFU is the administering centre for the research program. The Applicant will serve as Director of the initiative for its duration, less time off for an anticipated sabbatical leave, when she will be replaced by one of the leading co-applicants at SFU. An executive committee of three will be appointed to oversee the project day-to-day, chosen to be representative of the research priorities and interests, with members serving on a rotating basis. An international advisory committee (three international co-investigators including David Throsby, Ann Markusen and Yudhishthar Raj Isar, three Canadian to be elected and the PI) will set the terms of reference, guide the setting of research priorities and serve on the peer review panel if open calls are adopted. As the entire project takes shape, there are also plans to create a stakeholders committee to help facilitate the contribution of research to policy deliberations. In addition, there may be ad hoc working groups assembled, coordinated by a full-time executive director by year three. Administration and the technical network support represent 20% of the proposed budget.
Team Roles

Advisory Members are senior scholars who will provide intellectual leadership, advise on research direction and participate in annual conferences. They meet twice annually to assess progress reports. Co-Investigators are senior and junior scholars who will participate in co-design of the project, advise on the development of common instruments for the survey and life cycle studies, propose and develop related work projects and supervise students and research associates. Collaborators provide advice and specialist expertise and may participate in workshops and conferences. Partners consult in all aspects of the design of the study, advise on implementation and exchange representation at annual conferences. Stakeholders may enlist as MCRI members, participate in public exchanges and attend conferences. Members may subscribe to listserv and other informational services. Travel and conference costs account for 20% of expenses.

Student Training

About 30% of the budget is earmarked for students to assist in data gathering, interviewing, case studies and analysis. The student training model evolves out of the CPCC’s experiments with salons and networking but is indebted to the idea of the University of Waterloo’s Science Shop, which matches students to partners to answer incoming queries, devoted to making research more accessible. As well, students handle project responsibilities. The intent is to support 2 postdoctoral candidates/7 years, 2 doctoral students annually and 6 masters students most years across the country, designated by research sector and teamed with co-investigators. Other commissioned work requiring advanced statistical skills will be considered from time to time (for example, in secondary analyses of the 2006 census and labour force surveys). The CPCC, together with participants, will deliver a graduate course in cultural work and cultural policy annually. Field internships and student travel are planned.

Institutional Support and Budget Rationale

The total estimated costs of this proposal are $2.44 million over seven years. The remaining 18% of the budget includes direct research expenses such as fair quantum for respondent honoraria, translation and licensing to adapt survey protocols. Confirmed additional contributions of cash and in-kind funds from our national partners total $525,000 over seven years or $75,000 per annum, representing 20% of the budget. We are indebted to the CCA and the CMA for financial help to develop this proposal. SFU additionally confirms four SFU/RTS (released time stipends for faculty) per annum ($20,000) and $50,000 office space, meeting rooms, financial accounting services, archival space, web hosting and technical support. Commitment from the other Canadian home institutions for six RTS/seven years (with total RTS capped at 12% of the budget) will be secured for the next phase. In full, then, 44% of the proposed SSHRC budget is matched at this stage, before other parties are approached. In particular, direct costs associated with the survey for Phase I will be sought (estimated at $200,000 per wave, according to the US and other precedents).

Invitation for Expressions of Interest in Collaboration

There are a limited number of places for new collaborators from Canada to participate in the Second Phase of this MCRI application design. Scholars, researchers, and policy analysts with expertise in the study of creative work in Canada are invited to comment on the research design for this MCRI and develop a short (400 word) description of a research prospectus they would like to present at the organizing conference to be announced by May 30, 2009, subject to financing. It will be assumed that selected collaborators will be able to provide matched institutional support for a released time supplement, or equivalent, according to SSHRC regulations if successful in the next round of the competition. The deadline for proposals is May 15, 2009. Stakeholders and other potential partners who may wish to develop specialized companion studies to extend or supplement the main components of this research program are also invited to indicate research priorities. Expressions of interest should be addressed to:
Dr. Catherine Murray  
Principal Investigator, MCRI on Cultural Work and Cultural Infrastructure in the Creative Economy  
Centre for Policy Studies in Culture and Communities  
Simon Fraser University  
515 West Hastings (Office 3551)  
Vancouver, BC V6B 5K3  

Or email to murrayc@sfu.ca
Appendix 1: List of partners confirmed

Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA)
National Director: Alain Pineau
804 - 130 Albert Street Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5G4
Phone: (613) 238-3561 Fax: (613) 238-4849
Email: info@ccarts.ca

Canadian Museum Association (CMA)
Executive Director: John McCavity
280 Metcalfe Street, Suite 400, Ottawa ON K2P 1R7 Canada
Phone: 613-567-0099 or 1-888-822-2907 Fax: 613-233-5438
General inquiries: info@museums.ca

Canadian Art Museum Directors’ Organization (CAMDO)
Executive Director: Rob Labossiere
280 Metcalfe, #400, Ottawa ON K2P 1R7
Phone: (613) 862-5035

Creative City Network of Canada
Executive Director: Elizabeth Keurvorst
408-402 West Pender Street, Vancouver BC V6B 1T6
Phone: (604) 688-2489
Email: info@creativecity.ca; elizabeth@creativecity.ca
Appendix 2: Possible stakeholders to be approached in Phase II

Canada Council for the Arts

Canadian Commission for UNESCO

Canadian Cultural Human Resources Sectoral Council

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives

Canadian Policy Research Network’s programs on Cities and Communities, Labour Market and Vulnerable Workers, Education and Learning and Job Quality Research Areas

Cities with Cultural Planning Offices, or planners with responsibility for culture

Conference Board of Canada—Annual International Symposium on the Creative Economy

Department of Canadian Heritage, Strategic Planning Branch

Department of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism

Department of Industry

Infrastructure Canada

Provincial Ministries with Responsibility for Culture

Federation of Canadian Municipalities

Metropolis Project

Innovation Systems Research Network

Welcoming Communities Initiative

Unions or service organizations (national/provincial) representing various artists and arts areas such as: ACTRA, Canadian Crafts Federation, Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Regroupement Quebecpose de la Danse, Writers Union of Canada
Appendix 3: Biographies of partners and participants in cultural work, urban infrastructure and the creative economy (Spring 2009)

MCRI Principal Investigator: Catherine Murray (political science)

Catherine Murray is Professor in the School of Communication, Co-Director of the Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities and an associate of the Masters’ of Public Policy Program at Simon Fraser University. She came to SFU in 1992 after a position as Vice President, Media and Telecommunications at Decima Research, Toronto. Dr. Murray is a co-author of “Creative Spaces” (forthcoming: Sage), *From Economy to Ecology: A Policy Framework for Creative Labour* (2008), *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Media in BC* (2007), *Researching Audiences* (2003), “BC’s Place Based Approach: Policy Devolution and Cultural Self-Determination” in *Cultural Policy and Cultural Public Administration in Provincial and Territorial Governments in Canada* (Forthcoming in 2008) and over 60 publications. She has served on nine not-for-profit Boards in the cultural sector, and was a Member of the Minister of Canadian Heritage’s Expert Advisory Council on the Instrument for Cultural Diversity. She is currently a member of the International Advisory Board of the Cultures and Globalization Series for Sage Publishers, which continues UNESCO’s World Cultures Reports (for further information, see www.sfu.ca/cmns/faculty/murray_c/).

MCRI Partner: The Canadian Conference of the Arts

The Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA) is the national forum for the arts and cultural community in Canada. It provides research, analysis and consultations on public policies affecting the arts and the Canadian cultural institutions and industries. The CCA fosters informed public debate on policy issues and seeks to advance the cultural rights of Canadians. The CCA represents the collective interests of over 250,000 individuals. Among CCA members and supporters are artists and cultural workers, arts organizations, labour groups, arts educators, cultural industry organizations and concerned citizens from across Canada. See www.ccarts.ca/en/about/mission/

MCRI Partner: The Creative City Network of Canada

The CCNC is an organization of people employed by municipalities across Canada working in arts, culture and heritage policy, planning, development and support. Municipalities are playing an increasing role in the development of arts, culture and heritage in Canada. The Creative City Network of Canada exists to connect the people who share this working environment so we can be more effective in cultural development in our communities. By sharing experience, expertise, information and best practices, members support each other through dialogue, both in person and online. There are 150 members. The CCNC has had a three-year research collaboration with the Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities on the state of cultural infrastructure in Canadian cities. See www.creativecity.ca/about-us/index.html

MCRI Partner: The Canadian Museum Association

The Canadian Museums Association (CMA) is the national organization for the advancement of the Canadian museum sector, representing Canadian museum professionals both within Canada and internationally. The CMA works for the recognition, growth, and stability of the sector. It was established by a small group of people in Quebec City in 1947. There were 161 museums in Canada in 1951; by 1972 there were 838 museums, galleries and related institutions. As the quantity of Canadian museums increased, so did the need for the CMA. The CMA has nearly 2,000 members, and supports them with training and professional development programs, conferences, publications, networking opportunities, a body of knowledge, and a dedicated staff. CMA members include non-profit museums, art galleries, science centres, aquaria, archives,
sport halls-of-fame, artist-run centres, zoos and historic sites across Canada.
See www.museums.ca/en/about_cma/history/

Advisory Committee Member: Yudhishthir Raj Isar (sociology and cultural anthropology)
Jean Monnet Professor of global communication at the American University of Paris, Dr. Isar is co-editor of the Culture and Globalization Series (Sage), including the Cultural Economy (2008) and the forthcoming Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation (2009). He has been principal planner of the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development (Stockholm, 30 March – 2 April 1998) and for the design and implementation of follow-up to the report of the World Commission on Culture and Development at UNESCO. He is president of the European Forum for Arts and Heritage and has served as Special Expert Advisor to the National Task Force set up by the American Association of Museums for its Museums and Community Initiative. See http://aup.fr/faculty/cv/isar.pdf

Advisory Committee Member: Ann Markusen (economics)
Dr. Markusen has been professor and Director of in the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota since 1999. She is principle author of the trilogy of studies The Artistic Dividend: the hidden contribution of the arts to the regional economy (2003); Artist’s Centres: impacts on careers, neighbourhoods and economies (2006) and Crossover: How Artists Build Careers across Commercial, Not for Profit and Community Work (2006). Her theoretical work with Greg Shrock on the distinctive city, divergent patterns in growth, hierarchy and specialisation is rewriting the framework for arts and culture in urban and regional planning (forthcoming, Cornell, 2009). See http://www.hhh.umn.edu/people/amarkusen/

Advisory Committee Member David Throsby (economics)
Professor Throsby’s Economics of Culture (London: Cambridge, 2001) has been translated into five languages. Dr. Throsby teaches economics at Macquarie University in Australia and has been a consultant to a number of international organizations and NGOs, including the World Bank, UNESCO, OECD UNCTAD and the J. Paul Getty Trust. He was elected a fellow off the Australian Academy of the Social Sciences in 1988, served as a member of the UNESCO Experts Committee on the Cultural Diversity Convention, and is a member of the editorial board for the Journal of Cultural Economics and the International Journal of Cultural Policy. He is interested in the links between cultural and ecological sustainability. See http://www.businessandeconomics.mq.edu.au/contact_the_faculty/staff2/alphabetical_list_of_staff/david_throsby/research

Co-Investigator Caroline Andrew (political science)
Professor Andrew is director of the Centre for Governance at the University of Ottawa and past Dean of the Faculty of Social Science (1999-2005). She is co-author of Accounting for Culture: thinking through Cultural Citizenship (2005) and Urban Affairs: Back on the Policy Agenda (2002). She has been a proponent of the importance of taking cities more seriously in Canadian politics, and has worked on the intersections of gender, multiculturalism and social cohesion in the urban landscape. See http://www.socialsciences.uottawa.ca/pol/eng/profdetails.asp?ID=90

Co-Investigator Alison Beale (communication)
Associate Director of the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University since 2009 and Co-Director of the Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities since 2007, Dr. Beale is best known for her contribution to feminist analyses of cultural policy (editor of the Special issue on Cultural Policy in Feminist Media Studies in 2007 and Ghosts in the Machine (1998). Her documentary on Harold Adams Innis (1990)
remains one of the few bilingual resources on Innis in the country, and a remarkable contribution to economic history in Canada, and lent her an abiding interest in marginal women and men in communication theory. See [http://www.cmns.sfu.ca/people/faculty/beale_a/](http://www.cmns.sfu.ca/people/faculty/beale_a/)

**Co-Investigator: Guy Bellavance (sociology)**

An Associate professor in the Institut national de la recherche scientifique-Urbanisation, culture and société program, Dr. Bellavance has conducted extensive research on technoculture and multimedia in Montreal, changing modes of artistic creation, and professional art practices and the social concept of artistic standards. His research interests traverse empirical production and consumption studies, and he has published numerous refereed articles in French language journals such as Sociologie et sociétés, and recherches sociographique. Guy Bellavance s’intéresse spécialement aux problématiques de main d'œuvre et de consommation dans le secteur culturel. Ses recherches des dernières années ont principalement porté sur les conditions de vie et de pratique professionnelle dans le domaine des arts, la participation des nouvelles élites aux activités culturelles, l’action des pouvoirs publics en matière de culture et l'organisation socio-économique du secteur culturel. Plusieurs de ses travaux mettent en œuvre une réflexion sur la fonction et le statut des arts et de la culture en milieu urbain et en contexte métropolitain. Depuis 2002, une partie de ses travaux portent également sur le travail de création dans le secteur des nouveaux médias numériques. Directeur du Laboratoire Arts et Sociétés, Terrains et Théories (L’ASTT) et membre de la Chaire Fernand-Dumont sur la culture de l’INRS, il est aussi l’un des représentants de la communauté universitaire à l’Observatoire de la culture et des communications du Québec (Institut de la statistique du Québec). [http://www.inrs-ucs.uquebec.ca/default.asp?p=bella](http://www.inrs-ucs.uquebec.ca/default.asp?p=bella)

**Co-Investigator: Stuart Cunningham (communication)**

Director of Australia’s first Australian Research Council’s Center for Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation at Queensland University of Technology since 2005, Dr. Cunningham has conducted a wide range of international and comparative empirical studies on cluster mapping, value chain analysis, creative digital industries, and screen policy. He is best known for his defense of cultural policy in cultural studies (2003), his interest in dynamic adjustment of regulatory principles in new diasporic cultural forms, and most recently was the guest editor of The Cultural Economy, part of the culture and globalization series (Sage 2008). His recent work on embedded cultural workers—that is artists who work outside of conventional arts and cultural sectors—goes to the heart of the process of innovation, productivity and understanding “precarious labour” in the creative economy. See [http://www.creativeindustries.qut.edu.au/about_us/staff-profile/staffDetail.jsp?id=00001704](http://www.creativeindustries.qut.edu.au/about_us/staff-profile/staffDetail.jsp?id=00001704)

**Co-Investigator: Lon Dubinsky (communication)**

Professor Dubinsky is an adjunct professor at Concordia University and advisor to the Canadian Museum Association. He has worked on a number of major collaborative projects including the mapping of the quality of life and culture of Small cities CURA (2006), Canadians and their Past (2006) and The Learning Museum (1999). He has published widely in Muse and the Museum Management and Curatorship journals, and specializes in understanding how institutions, artists and citizens combine to create a culture of participation in small communities. See [http://www.youthsource.ab.ca/hyl/teacher_resources/LTH_workshop/dubinsky.htm](http://www.youthsource.ab.ca/hyl/teacher_resources/LTH_workshop/dubinsky.htm)

**Co-Investigator: Nancy Duxbury (communication)**

Dr. Duxbury is an adjunct professor in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University and past Executive Director of the Project on the State of Cultural Infrastructure in Canada conducted through the Centre for Policy Studies on Culture and Communities. She has worked as a municipal cultural planning analyst for the City of Vancouver for eight years, was editor of the Canadian Journal of Communication for
ten years, and served as director of research at the Creative City Network of Canada between 2003 and 2006. She has published extensively on the topic of community indicator projects, municipal diversity initiatives and most recently was the lead editor of Under Construction: The State of Cultural Infrastructure in Canada (Infrastructure Canada, 2008). See www.cultureandcommunities.ca. She is best known for her ability to develop networks and adapt and disseminate information among researchers with affinity for specific knowledge clusters.

Co-Investigator: Graeme Evans (urban planning)

Canada does not have a direct equivalent to Dr. Evans’ Cities Institute at the London Metropolitan University, and it is an absence that is sorely missed. A full professor since 2003, Graeme Evans’ professional training crosses arts management and urban planning. He has published extensively on cultural mapping and sustainable communities, branding of the cultural city, and compared cultural industry quarters around the world. He has two articles on creative spaces and the art of urban living forthcoming in Vernacular Creativity and Urban Studies in 2009. Professor Evans is due to complete the sustainable cities project in Canada with a visit to Montreal in the Spring of 2009. His book on Culture and Sustainability is forthcoming in 2010. See http://www.citiesinstitute.org/staff/graeme-evans.cfm

Co-Investigator: Paula Hamilton (history)

An Associate Professor of the Australian Centre for Public History at the University of Technology, Sydney, Dr. Hamilton has co-authored Oral History and Public Memories (2008), Memory and History in 20th century Australia (2004) and is a collaborator on the international people and their pasts project. She has founded the Public History Review, and has been a member of the Australian Journal of History and Culture since 2003. Dr. Hamilton’s forthcoming book History at the Crossroads: Australians and their Past reports on the first ARC funded linkage project which conducted a national survey on attitudes towards the past in collaboration with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, Tranby Aboriginal College, the Powerhouse Museum and the History Teachers’ Association.

Co-Investigator: John Hannigan (sociology)

A professor at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, John Hannigan specializes in urban sociology culture and urban development and creative economy theory. His text Environmental Sociology (Routledge, 2006) is in its second edition, and his seminal Fantasy City: Pleasure and Profit in the Postmodern City (1998) was the first Canadian intervention into the global cities debate. He has been a member of the national advisory group on the CPCC’s study on the state of Canadian cultural infrastructure, and has been a member of the editorial board of the Sociology Compass, and guest editor of a themed issue of the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research on the entertainment economy and urban place-building. See http://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/~socsci/faculty/hannigan/index.html

Co-Investigator: David Hesmondhalgh (media studies)

Dr. Hesmondhalgh is professor at Leeds Metropolitan University and director of the Center for Media Industries Research (CuMirc). He has led a major ESRC team studying creative work in the cultural industries, and his book The Cultural Industries is in the second edition with Sage. He has more than five other co-edited books, and extensive articles exploring the structural transformation of the music industries, production of celebrity, and critical theory on music and youth culture. A forthcoming monograph with Sarah Baker on creative work in music TV and magazine journalism will advance understanding of the changing nature of creative work. Dr. Hesmondalgh is on the International Advisory boards of Popular Music, European Journal of Cultural
cultural work & urban infrastructure in the creative economy


Studies, and the Chinese Journal of Communication, among others. See http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/details.cfm?id=96

Co-Investigator: Tom Hutton (geography)

Dr. Hutton’s seminal “New Economy of the Inner City” in Cities:21 ranked the highest of its year among Elsevier articles for web-access. A professor of the School of Community and Regional Planning at the University of British Columbia, Dr. Hutton has co-authored Service Industries and Asia-Pacific Cities: New Development Trajectories (2005) and The New Economy of the Inner City: Restructuring, Regeneration and Dislocation in the 21st Century Metropolis (2008). He is a member of the MCRI on Multilevel Policy in Canada (SSHRC-sponsored) and worked on the social dynamics of industrial creation and innovation with the ISRN (Innovation Studies Research Network). See http://www.scarp.ubc.ca/faculty%20profiles/hutton.htm

Co-Investigator: M. Sharon Jeannotte (public administration)

Adjunct professor and senior fellow at the Centre for Governance at the University of Ottawa since 2007, Ms. Jeannotte has been a senior advisor to the Canadian Cultural Observatory and Manager of international comparative research in the strategic research and analysis directorate of the Department of Canadian Heritage. She has had a varied career spanning over 25 years in the federal public service. Ms. Jeannotte has co-edited Accounting for Culture (2005) and has published on social capital, cultural citizenship, and indicators of social cohesion, quality of life and transgenerational approaches to understanding culture in Canada. She is a member of the pan-Canadian research consortium on provincial cultural policy, and advisor to the CPCC’s project on the state of cultural infrastructure. See http://www.socialsciences.uottawa.ca/governance/eng/profdetails.asp?id=424

Co-Investigator: Jan Marontate (sociology)

Jan Marontate is associate professor of communication at Simon Fraser University and past CRC II chair of Technology and Culture at Acadia University. Her interest in the sociology of the arts and technology spans visual arts, music, and museology. She has led SSHRC-funded projects on contested spaces, cultural networks and sustainable communities, digital technologies, musical diversity and new entrepreneurial models, and has done extensive research into association, networks and working lives in the Atlantic region. She has completed guest editorships of Sociology and Society, Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, and a foundational piece on museums and the constitution of collective memory in The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Culture. Dr. Marontate serves on the editorial boards of four journals in North America and Europe. Her conceptualization of “singularities and the sociological imagination” (2001) contributes to the understanding how innovators gain recognition instead of dismissal as anomalies, and her contribution to the field on rural cultural production is central to the cultural economy policies of the Maritime provinces. See http://www.cmns.sfu.ca/people/faculty/marontate_j/

Co-Investigator: Del Muise (social history)

Del Muise is Professor of History at Carleton University, a member of the Canadian and Their Pasts CURA, and editor of The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation (1993), which won the prize in regional history from the Canadian Historical Foundation. Dr. Muise has been a frequent contributor to Acadiensis, most recently on “Tartan Tourism, Industrial Development and the Promise of Progress for Cape Breton” and contributor to Labour and Working Class History in Atlantic Canada: A Reader. He has developed the masters program in Public History at Carleton University. His current focus is the politics of public memory in connection with the CBC documentary series Canada: A People’s History. He is working on a proposal for a comparative examination of the impact of federalism on museum reflections of national identity. He has a continuing
interest in heritage issues within Canada, particularly as related to museum policy over the past two decades, but also in the broader area of "Uses of the Past" for political and other objectives. He has collaborated with various NFB producers and directors on various media products in Canadian history and has an active interest in web-based dissemination projects. See [http://http-server.carleton.ca/~dmuise/about_prof_muise.html](http://http-server.carleton.ca/~dmuise/about_prof_muise.html)

**Co-Investigator: Ross Nelson (geography)**

Director of the Faculty of Arts at one of Canada’s newest universities, Thompson Rivers University, Dr. Nelson’s research areas overlap with urban and regional studies, environmental studies, urban, rural and regional economics and social/cultural geography. He was a member of the SSHRC-funded CURA on the cultural future of small cities, has collaborated with the federal government on a community mapping project, and was a central contributor to *Becoming British Columbia: a Demographic History* (2008). His interest in peripheral communities spans Northern BC, Canada, Europe, and the Roma populations of the Slovak Republic. His theoretical work is in the Innisian tradition, exploring staples economies, patterns of migration and economic structure of BC. No stranger to interdisciplinary collaboration, Dr. Nelson has also pioneered an international double degree program in geography and genomics.

**Co-Investigator: Kate Oakley (policy studies)**

Kate Oakley is a writer and policy analyst, specializing in the cultural industries, cultural policy and regional development. She is a Visiting Professor at the Department of Cultural Policy and Management, City University, and at the University of the Arts in London. Her recent publications in this field include *London’s Creative Economy: An Accidental Success?* (2007), co-written with John Knell and published by the Work Foundation, and *Better Than Working For a Living?* (2007), a study of labour markets in festivals and events, published by City University. She has just completed a study of the changing working lives of fine arts graduates entitled, *The Art of Innovation*, published by the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA) in London, and frequently consults for BOP and Demos. Ms. Oakley’s current research interests concern labour in the cultural industries, urban policy and art education. See [http://www.city.ac.uk/cpm/staff/koakley.html](http://www.city.ac.uk/cpm/staff/koakley.html)

**Co-Investigator: Will Straw (communication)**

Professor in the Art History and Communication Studies Department at McGill University, Dr. Straw has completed a range of studies for the SSHRC, as co-applicant in networks including the Digital Commons, Locating Public Space in New Urban Networks, the Culture of Cities and the Weight of the Past in Contemporary Cultural Industries. He has written “Pathways of Cultural Movement” in his co-edited volume *Accounting for Culture*, “Systems of Articulation, Logics of Change, Scenes and Communities in Popular Music,” in *Popular Music: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies* edited by Simon Frith (2004), and extensive analyses of Canada’s music industries. His best known work is the co-edited *Cambridge Companion to Rock and Pop*, and Dr. Straw was a founding editor of *Topia: A Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*. He has curated an exhibition at the Andrew Roth Gallery in New York on *Cyanide and Sin*, and published a book which has gained local and national attention. His new book, *Circulation and the City*, is forthcoming in 2009. He is an Erasmus Mundus Scholar in the European MA program in the Spring of 2009. See [http://www.arts.mcgill.ca/ahcs/html/Straw.html](http://www.arts.mcgill.ca/ahcs/html/Straw.html)

**Co-Investigator: Paul Théberge (communication)**

Professor Théberge is a CRC Chair in the Technological Mediations of Culture and professor in the Institute for Comparative Studies in Literature, Art and Culture and the School for Studies in Art and Culture (music) at Carleton University. Dr. Théberge’s work will examine the impact these developments are having on the music
industry, particularly in terms of legal, technical, economical and social concerns. A musician and composer himself, Dr. Théberge’s previous studies have examined musicians, consumers and the music industry as a whole. His current research looks at the Internet and how it promotes and distributes music, and what this means for consumers and artists. He is also a co-investigator in a Major Collaborative Research Initiative, headed by Dr. William Coleman of McMaster University, on “Globalization and Autonomy.” Within this multi-disciplinary project, Dr. Théberge is researching the role of music in global culture. A recent work on “technology, creative practice and copyright” was published in Music and Copyright edited by Frith and Marshall (2004). His chapter, “Plugged In,” in the Cambridge Companion to Rock and Pop has been translated into five languages, and Dr. Théberge continues his studies of Glenn Gould.

See http://www.carleton.ca/cu/research/chairs/canada_chairs/theberge.html

Co-Investigator: Owen Underhill (music composition)

Composer, conductor, teacher, flutist, Professor Underhill is professor of music in the School for Contemporary Arts at Simon Fraser University and past winner of the Western Canadian Music Award for Outstanding Classical Composition (2007) and Juno nominee for Best Classical composition (2001). He is a frequent co-writer with Michael Bushnell for Orpheus (2002) for the flute, clarinet, horn, trombone, harp, percussion and string quartet, The Faerie Queen Suite (2002) chamber orchestra, and Tristan and Isolde (2002). The World of Light (2007) and was commissioned by the Vancouver Symphony for solo tenor and full orchestra for World of Light (2007). Professor Underhill has been founder and artistic co-director of the Turning Point ensemble, since 2001, and artistic director of Vancouver New Music (1987-2000) where he helped in the premiere of 125 new works. A past director of the School for Contemporary Arts at SFU, Professor Underhill is special advisor of the move to the Woodward’s building in the downtown eastside of Vancouver, and collaborating with an artist led centre in community arts development. His research interest is in the emergence of new artistic practices and young musical artists in the creative economy.

See http://www.owenunderhill.ca/.

Collaborator: Terry Cheney (English)

A member of the Statistics Canada Advisory Committee for the cultural statistics program, Mr. Cheney has been a consultant in socio-economic statistics and writer of reports for the Cultural Human Resources Council. He has advised the Federal–Provincial Ministers of Culture on the Economic Dimensions of the Cultural Sector, and published on managing the cultural labour force in the 21st century in the International Journal of Arts Management (1998). He has also advised on the development of a manual on the use of statistics by the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Collaborator: Monica Gattinger (public policy)

Professor Gattinger is associate professor in the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa, and associate of the Centre for Governance, after working as a consultant to Telus Corporation and analyst in the Industry Canada policy services branch. She won the Graduate Student Canadian Policy Research Award in 2000 and is a co-applicant in an international research collaboration on subnational cultural policy models, and frequent researcher on multilevel governance. She has co-authored Power Switch: Energy Regulatory Governance in the 21st Century (2003) and Accounting for Culture (2005). An article on comparative cultural policy analysis is forthcoming in the Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society (Winter 2009). Dr. Gattinger is past Co-ordinator of the Public Administration Program (2005-2007) and special adviser on research to the Canadian Conference of the Arts.

See http://www.socialsciences.uottawa.ca/pol/eng/profdetails.asp?id=104
Appendix 4: List of references


cultural work & urban infrastructure in the creative economy


**Government Sources**


cultural work & urban infrastructure in the creative economy

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. “Creative Britain: New Talents for the Economy,”

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. “Creative Economy Programme: Infrastructure Report.” 2006,

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. “Creative Industries Mapping Document,” 2001,

Département des Etudes, de la Prospective et des Statistiques, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications,
France. “Generational Approach to Cultural and Media Practices,” 2006,


Institut de la statistique Quebec. “Répartition de l’Effectif des Professions de la Culture et des Communications Selon le Sexe et la Région Métropolitaine de Recensement, 1996-2006.”


cultural work & urban infrastructure in the creative economy


